I DON'T BELIEVE IN THE HOLOCAUST EITHER, BUT I'M TOO SPINELESS TO ADMIT IT, SAYS DR. ROGER EATWELL OF BATH UNIVERSITY - SHOCK CLAIM BY DISTINGUISHED, LIBERAL ACADEMIC

Yes, survivors did lie through their teeth!
Yes, reports of gas chambers were fabricated!
Yes, photographs were faked!

Amazing confessions by anti-Nazi lecturer

Nazis, Jew-Haters And Damned Liars. Right?

A Jewish author once wrote, "There's no business like Shoah business", (1) but Shoah business is not just for Israelis and not just for Jews, indeed, it's big business not only in Israel and throughout the *Diaspora* but throughout academia where many a *goy* academic has made a comfortable living feeding at the trough of anti-anti-Semitism, (2) lecturing to the world what wonderful people Jews really are - Sabra, Shatila, Hebron, and a few hundred other atrocities aside - and condemning the evils of the wicked *Aryan* Nazis.

Attacking some ideologies and some historical figures can at times be controversial, even when their crimes are thoroughly documented. For example, when he died in 1953 Joseph Stalin was hailed by Harry Pollitt Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, as "the greatest man of our time". (3) Even today, long after Stalin's crimes have been exposed and documented - including by his successor Nikita Khrushchev - his name is still revered by some people in the West who claim now to be not Stalinists but "anti-fascists". (4) Denounce Stalin to them at your peril. On the other hand, there is one person and one ideology whom it is always not only safe but almost *de rigeur* to attack and condemn in *respectable* company: Adolf Hitler and his merry men, the Nazis.

After all, the Nazis were not guilty simply of the most heinous of hatreds - anti-Semitism - but of *racism*, and of course, they practised what they preached. Didn't they exterminate six million Jews? Weren't they hellbent on world domination? And weren't they, ultimately, going to exterminate all *inferior races* in gas chambers along with the Jews, and establish a Third Reich of blond-haired, blue-eyed supermen that would last for a thousand years?

Hold on a minute, wasn't Hitler himself somewhat short and a little on the dark side, and didn't the Nazis fight *with* the non-*Aryan* Japanese *against* the largely *Aryan* British and others? And hadn't the British conquered the world anyway and established the greatest empire the world had ever seen? Okay, perhaps Hitler and the Nazis weren't hellbent on world domination, perhaps they weren't even as *racist* as has often been claimed, but on the other hand, they did murder, ie exterminate, SIX MILLION JEWS. Didn't they?

Unless you're deaf and blind or have been living on another planet, you can't but have heard of the people known as Holocaust Revisionists, or Holocaust Deniers as that arrogant, self-righteous bitch - and learned professor - Deborah Lipstadt insists on calling them. (5) Yes, but they're all Nazis, right? Or if they're not all outright Nazis then they're Nazi apologists, kooks and cranks, or maybe they're simply people who are intent on stirring up a hornets' nest of controversy by making outrageous and unbelievable allegations. After all, no news is bad news, and, let's face it, some outrageous charlatans have made comfortable livings over the years simply by making even more outrageous statements in public and writing books, making films, being interviewed on talk shows...on the strength of being controversial and outrageous, even when their ideas contain not a gramme of merit. (6)

Whatever their beliefs and motivations, and whatever their opinions of the Führer and his blond-haired, blue-eyed brutes, two things cannot be either questioned or doubted about the Holocaust Revisionists: A) they are infused with a deep, perhaps even unconscious anti-Semitism. B) They are totally insincere. In other words, they hate the Jews - all Jews - even if they say they don't, even if they think they don't. And they must be lying. Nobody could hold such beliefs sincerely, right? In other words, people can believe, sincerely, that the Lord God Himself had it off with a virgin, impregnated her, sent his only son to Earth where he performed miracles, including rising from the dead himself. They can believe that Muhammad was the messenger of Allah. They can believe in UFOs, psychokinesis, Bigfoot, the Abominable Snowman, or that the late Doris Stokes and her fellow travellers can talk with your Great Auntie Alice on the other side, but the one thing nobody could possibly believe is that the Holocaust and the alleged Nazi extermination of the Jews is an enormous lie. Right? That is too way out, ancient astronauts, psychic detectives and the Son of God aside.

Behind The Media Hype: Other Nonsense

One reason for the propagation of such nonsense - and nonsense in general - is irresponsible media. The current writer is a firm opponent of censorship. Be that as it may, one should always draw a firm line between censorship and responsible publishing. Just as no lawyer worthy of the name will allow his client to go into the witness box and give perjured testimony, so should no publisher publish a book which he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe, is a tissue of lies. At best, such books should be published only with the issue of a strong disclaimer.

It is probably safe to say that many autobiographies are full of lies, gross distortions, exaggerations etc., which the most cursory inquiry would expose as such. (7)

The press are also responsible for the perpetuation of nonsense, and again, not just about the Holocaust. (8) Time and time again the same lies, disinformation, misinformation and claptrap are republished, repeated and recycled. With many, many subjects, what one reads in the media, sees or hears on TV and radio, and what one reads in the academic journals, are entirely at odds with one another. To take just one example, so-called healthy eating.

For much of the 1980s and early 90s, a panic was whipped up by the media. People, especially men, were dropping dead in droves from coronary heart disease, it was alleged. There were books written about it - including many apparently, scholarly works - TV programmes...the reason for this *epidemic*, we were told, was that because we were eating too much fat and not enough fibre. The image the media created was a very simple one: man eats chips, beefburgers, suet...his blood cholesterol level rises, his arteries fur up, and he suffers a coronary. The imagery is both very powerful and very wrong. This nonsense was exposed and refuted definitively by the London GP and medical columnist Dr James Le Fanu in his 1987 book *Eat Your Heart Out*. As to the *epidemic* of coronary heart disease; the simple explanation for this is that people were dying of CHD because they were not dying of other diseases. (9) But, as has been said so often about the media, they never let the facts get in the way of a good story, and along with tales of Bigfoot, alien abductions and the adventures of a plethora of wanderers of the astral plane, the "epidemic" of coronary heart disease, the *conspiracy* to assassinate JFK (10) and countless other nonsense continues to be republished, repeated and recycled to an at times fickle, but too often credulous, public. So, after 1100+ words, we are now ready to turn to the *Holocaust*.

Behind The Media Hype: Holocaust Nonsense

As stated, the media hype of the Holocaust is the image of the blond-haired, blue-eyed jackbooted brute stamping on a Jewish face. This image is in reality a tribute to the power of the media, and nothing more. When one examines the antecedents of the people who control the media, (11) the reason for this becomes apparent. Most of the *research* into Nazi, so-called anti-Semitism and so-called fascism emanates from Jewish organisations, or from organisations controlled by racial Jews. In Britain, the organisation with the most consistent track record of *researching* the far right is the Searchlight Organisation. For some candid admissions about the nature and power of this influence, the reader is referred to articles published in the *Guardian*, February 1980 and *Media Week*, May, 1985. (12)

One would hardly turn to a Nazi organisation for "information" on the Jewish Question, so it is not much less absurd to turn to a Jewish organisation for information on Nazis. Especially when the organisation is run by Jews like these two, (Maurice Ludmer and Gerry Gable, see previous footnote). The bias is immediately noticeable to all but the wilfully blind. Or at least it should be.

When one looks behind this image though, what does one see? Anyone who studies the press for the Nazi era *including the Jewish press*, will come away with an entirely different picture from that recorded by the likes of the Searchlight Organisation and by the books of concentration camp survivors. The Nazi persecution of the Jews, unjustifiable, unjust and outrageous as it was, was purely economic; there were no state sponsored murders or terror campaigns against the Jews prior to the outbreak of World War Two. (13)

In November 1974, the British literary monthly *Books & Bookmen* published a fairly uncritical review of a slim pamphlet entitled *Did Six Million Really Die?* (14) The reviewer, Colin Wilson, is better known as an author on psychic and mystical matters; his apparent endorsement of this anonymous and supposedly scurrilous pamphlet (15) caused uproar and led to demands by Organised Jewry to ban it. Fortunately, this didn't happen. (16) Fortunately also it stimulated other researchers, for prior to 1974 there had been little more than a trickle of, for the most part, poorly researched publications on this supposedly so controversial subject; (17) *Did Six Million Really Die?* opened the floodgates. There followed Professor Butz's *book to silence all but conscious liars*, the Zundel trials, and eventually both *The Leuchter Report* and *The Ball Report*.

Unfortunately, the issue of so much Revisionist literature set off an outbreak of whining and wailing from Organised Jewry such as the world had never seen, even in the immediate wake of the Holocaust. Not only had the Nazis exterminated the Jews, but now they had the temerity to deny this systematic extermination, and even to blame the Jews themselves for inventing *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. (18) The Jewish World Conspiracy

of the notorious *Protocols Of Zion* had been superseded by the Zionist conspiracy of the Holocaust, which had been fabricated in order to extract tears and sympathy from gullible Gentiles, to bolster the State of Israel, and, of course, to promote miscegenation and the extinction of the hated *Aryan goyim*. (19)

Having been ignored for as long as they could be ignored, derided and denounced as Nazis, Nazi apologists, anti-Semites and cranks, having been subjected also to official persecution, and to intimidation and violence by Zionist thugs and *anti-fascist* fellow travellers, (20) the time has come at last when some attempt has to be made to challenge head-on the arguments of the Revisionists. To date, very little progress has been made in this respect; the two most notable efforts are the authentication of *The Diary Of Anne Frank* by the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation, (21) and the somewhat less convincing attempts of Jean-Claude Pressac to authenticate the Auschwitz gas chamber.

This brings us at last to Dr. Roger Eatwell, a liberal academic with excellent anti-fascist credentials, the last *goy* on Earth who could possibly be accused of giving aid and comfort to Adolf Hitler and his merry men. So what does the good doctor have to say about the Holocaust?

Outrage At The "Ham & High"

We have already discussed at length the media hype and the way the formula *Holocaust Revisionist = Nazi and anti-Semite* is parroted unthinkingly (22) by the press, radio and TV. What better way then to introduce Dr Roger Eatwell than by quoting him as quoted by one particular newspaper, the *Hampstead & Highgate Express*.

As might be expected, the *Ham & High* is a local newspaper which covers North London. (23) Domiciled in this area of North London is the Wiener Library, (24) a privately-owned Jewish library which specialises in literature concerning anti-Semitism, specifically the Nazi era and Nazi crimes against the Jews - real and imagined. (25) And at this library one sunny day in March 1993, (26) Dr Roger Eatwell gave a lecture on the (positively shocking) subject of "Holocaust denial". The *Ham & High's* report appeared on page 4 of the March 12, 1993 issue, and it was entitled *Lecture gives lie to Holocaust denial: Growing trend worries historian*. Dr Eatwell hails from the University of Bath where he is a senior lecturer. (27) The current writer has no formal training in document appraisal, literary criticism or any related discipline. Indeed, I have no formal academic qualifications whatsoever. However, I have undertaken so much textual analysis over the past couple of years that, whether or not practice makes perfect, I'm getting rather good at it. So, without further ado, let us analyse both this *Ham & High* news/feature article, and the (alleged) response of Dr Eatwell to Holocaust Revisionism. [Or Holocaust denial (28) if you really must].

We will then take a look at what Dr Eatwell actually says about this allegedly so controversial subject, in both his academic works and his private correspondence. First though, the *Ham & High*.

The article begins by quoting a so-called controversial historian by the name of David Irving. Actually, it misquotes David Irving. Here he is alleged to have said that "UNTIL the end of this tragic century there will always be incorrigible historians, statesmen and publicists who are content to believe that the Nazis used gas chambers at Auschwitz to kill human beings."

What (the not-so-controversial) David Irving actually wrote was: "Until the end of this tragic century there will always be incorrigible historians, statesmen, and publicists who are content to believe, or have no economically viable alternative *but* to believe, that the Nazis used 'gas chambers' at Auschwitz to kill human beings." (29)

The uncredited author of the *Ham & High* article says that Irving made this claim in the foreword to "a book" called the *Leuchter Report*. For the record, *The Leuchter Report* is actually a glossy A4 pamphlet, though admittedly a substantial one.

At about the same time as Irving wrote these words, French politician Jean Marie Le Pen is said to have referred to the "alleged" murder of six million Jews by the Nazis as *a detail of history*. He did indeed, and in May 1990, M. Le Pen he was dragged into court and fined one *symbolic* franc (30) for this *outrage*. But the claim that both Irving and Le Pen are "part of an increasing trend of playing down and even denying the existence of the Holocaust or the Nazi policy of genocide against the Jews in extermination camps such as Auschwitz and Belsen" is false on two counts.

To begin with, M. Le Pen is not the least interested in furthering the cause of Holocaust Revisionism, although it is a safe bet that like the majority of *Aryan goyim* he is heartily sick to death of the incessant wailing and gnashing

of teeth of both Organised Jewry and the organised left over this subject, and equally sick of being branded a Nazi just because he wants his great-great grandchildren to be white and is not afraid to say so.

In the second place, the claim that Jews were *exterminated* in Belsen (31) is indicative of the sloppiness of journalists who write about this subject, as much as it is indicative of the dishonesty of certain Holocaust survivors who continue to tell grossly exaggerated and at times blatantly libellous atrocity stories about their misadventures in the various camps.

The *Ham & High's* photograph of Dr Eatwell (which graces the front cover of this pamphlet) shows him looking suitably outraged and holding up a copy of the offending Harwood pamphlet. But Dr Eatwell would not be outraged in the slightest if you or I were to tell him that there were no gas chambers in Belsen and that no Jews were *exterminated* in Belsen.

BECAUSE HE KNOWS DAMN WELL THEY WEREN'T

As indeed so does every academic who has done his homework on the Final Solution, and as the *Ham & High* should have known. What are the undisputed historical facts about Belsen? The following brief resumé was extracted from 1991 study published by the Imperial War Museum, *The Relief Of Belsen*.

"Belsen" was not an extermination centre such as Birkenau or Treblinka, nor was it a work camp like Mauthausen or Dachau."

"Conditions in the camp were initially quite good, by concentration camp standards, but from 1944 they deteriorated rapidly." (32)

"In March 1944...the concentration camps in the path of [the] advancing allied armies were cleared and their exhausted, sick and dying inhabitants sent to Belsen. The facilities in Belsen were totally unable to cope with this influx and basic services - food, water and sanitation - swiftly collapsed...By April 1945 there were over 60,000 prisoners in Belsen living in the most appalling conditions." (33)

On September 17, 1945, the trial of Belsen concentration camp staff opened at Luneberg, Germany. There were 45 defendants including Commandant Kramer and the notorious "Bitch of Belsen" Irma Grese. This trial also concerned atrocities allegedly committed at Auschwitz, (both Kramer and Grese had been at both camps). The Belsen trial resulted in eleven executions - including those of both Kramer and Grese, twenty gaol sentences and fourteen acquittals. (34)

See, no gas chambers, no *exterminations*, just ordinary sorts of war-time brutalities. Not that this excuses them in any way, but the crimes committed at Belsen were no worse than the crimes committed in countless other war-time detention camps, including those currently existing in the former Yugoslavia, and in Israel, where Palestinian prisoners have long been routinely tortured by those poor persecuted people who suffered so much during World War Two, and who are now doing their best to make sure that others suffer just as much while never letting the world forget that their suffering is unique, more wicked and more unforgivable than anyone else's. (35)

The article continues "While it would be nice to dismiss such grotesque lies as the rantings of a lunatic fringe..." Sure, like the grotesque lie that there were no gas chambers at Belsen, huh? Pull the other one. According to Dr Eatwell, Holocaust Denial has now spread beyond the lunatic fringe (including to himself, as we shall see soon!) and is capable of influencing public opinion. Which will surely refute the filthy anti-Semitic lie that *public opinion* is manufactured by the Jews. However, the good philo-Semitic doc isn't looking on the bright side, rather he sees "a noticeable rise in anti-Semitism across Europe". Yep! And the more those brave Israeli soldiers beat and shoot Palestinian schoolchildren, the more people hate them. Seriously though, Holocaust Denial is now, we are told, being funded by Arab organisations, and is "nowadays presented in pseudo-academic journals with footnotes and extensive bibliographies."

This last is reminiscent of the claim by the *shabbes goy* historian Richard Thurlow, who, in a 1978 article in that august journal *Patterns Of Prejudice*, (36) complained that the Revisionist Historian Antony Sutton (37) "has developed a *Protocols*-style argument, complete with massive documentation..." to explain the transfer of Western technology and credits to the Soviet Union. (38) The idea that massive documentation, meticulous footnoting and pages of bibliography are evidence *against* an hypothesis is the sort of twisted logic we have come to expect from those *goy* academics who make a comfortable living telling Organised Jewry what wonderful people they are and

how they are hated because their ancestors were accused of killing a schizophrenic in Biblical Palestine, (39) rather than because of the way Jewish leaders have consistently ridden roughshod over the rest of mankind in the past fifty and more years.

Academics who have previously given Holocaust Revisionism a wide berth are now making considerable efforts to counter it. As is Dr Eatwell. Unfortunately (or otherwise), the good doctor's writings are doing a great job *for* the ‚Revisionists. "[I]t's a conspiracy theory" he says, and its aim is "effectively to rehabilitate racist and anti-Semitic politics in the world by denying its worse excesses." Clearly this is nonsense. If some idiot were to claim that the Nazis had exterminated fifty million Jews, doubtless Dr Eatwell would be the first person to correct that erroneous impression. That wouldn't mean that he was attempting to rehabilitate Nazism by denying its worst excesses, it would simply mean that he didn't believe its worst excesses went that far, as obviously they didn't. Most (but not all) Holocaust Revisionists are of the same frame of mind.

Apparently, Dr Eatwell is worried by the growing acceptability of these arguments "as credible revisionist history, rather than fallacious lies". He laments the use of scientific investigations, statistics and other data which are now used in this unspeakable theory. A quite startling claim is then made: "One difficulty...in countering the literature was the widespread ignorance of what these people were actually saying." As *all* this ignorance stems from the media, "anti-fascist", Jewish and Zionist organisations and individuals, who are, virtually to a man, hostile to the entire concept of Holocaust Revisionism, this *problem* is one entirely of the anti-Revisionists' making. In fact, the Revisionists have been portrayed as Nazi-baby-eaters, lunatic fringe conspiracy theorists and anti-Semitic cranks, to destroy their credibility. When people realise that the Revisionists have been the victims of misrepresentation, calumny and fraud on a massive scale, it is only natural that they should give their arguments a fair hearing, and even more natural that they should distrust the media, academics and those with sinister political motivations (including Jewish and Zionist groups). After all, who has the more credibility with you, a proven liar or the person *he* accuses of lying?

"Most of this material is more plausible than you might think" says the good doc. "It's not saying that there were no concentration camps" Readers of the *TV Times* may not have got that impression. (40) "Most victims denial theorists said, died of typhus at the end of the war...", says the good doc. Like the victims of Belsen; haven't we all seen these terrible scenes of mass death? And haven't they been used to *prove* in the minds of a credulous public that the Nazis *exterminated* Jews? Can you honestly claim that they haven't? Can anyone?

This is a topic, "Dr Eatwell, who is not Jewish, finds hard to apply a rigorously objective academic eye to". That is an unfortunate if extraordinarily candid admission. Booklets such as *Did Six Million Really Die?* fill him with "a sense of outrage". That's not what he told me, but more about that anon.

"So how far, asked Dr Eatwell, had these theories affected public opinion, and should they be banned or not?" Any academic who could ask such a question in earnest should be hung, drawn and quartered. Any academic who would suggest it, should be hung, drawn and quartered. Fortunately, the spirit of inquiry prevails with the good doc, he may be venal, but he's not that venal, although after receiving a number of letters from sixth formers asking about Holocaust Revisionism (sorry, Denial!) in a neutral or sympathetic manner, he has decided to apply self-censorship and has "vowed never to talk to school groups again, as he was unable to convey the right tone and avoid inadvertently promoting denial views as a valid historical approach."

This is surely music to the ears of any Holocaust Revisionist. What is the guy actually saying? "I don't want to believe the wicked lies those awful people are telling, but I can't help myself. Therefore, like a reformed alcoholic I will practice total abstinence. One sip could be fatal." It could indeed, something the paper refers to as a *chilling thought*.

One final thought from this article, "My feeling is that it is not as easy as people assume to counter these arguments and they are certainly not going to go away." Too right they aren't, rather their time has not yet come. Okay, this is where I came in.

Roger Eatwell: Reluctant Holocaust Revisionist - Exposed In His Own Words

In 1991, the charismatic if ambiguous Dr Eatwell - Rojj to his friends, well, Rojj to me from now on, it's much friendlier. Er, where was I? Oh yes, in 1991, Rojj contributed to a book called *Neo-Fascism in Europe*. Edited by Luciano Cheles, Ronnie Ferguson and Michalina Vaughan, it was published by the mainstream, eminently

respectable publishing house of Longman of London and New York. However, respectability is no guarantee against either fraud or nonsense, and as well as the good doc's evasively honest (41) essay on the propaganda technique of Holocaust Denial, this very same book contained a lie-ridden, error-prone essay by Gerry Gable, long-time publisher of the international race-hate magazine *Searchlight*. I have published a detailed critiqued of Gable's contribution elsewhere so will not cover the same ground here; (42) it will suffice to say though that while this damned liar slipped through - and continues to slip through - the net of respectable publishers, no such criticism can be made of Rojj. He is obviously totally unbigoted.

Chapter Six of the book is called *The Holocaust Denial: a Study in Propaganda Technique*; it runs from page 120 to 146. When I began reading it I was expecting a typical anti-Revisionist polemic, and indeed, on the very first page the author likens the denial of the Holocaust to "the 'scientific' belief that the moon is made of green cheese." But on page 126, he makes a stunning admission: the position of the Revisionists is often traduced, and to back this up he cites the Publisher's Preface to Gill Seidel's 1986 book *The Holocaust Denial*. "'Now it is being argued that Jewry emerged unharmed' from the war." This is clearly untrue, says Rojj. He also dismisses the claim that Holocaust Revisionism is an update of the *Protocols Of Zion*. (This idea is the central theme of Seidel's polemic, although Rojj wasn't referring to this here).

The extent to which the Revisionists are traduced is revealed on page 132, when the good doc informs us that: "It is noted that there are some fakes relating to the Holocaust which are even admitted by Jewish groups. Many photographs relating to the Holocaust are alleged to be faked, or presented in a misleading way."

Shock! Horror! Gasp! In 1981, that damned liar Maurice Ludmer - Gerry Gable's partner-in-slime (43) - wrote that Udo Walendy was someone who "...has been active in the neo-Nazi movement in Germany since the 1960s and specialises in trying to prove that photographs of concentration camps and their victims were faked." (44) The 1982 book by Robert Singerman *ANTISEMITIC PROPAGANDA: An Annotated Bibliography And Research Guide* lists, among other things, numerous editions of the notorious *Protocols Of Zion*, AND Udo Walendy's study of allegedly faked photographs *Forged War Crimes Malign The German Nation*. Of this book, Singerman comments (on page 325) that it "[s]eeks to prove that all of the so-called atrocity photographs related to the alleged extermination of six million Jews are crude forgeries calculated to 'burden the German people with guilt.'"

Hold your horses! The good doc has told us that some such photographs, including some, perhaps many, of those analysed by Walendy, are, after all, fakes. So Walendy's study is not necessarily anti-Semitic. If, for example, a quarter of those he reproduces are indeed fakes, (45) then his study is only 75% anti-Semitic. If half of them are fakes, then the book is only half anti-Semitic. But what if every single photograph listed is indeed a fake? That would mean, surely, that the book is not anti-Semitic at all. On the other hand, it could be argued, using the same logic, that the people who published these photographs in the first instance were anti-German. Or even anti-*Aryan*, especially if they, or some of them were Jews. Shucks no, that would be anti-Semitic again, besides, Jews are incapable of racial hatred. Ask Gerry Gable. And the Arabs of Hebron.

Curiously, Rojj has nothing more to say about the fake photographs, (46) instead he reports that Revisionist Historian Robert Faurisson (or FauriSSon as the students at Lyon-2 called him) accuses Martin Gilbert of doctoring the (quite ludicrous) Gerstein Statement. I have written elsewhere that Martin Gilbert is not a scumbag - like Deborah Lipstadt, for example - but an honest sap. (47) He is also the official whitewasher of Churchill since 1968, and as he seems to think the sun shone out of that evil old bastard's arse, a case could be made out for him being mentally ill.

Let us return to pages 132-3. Here, Rojj points out an *error* (or two!) made by Martin Gilbert. Exterminationists make honest errors; Revisionists tell lies. Sound familiar? Revisionists don't always tell lies though because on page 123 we are told that "...Faurisson, in particular, appears to believe what he is arguing." He certainly does about the *gas chambers*, but perhaps Professor Faurisson has been a little too dogmatic about *The Diary Of Anne Frank* (to put it diplomatically). Be that as it may, the literary jottings of this tragic figure are not central to our theme, nor to the good doc's. Though he does express surprise that Professor Faurisson's work is distributed by the 'left wing collective' *La Vieille Taupe*, "which includes Jewish supporters." Maybe some Jews don't like being lied to either?

The Holocaust Denial: a Study in Propaganda Technique

to hear: namely, that Hitler headed an evil empire (though he – Speer – knew nothing of the worst atrocities).

Faurisson, Roques and others have sought to prove, through internal textual criticism, that much of the court or interrogation information is worthless. Their use of the Gerstein document is a good example of this approach. Gerstein was an SS officer in charge of procuring Zyklon B crystals (which served both as a fumigator and as a source of lethal gas). He was interrogated in France at the end of the war, before committing suicide. Historical Revisionists look for internal contradictions in such testimony, or for patently ludicrous statements, for example the claim that hundreds of victims were packed into gas chambers of only a few square metres. They allege that such claims prove that the witness was simply saying what he believed his captors wanted him to say.

Neo-Fascism in Europe

much of the Holocaust is a post-war fabrication. It is often added that Allied intelligence services, and the Vatican, had considerable knowledge of what was happening in occupied Europe; thus, if there had been systematic genocide, these sources would have made more of it during the war.

It is noted that there are some fakes relating to the Holocaust which are even admitted by Jewish groups. Many photographs relating to the Holocaust are alleged to be faked, or presented in a misleading way.[29]

the war (especially from Poland), which provide a record of the events that were taking place from non-Jewish and sometimes even anti-Jewish sources, are rejected as biased and written under pressure from Jews. The revisionists ingeniously exploit any contradiction or distortion in the documentation. Thus, when some witnesses let their imagination run free and incorrectly claim that the DACHAU concentration camp had working gas chambers, the revisionists pounce on this discrepancy to assert that if some details in the evidence given by witnesses are incorrect, then the whole story of the Holocaust must be nothing but a pack of lies. Generally, how-

The cutting above is taken from the *ENCYCLOPEDIA of the HOLOCAUST*, Editor in Chief, Israel Gutman, published by Macmillan, New York, (1990), Volume 2, page 685. A glance at the photographs on pages 8-9 soon reveals that it wasn't only survivors who lied through their teeth (and continue to lie) about the non-existent Dachau gas chamber, but Allied servicemen, Zionist schemers, communists, and, most of all, the media. When, in 1978, the South African Zionists Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond published the Second Edition of their wailing-and-gnashing-of-teeth book *SIX MILLION DID DIE*, they included many fake and wilfully misleading photographs, including one said to be "Victims of the [now admittedly non-existent] Dachau gas chamber...", on page 122. Predictably, the book called for Holocaust Revisionism to be banned. Yet if lying about the Holocaust per se were to be banned, their book would never have been published! Above that: fragments of Roger Eatwell's double-talk from his Revisionist essay, the misleadingly titled *The Holocaust Denial: a Study in Propaganda Technique*.



GAS CHAMBER EXTERIOR . . . Dachau

50

These photographs - above and next page - were published by the *Daily Mail* in September 1945; it was claimed at the time that they would play a vital role in the *re-education* of the Germans. In 1978, the Socialist Workers Party published a pamphlet in which it claimed that Britain's already lax immigration controls were the first steps on the road to Dachau. Part of the *re-education* (of all white peoples) appears to be that hostility to governmentally forced race-mixing equals genocide. A message constantly reiterated by Gerry Gable's hate-filled magazine, but even to mention this entails a not inconsiderable risk of being branded *anti-Semitic*, and perhaps a visit from the *goy* thugs of AFA or Red Action.

. . . SOME OF THE GASSED . . . Dachau

51

Above: "Wake up lads, you haven't really been gassed, it's all been a terrible mistake!" According to the *ENCYCLOPEDIA of the HOLOCAUST* at any rate.

4 Searchlight, November 1994

14 Searchlight, July 1993

Above: Racial hatred of a different kind; the way a certain type of Jew - Gerry Gable - depicts "Nazis", in reality any white person who is not ashamed of being white and would like his great-grandchildren to be white also. Gable and his kind are a far more effective breeding ground for anti-Semitism than the diminutive British National Party.

On page 136 of his essay, Rojj points out that "...Zyklon B was regularly used on an extensive scale to fumigate barracks in camps..." Hmmm. Two years later, when the Anti Nazi League - the appropriately acronymed ANAL - published *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: THE NEW NAZI LIE*, they made much of one of the claims of the Revisionists. (Actually, they made much of many of them, but I'm interested here in one claim in particular). What do the Revisionists say? They asked. Among the answers they gave to this question was "gas used to kill Jews was really disinfectant." Now it appears that the emphatically anti-fascist, anti-Nazi academic who is so *outraged* by the Revisionists - according to the *Ham & High* - that he refuses to discuss their propaganda with schoolkids, two years before ANAL went into print, Rojj said precisely the same thing!

We must make one minor point here, Zyklon B is actually a fumigant - as Rojj quite rightly says - many people, including Revisionists, refer to it as a disinfectant, and much is made of this by certain members of the anti-Revisionist lobby. (48) For people who don't live in barracks in war-time under constant threat from louse-borne typhus - ie most of us - the difference between a disinfectant and a fumigant is somewhat academic.

On page 139, the good doc refers *en passant* to the Mermelstein v IHR legal case. This case has now actually been resolved, though because the IHR didn't read the script, it wasn't resolved in the way the anti-Revisionist lobby would have liked. Hence the dearth of media coverage. (49) On the same page though he chirps up: "Historical Revisionism relies on an unattainable conception of proof in which there is not the slightest doubt in any area." Not quite true, Rojj, and shame on you for even suggesting it. One of questions the Revisionists ask is were there gas chambers in Dachau? To which the anti-Revisionists answer no. Oh, reply the Revisionists, but in 1945, we were told there were, we were even shown photographs of them, and what amounts, in the words of Gitta Sereny to *mountains of evidence*. (50) Please can you tell us what is the difference between the mountains of evidence that gas chambers existed in the Dachau and Buchenwald concentration camps in 1945 and the mountains of evidence that prove (quote unquote) the existence of gas chambers in Auschwitz to this day? To which comes the inevitable reply: "Get out of my sight, you filthy anti-Semites!"

The Epistles Of Roger Eatwell

Okay folks, this is where I came in. Having read what Rojj said about the Revisionists being traduced left, right and centre, how their claims about fake photographs et al were after all true, how they weren't all anti-Semites and Nazis, how - though not in so many words - Organised Jewry and the "let's abolish the white race" lobby had led the world up the garden path for decades, and much more, I decided to drop the good doc a line. Being an honest sort of bloke I would have used my own monicker when I sent him the first of my *billet doux*, (51) however, by October 1993, when I wrote him, I had already begun publishing my documented exposés of Gerry Gable's race-hate magazine, and for purely tactical reasons I didn't want any connection to be made between the two. (52)

This then is the reason - and the only reason - that I used the name T.D. Man in my correspondence. (53) This is a *nom de plume* that I have used since 1988. (54) As well as the *nom de plume* I used a different address, that of the Association of Little Presses, of which I was at that time a paid-up member. (55) My first letter was dated 12th October 1993, and read as follows:

Dear Professor Eatwell,

I've been meaning to write to you for some time in connection with the article in the "Ham & High", March 12th, "Lecture gives lie to Holocaust denial", (enclosed). I realise you must be a busy man but I wonder if you could find time to answer this letter. I am very confused as to the actual structure of the Nazi concentration camps, not reading German or having your resources. From what I gather the "Revisionists" claim that there were no gas chambers at all and that they were merely the figments of people's imaginations. Obviously there was a gas chamber in Auschwitz, but can you tell me if there was a gas chamber in Belsen, or in Ravensbruck, Dachau or Buchenwald? I would also like to know if you could recommend any books for me to read on the Holocaust which will give me the true facts.

Yours sincerely,
T.D. Man

Okay, let's deal with yours truly's points first. I thought Rojj was a Professor, but he's only a mere doctor. He certainly deserves to be a professor though, and I've no doubt that by the time this pamphlet gets around he'll be offered a chair or two. An honorary chair by the IHR and an electric chair by the ADL. (56) I *am* confused about the concentration camps and the *gas chambers*, especially about the lies I keep reading about them. There certainly was and is a gas chamber at Auschwitz, I wouldn't deny it. The pertinent question though is not does this gas chamber exist, but was it constructed during or after the Second World War?

The request for a list of books is a little ironic. My correspondent Nick Griffin (57) made a similar request to Yad Vashem. In his letter he wrote to them expressing surprise that some people were attempting to deny the existence of the Nazi gas chambers et al, and asked if they could provide him with further information on it. They forwarded him a list of Revisionist books!

Back to yours truly's correspondence. The good doc replied on October 15, a neatly wordprocessed letter which said that "a) Some involved in the Holocaust Denial are NOT neo-Nazis, though obviously their arguments give neo-Nazis 'succour' indirectly

b) there are various problems concerning books which have been written about the Holocaust."

Re a): remember what yours truly said about some idiot claiming that Adolf and his merry men had sent fifty million people to the ovens? The claim that Holocaust Revisionism gives succour to Nazis, or, more importantly, Nazi ideology, is clearly nonsense, since Nazi ideology does not preach genocide; (58) any atrocities committed by the Nazis against the Jews - and anyone else - happened in the context of the bloodiest war in history and were more than matched by atrocities against non-combatants on the Allied side. (59) There are though many things Nazism practised which should most definitely be opposed, for example, the obligation of all citizens (60) to carry identification on their persons at all times. Ironically, the 1994 Conservative Party conference saw Home Secretary Michael Howard mooting the idea of a voluntary identification card system, and the Tory faithful clamouring for the system to be made compulsory. (61) Howard and others claim that ID cards will assist in the fight against crime. The "crime" of *Rassenschande* perhaps? Make sure they stamp yours with the word JEW, Michael.

Now, where was I? Yes, though most people would prefer Michael Howard to Adolf Hitler, if a boot is stamping on your face, the ethnic origin or professed political agenda of the owner of the foot inside it is rather academic, (62) but leaving aside succouring the Nazis, what are the *problems* Rojj was referring to in his second point?

These *problems* are that many books on the Holocaust are written by shameless liars, and they are not various but myriad. The current writer has examined some of them in his book *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?*, and many authors before him - including non-Revisionists - have commented on them, criticised them, and even attacked them. To cite just one tiny example, the professional survivor Elie Wiesel wrote in his book *Night*: "Not far from us, flames were leaping up from a ditch, gigantic flames. They were burning something. A lorry drew up at the pit and delivered its load - little children. Babies! Yes, I saw it - saw it with my own eyes...those children in the flames. (Is it surprising that I could not sleep after that? Sleep had fled from my eyes.)" (63) This is a complete fantasy; Elie Wiesel never saw any such thing. (64)

Now, back to Rojj. Because I can't read German he very kindly enclosed something in French for me. Unfortunately, I can't read French either, (65) but it was thoughtful of him. I passed on this publication to someone else who passed it on to someone who can read French, and I've no doubt that he enjoyed it, even though I don't even know his name. This French publication, is, apparently, based on KGB archives, "which are only just being studied". Obviously now that the so-called Cold War is over, the Russians are not just good guys but wouldn't ever dream of lying to us. Frankly though, it's not the Russians that concern me. We have more than enough liars in the so-called Free World. The fact that these people are now poking about freely in former Soviet archives makes me doubly suspicious. Especially with all this *aid* the Soviets have been getting off us lately.

Here is an extract from the good doc's first epistle: "(The line now accepted by academics is that people were not systematically gassed in the German camps, like Belsen and Dachau. The horror pictures of the dead from Belsen, for example, show people who died from typhus, malnutrition, etc.)."

What! You mean that all those photographs we've seen on TV and paraded in *Searchlight* magazine by Gerry Gable (66) and his ilk were not of *gassed* Jews but of people who had died of diseases brought on by the appalling war-time conditions, and by the breakdown of food supplies and the like? Shock! Horror! But what does the Anti Nazi League have to say about this, for example?

In their aforementioned 16 page pamphlet *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: THE NEW NAZI LIE*, one of the points ANAL made was that so-called Holocaust Deniers claimed that "Jews who died in concentration camps did so as

a result of diseases such as typhus." And now, Rojj, leading anti-Nazi academic, who is *outraged* at the very mention of Holocaust Denial, is saying precisely the same thing! Hold on folks, there's more to come; wait until Rojj tells us about the fakes! (67)

The good doc finishes his letter with a suggestion for further reading, and another suggestion that I consult the Wiener Library, including its Stürmer-like caricature Director David Cesarani. At the time I was actually researching in the Wiener Library, and many happy hours I spent there too, studying not only the Library's excellent collection of Revisionist books but its bulletin, anti-Semitica and, not least, its complete collection of the pseudo-anti-fascist rag *Searchlight*. It wasn't until 1994 that Cesarani kicked me out with much wailing and gnashing of teeth. (It is the Wiener Library, not the Whiner Library).

Encouraged by the good doc's response, I fired off another letter to him shortly. Dated 21 October 1993, it read in part as follows:

When you say that there are "problems" with books written on the Holocaust I assume that you are being extremely diplomatic. What you really mean is that a lot of books are sloppily researched, sensationalist or just plain fabrication...I am surprised though that you couldn't recommend an English language book on this subject. A while ago I waded through Raul Hilberg's three volume tome. It's heavy going and I gather it has been substantially rewritten from the first edition, but it's pretty comprehensive. I wondered if you had any criticisms to make of this book; I gather that even David Irving was quite impressed with Hilberg's scholarship.

I am still a little confused over the gas chambers though so hope you can clarify this point for me. The Holocaust Deniers - Revisionists if they prefer - say that after the War it was claimed that there were gas chambers in Belsen, Dachau, Buchenwald and Ravensbruck camps, among others, but that this is no longer claimed. Is this true? I would also like to know if you can recommend one of your own publications on this subject. You have, of course written a book or essay or something on the Holocaust? I would be particularly interested in an analysis of the Revisionists propaganda and wonder if you know of a book on this subject...Finally, can I ask you what is your opinion on making Holocaust Denial a criminal offence?

The good doc replied in a handwritten letter dated 9.11.93, in which he again referred me to Cesarani. "He can either answer [your questions], or put you in touch with someone who can." Hmm, Gerry Gable, perhaps? Editor of what Dr David anti-Semitism-is-a-disease-wailing-and-gnashing-of-teeth Cesarani refers to as "The authoritative anti-fascist magazine Searchlight". (68) Er, perhaps not. The good doc's letter continues: "My work on the Holocaust Denial has mainly consisted of looking at its internal logic - e.g. contradictions, non-sequiturs, etc." Yes, and so you should, there is every reason for you and everybody else to be highly suspicious of both the motives and the methods of anyone who seeks to rewrite history, whatever their political antecedents and alleged motives. Some anti-Revisionists are doing a good job of this, the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation for example, who appear to have marked the card of Robert Faurisson. (69) The good doc is also doing a good job - a good job for the Revisionists, that is - but when are the mainstream historians of the Holocaust - Deborah Lipstadt, for example - going to apply the same techniques, the same standards, and the same condemnation, to the shameless liars who perpetuate "good lies" Holocaust?

One of the non-sequiturs Rojj might like to look at is how the treatment of the Jews by the Nazis during the Second World War discredits eugenics or makes it imperative that we lower the white birthrate. Hmm, perhaps Gerry Gable has the answer to that. Perhaps he has six million answers!

Finally in his letter, Rojj answers my question about making so-called Holocaust Denial a criminal offence. No, I wouldn't do that, he says, or in his words: "Assuming that the intention is to debate history (not cause attacks on Jews), I can see no reason to ban the Holocaust Denial." You shouldn't make so many assumptions, but some might argue that perpetuating wilful lies about the Holocaust itself causes attacks on Jews, or at least hatred towards them. Let me draw an analogy. In the 1930s the fanatical anti-Semite Arnold Leese accused Jews of practising ritual murder; he ended up in court for it, but members of his organisation the Imperial Fascist League had also been physically attacked for, among other things, spreading anti-Semitic propaganda. Organisations which do this - or are perceived as doing it - are still attacked to this day.

When certain Jews and their *goy* fellow travellers perpetuate the nonsense of the Holocaust - the soap made from Jews, for example (70) - they are surely perpetuating anti-German hate propaganda. If one judges their proven lies by the same standards as the alleged lies of the Revisionists.

Encouraged by this reply, yours truly wrote back to the good doc on November 17: "I have just received your reply to my letter of 21st October. I saw you on TV on Sunday 7th by the way. I have also found a book called *Neo-Fascism in Europe* in my local library, to which you contributed." Well, yeah, actually it was a not so local library, but as I travel into Central London two or three times a week I suppose you could call it local. In point of fact, I found this book sometime before, but that's neither here nor there. Yours truly continued: "I have read

your contribution to this book, which concerns Holocaust Denial/Revisionism, and there are one or two points I would like to take up, if I may. Firstly, you refer to gas chambers in Dachau and Ravensbrück camps. [Note the umlaut!] The *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* refers to these too. Specifically, under the section on Holocaust Denial it says that some 'witnesses' let their imaginations run free and incorrectly claimed that the Dachau concentration camp had working gas chambers. The revisionists were said to have pounced on this 'discrepancy'." This *discrepancy* is reproduced on pages 8-9 for both gullible *goyim* and disbelieving Jews to marvel at. Pray let us continue: "I am not an expert in semantics, but this does seem like an extraordinary thing to say. It is so extraordinary that I would like you to qualify it for me. Am I to believe that it was claimed that there were gas chambers in some camps where it is now claimed that there were none? I did mention this point in my last letter, but you referred me to another historian. At the risk of both imposing on your kindness and sounding impertinent, this will not do. You are an acknowledged expert in this field, you have gone on record as saying that Holocaust Denial outrages you, and this is a serious criticism. I think you should feel duty bound to answer it yourself. I haven't yet got around to chasing up Landau's book (71) but the other material I've read on this subject I find less than impressive."

And just for good measure I concluded: "Returning to your own essay, on page 132, you refer to fakes which are said to be 'admitted by Jewish groups' including photographs. Am I to understand that there are, perhaps at this very moment, books being sold as historical accounts, which contain fake photographs? You mention the *Journal of Historical Review* in this connection. This is, I am led to believe elsewhere, a 'revisionist' magazine published by 'anti-Semites'. Am I to believe that this magazine contains an analysis of fake photographs? Can you also please tell me which issue and where I can obtain it?"

This last was something of a rhetorical question as I did subscribe to the *Journal of Historical Review* for the first two years of its existence; later I found further copies in the Wiener Library. Curiously, the Revisionist books in this prestigious archive are filed alongside concentration camp memoirs and the like, not with the anti-Semitica where Dr Cesarani informs me that my publications are now kept!

Back to the main man. Shortly I received a letter dated 24 November 1993; this was and remains one of the most remarkable letters yours truly has ever received. I'd like to frame it and put it on my wall. But I'd rather sell it.

The good doc's letter reads in part: "If I used the word discrepancy in relation to gas chambers at Dachau etc., it was to try to cover the point that survivors who claim there were gas chambers are not necessarily lying - thus using words like 'deceipt' [sic], 'liar' etc. are (in most cases) wrong. I enclose part of a Holocaust denial article which makes the same point. I also enclose a Holocaust denial article about fake photos." One point here before I embark on my textual analysis: it wasn't Rojj who referred to the non-existent Dachau gas chamber as a *discrepancy* but the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, see page 9.

Rojj continues: "It seems to me beyond doubt that there have been mistakes, forgeries and lies. HOWEVER, it also seems beyond doubt that people (not just Jews) were treated appallingly in camps. In Dachau, for example, people were frozen to death in order to conduct medical experiments. I might add that new documents seem to provide (I have not looked at them, and one must always be wary) further proof of Nazi mass killings. This canot [sic] be separated from the view of some Nazis towards 'subhumans' etc."

Okay, that's quite a lot to chew on, so let's take it in small bites. "If I used the word discrepancy " - you didn't "in relation to gas chambers at Dachau etc., it was to try to cover the point that survivors who claim there were gas chambers are not necessarily lying - thus using words like 'deceipt' [sic], 'liar' etc. are (in most cases) wrong."

Let me get this straight, Rojj, some survivors claim there were gas chambers in Dachau, but they're not lying. Most Revisionists claim there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz, but they are lying? (According to Gable, Cesarani and their ilk, if not you). Ah, they're not necessarily lying. So perhaps they made mistakes? Discrepancies, as the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* puts it.

Ah, but the good doc actually says that "survivors who claim there were gas chambers are not necessarily lying", ie they may be lying, but "(in most cases)" they are not. Necessarily. Okay, Rojj, if that is the case, will you please explain the two photographs reproduced here (and which you, dear reader, have already seen) on pages 8-9. Please read the captions. These were culled from a book held in the Wiener Library. Called *LEST WE FORGET*, it was compiled by the *Daily Mail* newspaper and published in September 1945. The subtitle is: *THE HORRORS OF NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS REVEALED FOR ALL TIME IN THE MOST TERRIBLE PHOTOGRAPHS EVER PUBLISHED*. The introduction by George Murray reports on page 5 that 4,000,000 people were reported murdered in Auschwitz. Is this the much touted "Soviet estimate" one wonders? The reader is told further that "The butcher's hooks, the ovens, the gas-chambers, the torture cells, the whipping posts were common to all the camps." Yes, Rojj, *all* the camps. On page 5 it is stated that this book "may well play a useful part in the re-education of the Germans." Yes, and of the British and white people everywhere. (72)

Again, read the captions: *GAS CHAMBER EXTERIOR...DACHAU* and a pile of corpses which represent *SOME OF THE GASSED...DACHAU*. It wasn't survivors who took these photographs, Rojj, unless they were wearing American uniforms. These photographs were not mistakes, they were, and remain, lies.

So the lie peddled incessantly by the controlled media that the Revisionists accuse the Jews of fabricating the Holocaust, (73) doesn't hold water. Leaving aside the heavy Jewish presence in the media, especially in the United States, (74) the lie-machine was, and remains, truly vast. IT IS THE MEDIA AS MUCH AS ORGANISED JEWRY WHO HAVE BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR PERPETUATING THIS ENORMOUS LIE. (75)

Back to Rojj: he encloses part of a Holocaust Denial article, he says, and he did, but while such articles can be dismissed as rhetoric, the same cannot be said for Udo Walendy's study of fake photographs. So what he is really saying is that these people who have been - and are - branded anti-Semites ad nauseum by the media, the likes of Gerry Gable, and the likes of the intellectual prostitute and whiner David Cesarani, these people are not really, or at worst not necessarily anti-Semites, that they are not simply telling the truth as they see it, but the objective truth, (76) that they have been traduced left, right and centre, and that they have a case to answer. Then when is somebody going to answer it? The German government answered it in 1994 when it banned so-called Holocaust Denial. Does this mean, one wonders, that it is now a criminal offence in Germany to sell Udo Walendy's book *Forged War Crimes malign the German Nation*? (77)

Rojj continues: "It seems to me beyond doubt that there have been mistakes, forgeries and lies." Yes, they did lie, he said, the Allies lied, the media lied, survivors lied, and all three continue to do so. (78)

Again, Rojj continues: "HOWEVER, it also seems beyond doubt that people (not just Jews) were treated appallingly in camps. In Dachau, for example, people were frozen to death in order to conduct medical experiments. I might add that new documents seem to provide (I have not look at them, and one must always be wary) further proof of Nazi mass killings. This canot [sic] be separated from the view of some Nazis towards 'subhumans' etc."

Nobody in his right mind has ever denied that people - not just Jews - were treated appallingly in these camps, but again, this is not the issue. People were indeed murdered during the course of medical experiments in concentration camps, Dachau in particular, (79) but however barbaric, inhuman and a host of other adjectives such acts may have been, such murders, even mass murders, do not constitute a Holocaust, and they do not prove the existence of gas chambers.

"This canot [sic] be separated from the view of some Nazis towards 'subhumans' etc." Really, Rojj? But what about the view of some Jews that certain *Aryan goyim* are subhumans? For example, the May 1993 issue of the Jewish-owned race-hate magazine *Searchlight*, refers to British National Party supporters as "lice". [See also the illustrations on page 10] This is far from an isolated incident. Of course, the good doc could claim that this was the view of one Jew - and a particularly nasty one at that - but the same could be said of the Nazis. For example, throughout the Nazi era, top Nazis continued consulting Jewish doctors. (80) Which does tend to indicate that a lot of this supposed Nazi race-hate propaganda was rhetoric. Or anti-Nazi propaganda. And as for the designation by certain Nazis that Jews were subhuman, sauce for the goose, sauce for the gander. The good doc should take a closer look at some of the anti-German and anti-Japanese hate propaganda spewed out by Hollywood in the 1940s, hate propaganda which had considerable Jewish input. (81)

Inspired by this latest admission of anti-German hatemongering and the good doc's double-talk on hate propaganda, yours truly fired off another epistle. Dated 6 December 1993, it read in part as follows. (Paragraphs have been omitted for clarity!?)

"The idea that if we believe other races to be inferior to be the first step on the road to Auschwitz is patently absurd. The Nazis believed the Jews to be plotting, successfully, to take over the world. Which would indicate at least that they believed them to be not unintelligent. That didn't stop them from murdering them in great numbers. As they unquestionably did. And Abraham Lincoln was an avowed white supremacist, and he was hardly anti-black. (82) In any case, National Socialism was not white supremacy but something entirely different, as I needn't tell you...I believe, that the Nazis did conduct vile and inhuman medical experiments, in Dachau, for example. As did the Japanese. But this clearly has nothing to do with the systematic extermination of people on account of their race. It is simply another - if particularly grotesque - example of man's inhumanity to man and a government's violation of human rights. Apart from that, what have we got so far? Your claim in the *Ham & High* of March 12 that Holocaust denial outrages you. This is followed by an admission that 'mistakes' have been made. That survivors claimed there were gas chambers in Dachau, but that there weren't in reality. When the Revisionists deny the existence of gas chambers in Auschwitz, they are lying. When survivors make claims for gas chambers where it is admitted there were none, they are 'making mistakes.' This is a double standard and one which is totally unworthy of someone who, by his own admission, specialises in semantics. You say that it seems

to you beyond doubt that people (not just Jews) were treated appallingly in concentration camps. Yes, but that is not the point. These camps were appalling places, and still are, in the Lebanon and Bosnia, for example, but that does not mean they were extermination centres. You admit that there have been lies and forgeries as well as mistakes. This is a very significant development. When Richard 'Harwood' published his *Did Six Million Really Die?* way back in 1973, (83) it caused outrage. Jewish and Zionist organisations demanded it be banned. Now, you reproduce two photographs from this publication and admit that they were fakes. Certainly they cannot both be genuine. This is progress. The questions must now be asked: If there are some fakes and some lies, how many more are there? Can we afford to dismiss as Nazi propaganda any reasonable claim that there was and is dirty work afoot? We - the Allies - won the war. It seems only reasonable then to assume that if the Nazis told lies, and they certainly did, a great many, especially about the Jews, if they told lies, what lies did our side tell? We must therefore examine from first premises the extermination claims. In the *Jewish Chronicle* for July 6, 1979, it is revealed that 64 year old Erwin Schoenborn was jailed in Frankfurt for 18 months for claiming the gas chambers had not existed and offering a 10,000 mark reward for proof. I have heard a great deal to date about jailing Revisionists - I think we may now call them that - but not a word about jailing survivors and others who lie. In the same paper which recorded your seeming outrage, the *Ham & High*, February 19th, there was a call to make Holocaust Revisionism illegal in Britain. Jewish organisations are forever whining about community libel laws. Yet, you sent me a tranche of photographs which are nothing less than libels on the German people. The point the Revisionists make is this: if there are some fakes, how do we know that there are any genuine atrocity photographs, outside of the 'normal' atrocities of war? Returning to *Did Six Million Really Die?*, I have now read some of the polemics which were directed at it at the time and later, and they all denounce it as anti-Semitic propaganda and the rewriting of the Holocaust, as an update of the notorious *Protocols of Zion*, ie from Jewish conspiracy to Zionist conspiracy...You said in your letter of 15th October that the arguments of the Revisionists give succour to neo-Nazis. By the same logic, so do yours. In reality though this is absurd. For example, if I were to claim that the Nazis had exterminated 50 million Jews, (84) that would clearly be utter drivel, and no one in his right mind would accuse you of being a Nazi apologist for denouncing such claims as nonsense. If someone argued that only one million Jews, or even only one hundred were killed by the Nazis, that need not necessarily be construed as apologia. The latter figure of course would be clearly absurd, as I think even all real Nazis would admit. But *Did Six Million Really Die?*, which we are told is an anti-Semitic pamphlet does, in your own words, contain evidence of forgery. Therefore, the people who clamber for it to be banned are demanding the suppression of inconvenient truth. This means that it is not the 'Nazis' but organisations like the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Institute of Jewish Affairs which are to be condemned. For wilfully attempting to suppress the truth...You do not state in your letter who you consider to be responsible for these fake photographs, nor who are these Jewish groups who admit of their forgery. I would be most grateful if you could clarify this point. Also, why are not such fakes and forgeries denounced, and why are they still splashed about today as 'proof' of Nazi genocide? The Socialist Workers' Party is particularly good at this. Parade an 'atrocity' photograph of Belsen as proof of Nazi genocide and condemn the evils of *racism*. This is totally dishonest, as I am sure you will agree. Although it does not follow of course that racial prejudice - not *racism*, note - is in any way enlightened. There is nothing more absurd than to judge a man by the colour of his skin, or by his race. Skin colour of course is not the same thing as race at all. But I digress...all the Revisionists are saying is that the claims of extermination should be examined from scratch. I think that is fair in view of the lies and perfidy you yourself have revealed. You say there are 'problems' with survivor testimony, so let us look at some of the documentary evidence...It seems to me that most 'historians' who write on this subject are nothing more than intellectual prostitutes who have sold their souls for their lucrative sinecures. (85) Either that or they are terrified of being branded anti-Semitic, which of course is totally dishonest. The Revisionists do not just have a case to answer, they have more than a case to answer."

Whew, that's quite a mouthful. What did the good doc make of it? In his letter of January 5, 1994, he replied: "Thank you for your letter. I'm afraid I can't reply to all the points at present - perhaps we should meet sometime to discuss them." Yeah, and perhaps not, as the reader will see shortly. Rojj then went on to say that he had been misquoted by the *Ham & High* about being "outraged". Well, what have we here? "I am not outraged at the suggestion that the gas chambers were a war-time myth; in fact I admit that there were no gassings in Dachau and that both certain Holocaust survivors and Jewish and Zionist organisations have lied through their teeth and have attempted to suppress both the truth and free debate on this subject. I acknowledge that some - possibly a great many - alleged atrocity photographs are fakes; in fact, I don't believe half the bullshit about *Aryan* evil we've been fed by both the controlled media and those wonderful people who gave you Sabra and Shatila, but I'm too spineless to admit it publicly."

This is real progress. Rojj points out next that although he was not outraged, some people who wrote to him were. Mike Whine and Greville Janner, perhaps? "I've always tried to be as neutral as I can over this issue." What? Neutral over Nazis?! Are you some sort of fascist, or something? Don't you know they exterminated six million Jews? In Dachau. Er, no, it wasn't Dachau. Where was that photograph taken, you know, the one of the bulldozer shovelling all those bodies into a burial pit. Belsen? What, no gassings at Belsen either? Where were they gassed then? Oh, Auschwitz! I see now, and this camp was liberated by our glorious ally the Soviet Union. Well, that explains it, doesn't it? I mean, it must be true. Not only were the Soviets under the leadership of Uncle Joe devout humanitarians - Katyn and a few hundred other places excepted - but they'd never lie to us. Would they?

As well as being neutral, the good doc doesn't think that *such arguments* should be made illegal, unlike the servants of Imperial Zion, who'd also like to make sure that such arguments are not heard at all, even in the underworld! *Including yours, my dear Dr Eatwell. He does believe though that there could be a case in special* circumstances for bringing prosecutions under the 1988 *Malicious Communications Act* against people who send certain material to camp survivors "if the intention was to cause them mental anguish, or worse..." Notwithstanding that some of these survivors are already mentally ill, I would tend to agree with that. But shouldn't they be prosecuted likewise for spreading anti-German hate propaganda? (86)

Encouraged further, yours truly fired off another epistle the very same day. I followed it up a week later but this was just to chase up a point or two. I wrote again on January 25th, making a few observations about some Zionist whining and wailing, with particular reference to *Patterns Of Prejudice* and the *Jewish Chronicle*. I ended this letter with the words: "Next time you are in London I would like to meet, if you can give me a couple of weeks notice that will be fine. I will not divulge this correspondence to anyone else." Well, he didn't meet me next time he was in London - as presumably he was, sometime - so I no longer feel obliged not to divulge this correspondence to anyone else. Academics should really have the courage of their convictions.

Time passed, and on 4th May 1994, yours truly put pen to paper again, (actually I use *WordStar6*, but try saying the wordprocessor is mightier than the sword; it doesn't have quite the same ring to it).

The good doc replied in a letter dated 27 May 1994. "Thank you for your letter, and I am sorry for not having replied earlier. It's the usual tale of academic inefficiency..." I take your point, Herr Doktor, you're certainly very inefficient in professing your belief in the Holocaust. Heck, you sound more like Arthur Butz, or "Richard Harwood" even, than good ol' liberal anti-fascist Roger Eatwell. Not only that, you kind of make me wonder how many others there are like you. A great deal more, I would reckon, although they're almost certainly even more spineless.

"You ask me a series of specific questions about the Holocaust. I think I pointed out to you earlier that I am not a historian of the Holocaust." I'm not an historian at all, nor any sort of academic, but how academic does one have to be to perform basic textual analysis and entrap brazen liars? Or to sus out spineless creeps who haven't the courage of their convictions to say what they mean and mean what they say? How many degrees: BAs, MAs or PhDs does it take to realise that the Emperor has nothing on and that his ministers are too afraid to tell him?

Rojj points out that what he tries to do is "look for internal flaws etc" in the Holocaust Denial literature. Well, he's certainly found a lot of flaws, but these are mostly in the literature of the Holocaust affirmers and anti-Revisionists.

The good doc says that "...as I understand it there is considerable material in the Russian archives which supports the claim that there was a policy of systematic genocide". Well, they certainly committed genocide on an enormous scale themselves, but once again we're being told that we have to rely on the Soviets for *proof* of the alleged Nazi genocide of the Jews. And of course, they're currently relying on us for aid. Could there be a connection, one wonders? The more aid we ship them, the more *proof* of Nazi genocide they'll give us? Hmm. (87)

If the good doc's last statement is curious, his next one is indefensible: "...Holocaust denial literature has made no impact whatsoever on academic writing - other than perhaps to encourage further research (for example, in the Russian archives)."

Let me get this straight, Rojj. You don't believe any of this bullshit about gas chambers in Dachau; almost certainly you don't believe that Jews - or anyone else - was gassed in Auschwitz either, you have seen the fake photographs which the Revisionists have unearthed, you acknowledge them; you are giving lectures at the Wiener Library doing your best to sound outraged, yet you tell us that all this is having no effect on academics. Obviously then, my dear doctor, you are one Earth-shattering exception.

Rojj then goes on to say that "...Holocaust denial probably harms rather than strengths [sic] current radical nationalist/etc. groups. Whilst the BNP, for example, has a clear following in a limited number of areas, the belief that it has a Nazi/antisemitic side loses rather than gains it support."

In other words, if the BNP stops selling Revisionist literature, people will stop believing it's a Nazi party. Personally I can't see the relevance of the diminutive British National Party to Holocaust Revisionism. The BNP is attacked primarily for its race policies, in a nutshell: end immigration, start repatriation. This is uniformly condemned as *racist* and all sorts of other epithets by the far left ad nauseum, but, curiously, when Nelson Mandela's ANC government announced not only that it was going to continue repatriating illegal Mozambiquan immigrants but was also going to extend and electrify the fence between South Africa and Mozambique, no one on the "anti-*racist*" left batted an eyelid.

It's not really relevant to our discussion, but here is the lowdown on the BNP. The BNP is run by John Tyndall, who most definitely is a Nazi. His inner circle contains a number of Nazis, including Richard Edmonds who is also a pathological anti-Semite. However, the majority of BNP supporters are most definitely *not* Nazis, some of them are not even *racists*. (88) The current writer was told by one fairly senior BNP member that the British people would never tolerate the sort of "leadership" that Tyndall wants to foist onto the country; they've had enough of being told what to do and they simply wouldn't stand for it. Leaving aside the fact that the British people will stand for - and indeed have stood for - practically anything, that is besides the point. Because a) the BNP is going nowhere politically and b) it is a political party (of sorts) and, like all minor, political parties, it needs to make a few quid on the side. To that end it sells publications (and other things) which are ideologically in tune with it, or which it believes to be ideologically in tune with it. This includes a great many non-political publications. For example, its current publications list includes *The Arthurian Legends*, which is described as "A beautifully illustrated anthology of Arthurian literature..."

Deciding that the good doc may have been growing a little tired of yours truly's ranting and raving, I refrained from any more epistles until June 14. I made several points in this letter, from which the following are extracted: "You say that Revisionist literature has made little impact on mainstream history, I would have to disagree there. At last, other historians are beginning to debate the real issues realising that it is not enough simply to call people names. The outlawing of so-called Holocaust denial in Germany is living proof that their arguments have to be taken seriously. Personally I think this is scandalous." As indeed it is. The claim that the Revisionists have made no impact at all is nothing more and nothing less than wishful thinking. Organised Jewry - the world's master liars - express the same sentiments. (89)

"I am still a little bothered by the fake photograph problem, among other things. I'm most grateful for that article you sent me, but neither you nor the article answer the really important questions: where did these photographs come from? was it the British who forged them? The Zionists? The Americans? Why aren't they ever mentioned in the mainstream media? And why is there all the hullabaloo over the Revisionists when in this instance at least all they have done is to expose provable lies?"

This letter went unanswered. On September 5, 1994, yours truly wrote to Rojj again: "I am still a little bothered by the fake photograph problem, in fact, I am more than a little bothered, I am disturbed. As we are both agreed that these photographs are indeed fakes, and indeed, as they cannot be anything but fakes, where did they come from? Why the hush, hush surrounding them? These are lies, lies and libels against the German people, are they not? Yet why haven't the people who clamoured so loudly to ban *Did Six Million Really Die?* raised their voices at these outrages? Surely they are outrages?" Why haven't they indeed? Why not write to your MP about them? Especially if you live in Leicester.

Yours truly received no reply to this epistle either. This was not, I am sure, because Rojj is a scumbag, but he certainly lacks the courage of his convictions. Come out of the closet, Rojj; David Irving did. (90) You may not keep your post and your pension at the University of Bath, but think of the applause you'll get in Welling; you may even land yourself a job with the Institute for Historical Review!

Notes And References

(1) This has been attributed to the Jewish author and publisher Jacobo Timerman; apparently this is a well-worn joke in Israel.
(2) A phrase coined, apparently, by the leading American anti-Zionist Jew Alfred M. Lilienthal to describe the ideology of the misnamed Anti-Defamation League.
(3) See *IN MEMORY OF JOSEPH STALIN AND KLEMENT GOTTWALD*, a 16 page Communist Party pamphlet written by Pollitt.
(4) The diminutive New Communist Party, which is an uncritical supporter of the Jewish-controlled race-hate magazine *Searchlight*.
(5) Lipstadt claims, proudly, to have invented the term, and even more proudly never to debate them on this subject, on which there is no debate.
(6) To cite just a handful of examples: Erich von Däniken, proponent of the ancient astronaut hypothesis (and con man); George Adamski and his fellow UFO contactees and abductees; and Andrew Collins, he of psychic question (psychic jesting?) fame.
(7) Again, without straying into the supposedly controversial field of Holocaust Revisionism, I will illustrate what I mean. In one of her autobiographies, *Voices In My Ear*, the late Doris Stokes claimed to have solved the case of the murders of three babies at Blackpool's Victoria Hospital, and in a separate case, to have solved the murder of a 17 year old girl at Kirkham, Lancashire. A later author, Melvin Harris [in *Sorry You've Been Duped*, published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, (1986)], wrote to the police, who informed him that Mrs Stokes had played no part in solving either case. Any publisher worthy of the name would have done this himself, and either edited out Stokes' unsubstantiated claims (ie blatant lies) or better still, shown her the door. Ironically, Stokes' books were ghost-written by a woman named Linda Dearsley. The same Linda Dearsley perhaps who has written for the BBC TV soap opera *EastEnders*?
(8) When I refer to the press here I mean not just the tabloid press but the so-called quality press, magazine publishers, and the telecommunications media as well. Both certain radio stations and commercial (and BBC) TV have done much to perpetuate mystical nonsense, moral panics, junk science and disinformation in general to an at times fickle, at other times credulous, public. This is a worldwide phenomenon.
(9) We are told also that smoking is a major - perhaps *the* major - determinant of cancer. In reality, cancer (lung and otherwise) is a disease of old age. Notwithstanding the fact that there are many other factors - and literally hundreds of markers - the older you are, the greater is your chance of dying of cancer.
(10) Before you fall for any of the Mafia did it or Oswald had a double crap, read *Disinformation, Misinformation, and the "Conspiracy" to Kill JFK Exposed*, by Armand Moss, published by Archon Books, Hamden, Conn, (1987).
(11) Specifically that section of the media which *researches* the far right, etc.
(12) *Guardian Women*, February 25, 1980, Maurice Ludmer interviewed by Polly Toynbee; and *TO KNOW THE RIGHT*, by Bob Huntley, published in *Media Week*, May 10, 1985, page 34. This latter is an interview with Gerry Gable.
(13) The current writer has published his analysis of the Jews under Nazi rule through Jewish eyes in his January 1995 study *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?* Although this is an original contribution (based on an analysis of reports published in the *Jewish Chronicle*) it is far from unique; any serious study of Nazi Germany "prior to the outbreak of war" will reveal the same.
The perceived wisdom of Kristallnacht is that the pogroms were incited by Nazi agents. This view is not shared by myself, nor by many researchers with far more resources than myself, but even if one makes allowance for this and for mysterious deaths in police custody (hardly a uniquely Nazi phenomenon), then by and large, in Nazi Germany, law and order (if not the rule of law) prevailed.
(14) This has also been published under the title *Six Million Lost And Found...*
(15) It was actually published under the pseudonym Richard Harwood, who was later revealed to be Richard Verrall, a leading member of the National Front. Although it is usually claimed that he was the sole author, this pamphlet appears to have been a collaboration. A further pamphlet published under the same name, *Nuremberg And Other War Crimes Trials...*, may have been written by someone else.
(16) This pamphlet, along with many similar publications, has long been banned in West Germany and in (Apartheid) South Africa.
(17) Poorly researched, primarily because they were poorly funded.

(18) The title of Professor Butz's book, of course.
(19) This is actually part of Richard Harwood's thesis. Absurd as this sounds, Harwood's interpretation is essentially correct, barring his conspiratorial explanation. The likes of the Searchlight Organisation are not conspirators, and they certainly did not invent the Holocaust; they simply exploit it in order to promote a fanatical hatred of the wicked *Aryan goyim*.
(20) Including by passionately anti-Zionist organisations such as the Socialist Workers Party.
(21) Both Robert Faurisson and the (sometimes mischievous) Ditlieb Felderer have published books attacking the authenticity of the diary. However, extensive forensic tests do in fact reveal that it was contemporary and very likely the unaided efforts of a precocious thirteen year old. The official findings are published as:

THE DIARY
OF
ANNE FRANK
The Critical Edition
Prepared by the Netherlands State Institute
for War Documentation
Introduced by
HARRY PAAPE, GERROLD VAN DER STROOM
AND DAVID BARNOUW
With a summary of the report by
the State Forensic Science Laboratory
of the Ministry of Justice
compiled by H.J.J. HARDY
Edited by DAVID BARNOUW AND GERROLD VAN DER STROOM
Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans and B. M. Mooyaart-Doubleday
published by Viking, London, (1989).

Whew! Deborah Lipstadt comments on the authenticity of the diary in her polemical *Denying The Holocaust*; however, her unkind remarks about Professor Faurisson et al are totally unjustified. The confusion over the authenticity of the diary arising out of the law suit filed by Meyer Levin appears to be genuine. However, as Professor Butz points out, the diary tells us nothing about the true nature of the Holocaust, and is therefore not central to the Revisionists' claims.
(22) Some would say conspiratorially.
(23) Living a twenty minute train journey from Central London I tend, like so many Southerners, to think of London as the centre of the universe. For the benefit of you yokels - and foreigners! - Hampstead is a rather affluent area of North London.
(24) The Wiener Library is actually based in Devonshire Street, London WC1, but it's north enough to be in North London, if you get my meaning.
(25) I am not ashamed to confess that I spent many happy hours researching in the Wiener Library's archive and got very friendly with some of its staff - including the charming Miss Rosemary Nief. (Down boy!) But then, oh dear, its Director, David Cesarani, who, like Gerry Gable, is an anti-Semite's dream - told me that I wasn't welcome there anymore because a) I was using the Library to run a private/political vendetta against his aforementioned hatemongering co-racialist; and b) because I was so irreverent as to believe that anti-Semitism is a not disease, and that I am an anti-Semite anyway. Fuck you, Cesarani.
(26) I have no idea if the day in question really was sunny, but that is a *detail of history* we need not concern ourselves with.
(27) According to the *COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES YEARBOOK 1994*, Volume 3, page 1734, Roger Eatwell MA DPhil Oxford, is a Senior Lecturer on the Faculty of Social Sciences.
(28) Yes, they even spell it with a small d!
(29) The original was actually italicised, but one needn't be too pedantic.
(30) The *Times*, May 24, 1990, page 9.
(31) Ie the reference to Belsen as an *extermination* camp rather than the more terminologically correct (but still misleading) death camp.
(32) From page 4 of *THE RELIEF OF BELSEN, APRIL 1945: EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS*, published by the Imperial War Museum, London, (1991). Foreword by Alan Borg, Director-General of the Imperial War Museum.

(33) *The Relief Of Belsen*, page 4, (ibid).
(34) *The Relief Of Belsen*, page 27, (ibid).
(35) Suffice it to say that this is not true of all Jews. An especially embarrassing report appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle* of December 16, 1994. The left wing Jewish lawyer Geoffrey Bindman was part of a two man team commissioned by the Law Society to research a report on human rights abuses in Israel. He and his collaborator accused the Israelis of treating the Palestinians the way the Apartheid régime in South Africa treated blacks. Obviously this didn't go down at all well with the servants of Imperial Zion, who accused him and his partner, barrister Bill Bowring, of being taken in by *propaganda*. In any case, human rights abuses in Israel are too well known to require further documentation here. They have been documented by everyone from a *Sunday Times* "Insight" team in the seventies to human rights activists within Israel itself. Including many Jews, of course.
(36) The theoretical journal of the forever wailing-and-gnashing-of-teeth Institute of Jewish Affairs.
(37) Sutton is not a Holocaust Revisionist and appears to take the ravings of Imperial Zion more or less at face value.
(38) *the powers of darkness: conspiracy belief and political strategy*, by Richard C. Thurlow, published in *Patterns Of Prejudice*, Vol 12 No 6 Nov.-Dec. 1978, pages 1-12 and 23.
(39) Listen, if you claimed to be the Son of God and argued with the Devil in the wilderness, schizophrenic is one of the milder labels they'd hang on you.
(40) In October 1993, Channel 4 screened *Another Journey by Train*, a documentary featuring, among others, the professional Auschwitz survivor Kitty Hart. In the *PICK OF THE DAY* column in the *TV Times* for 16-22 October 1993, it was proclaimed that "Kitty Hart lived through the Nazi death camps and is furious at claims that they didn't exist." The reality is that no one in his right mind has ever denied either the existence of the Nazi concentration camps, or the fact that Jews (and non-Jews) died in them.
(41) !
(42) *Searchlight On A Searchliar...* Originally published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing in 1993, the second edition is now available. This runs to 33 pages (having been reset in 10 point) and contains, among other things, a lengthy bibliography of Gable's fables.
(43) Ludmer was editor of *Searchlight* when he died in May 1981, apparently from a heart attack after reading an article about the Institute for Historical Review. At least, unlike Gable, he had a heart.
(44) *INSTITUTE FOR REWRITING HISTORY: Nazis attempt to deny the Holocaust*, by Maurice Ludmer, published in *Searchlight*, May 1981, pages 3-4. See also editorial.
(45) I've got a copy of this little book: it's fascinating. I've checked out these photos as far as I can, and I am satisfied that all or most of them are indeed fakes - in one sense or another.
(46) Not here, but wait until you see what he says in his epistle to yours truly.
(47) See my aforementioned book *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?*, which was issued by Britain's most discerning publishing house. Me.
(48) See for example *DENYING the HOLOCAUST: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, by Deborah E. Lipstadt, published by the Free Press, New York, (1993), page 228.
(49) The Spring 1992 issue, (number 3) of *THE REVISIONIST NEWSLETTER: NEWSLETTER OF THE HISTORICAL REVIEW PRESS*, announced *IHR SCORES STUNNING VICTORY IN MERMELSTEIN TRIAL: $11 Million Lawsuit Ends in Vindication for Defendants*. The anti-Revisionists can however take comfort from the fact that Mermelstein's case was thrown out by a Jewish judge.
(50) In her anti-Revisionist polemic *The men who whitewash Hitler*, published in the *New Statesman*, November 2, 1979, pages 670-3.
(51) I say first because I really hadn't intended to correspond regularly, I just wanted a few straight answers to a few straight questions.
(52) In view of what followed, this was a wise precaution. For example, when I published *A Revisionist History Of The 1960s Synagogue Arsons*, I documented Gable's lies in his own words and mailed out copies to, among others, the *Jewish Chronicle*. (The silence has been deafening). In this pamphlet I refuted Gable's claim that he'd solved the 1965 arsons - which were actually solved by routine police work - and the claim that he'd brought to justice the killers of a Jewish student, Wolf Katz, who had died in a fire at a North London yeshiva in November 1964. This fire was not part of any arson campaign but simply a tragic accident; Gable had simply tacked it onto his story to impress his co-racialists, and, no doubt, to encourage them to keep sending in the shekels to support his hate campaign against the *Aryan goyim*, or, in his words, to oppose anti-Semitism.

I can just imagine the conversation in the watering hole opposite the *Jewish Chronicle* at lunch time the day my mailing arrived, between Gable and his sidekick, *JC* staffer Julian Tossoff. It probably went something like this:

Tossoff: "Gerry, this bloke Baron's just sent us a documented exposé of you lying through your teeth to the *JC* in 1987."
Gable: "Ignore him, he's an anti-Semite."
Tossoff: "But Gerry, he's exposed your lies in your own words and using cuttings from our own archive."
Gable: "He's an anti-Semite."
Tossoff: "Yes, Gerry, but you didn't really stand in the shell of that burnt out yeshiva at four in the morning, unless you were there with a box of matches."
Gable: "Listen, you'll have plenty of time to pontificate on that when Baron's friends in the BNP cart you off to the gas chambers! Whose side are you on, mine, or that filthy anti-Semitic *goy's*?
Tossoff: "You're right, of course Gerry, he's only a filthy *goy*, and in the struggle against eternal anti-Semitism, anything goes. Fancy another pork pie?"
(53) I did actually mail one or two of my documented exposés of Gerry sweepings-of-the-ghetto Gable to Eatwell himself, but I've no doubt they fell on stony ground. If he even read the damned things.
(54) In my written work. It actually comes from The Dark Man, as in *The Dark Man Theme*, which may date from 1987 or even 1986. It started as a private joke between myself and an elderly lady, one of my collaborators in the days when I used to compose music.
(55) I have since allowed my membership to lapse because although membership was only about ten quid a year it was money down the drain. I must stress that neither ALP nor Bob Cobbing (who was then running it but has since retired), had the slightest idea what I was doing, that I was connected in any way with Anglo-Hebrew Publishing, nor even, probably, that any such entity existed.
(56) For the benefit of the totally uninitiated, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is a US based so-called "Jewish civil rights" organisation; it has been described by the distinguished American anti-Zionist Jew Alfred Lilienthal as the Jewish Gestapo. Its dirty tricks include - among other things - spying on American citizens of all races and keeping files on thousands of individuals and hundreds of organisations.
(57) Whose political ideology I most definitely do *not* share. For the totally unititiated, Griffin is a former Chairman of the National Front, an aspiring Holocaust Revisionist, and not exactly the world's most fervent Gentile Zionist.
(58) This may sound not quite believable, but the reader should differentiate between the sex shop/Hollywood image of Nazism as peddled by the likes of Gerry Gable, and, more recently, by Steven Spielberg, and Nazism in practice.
(59) The words Hiroshima and mushroom come to mind in particular.
(60) And in the case of Jews, non-citizens.
(61) As of course it would be in time.
(62) With apologies to George Orwell.
(63) *Night*, by Elie Wiesel, Translated from the French by Stella Rodway, paperback edition published by Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, (1981), page 43.
(64) The reader is referred to *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?*, page 100 for comment on this, and Professor Faurisson's analysis. The same book contains many more examples of lie-ridden survivors' testimony. Briefly though, Professor Faurisson points out that it was the myth of people being thrown alive into burning pits which gave rise to the term Holocaust, (he refers to it as *the fire lie*). This piece of nonsense is no longer claimed by serious scholars, although such nonsense and other, even more bizarre nonsense - human soap, for example - continues to crop up in both the sensationalist media and in *survivors'* stories.
(65) I stand embarrassed. I studied (quote unquote) French, for six years at school, as a result of which I can count up to ten, and learnt such words as *merde*, and a few other dirty ones.
(66) As proof not only of the alleged Nazi genocide of the Jews but of the uniqueness of *Aryan* evil.
(67) We've already mentioned this in our analysis of his article on the propaganda technique of Holocaust affirmation, er, sorry, Holocaust Denial - slip of the pen - but his later epistle is the icing on the cake.
(68) *JUSTICE DELAYED*, by David Cesarani, published by Heinemann, London, (1992), page 199.
(69) By authenticating *The Diary Of Anne Frank* and subjecting Faurisson's textual analysis to its own textual analysis. The critical version of the diary, which runs to over seven hundred pages, was published in 1986, and an English translation in 1989. [See footnote 21.]

(70) Believe it or not, this long discredited canard appeared in the *Times*, and probably a great many other newspapers, as recently as January 28, 1995, the fiftieth anniversary of Auschwitz. Ironically, this piece of nonsense - and anti-German filth - made its first appearance in the *Times*. During World War One, when the filthy Huns were accused of operating a corpse-factory. On the genesis of the human cadaver myth see for example *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-18*, by Philip M. Taylor and M. L. Sanders, published by the Macmillan Press, London, (1982), pages 146-7. For a critique of the World War Two version see *Human Soap*, by Richard Harwood & Ditlieb Felderer, published in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1980, Volume One, Number Two, pages 131-9.
(71) And still haven't!
(72) One can just imagine Gerry sweepings-of-the-ghetto Gable addressing a class of schoolgirls in one of his lectures on the evils of *racism*: "Look what those wicked Nazis did to us wonderful Jews. You don't want your children to grow up to become Nazis and *gas six million Jews*, do you? The best way you can do that is to find yourself a black boyfriend, because if you have half-caste children, they won't grow up to be Nazis."
(73) Some *Revisionists*, but not the academics amongst them, do indeed accuse the Jews of fabricating the Holocaust, though it is doubtful if one should refer to - say - the average white *racist* skinhead as a Revisionist just because he believes Hitler didn't gas the Jews (and that he should have). Undoubtedly the media's barrage of hate against mainstream Revisionists is prompted by the fear of being branded anti-Semitic by the servants of Imperial Zion.
(74) For a brief insight of Jewish media power, the reader is again referred to my book *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?*, in particular pages 30-1. Pages 33-4 document useful sources.
(75) It is in fact the media - and not simply the tabloid press - who have been responsible for perpetuating most of the lies of our times, from psychic nonsense to pseudo-science to moral panics, however, this subject is far too vast to discuss here.
(76) As far as any such creature exists.
(77) Also known in English as *Faked Atrocities*.
(78) So do academics, including Jewish academics. Try reading some of the polemical effluent churned out by the Searchlight Organisation's academic henchman Michael Billig, a so-called expert on anti-Semitism and the mythical disease of *racism*.
(79) See for example *RACIAL HYGIENE: Medicine Under The Nazis*, by Robert N. Proctor, published by Harvard University Press, (1988).
(80) See for example the *Jewish Chronicle* for January 4, 1935 page 6 and March 8, 1935, page 15. In the former, a leading Nazi was said to have engaged a Jewish doctor because "I have no confidence in the others."
(81) On pages 124-5 of the 1987 book *The Jewish Image in America Film*, Jewish author Lester D. Friedman quotes one critic on the 1944 anti-Japanese propaganda film *The Purple Heart* thus: "I defy anyone to see this picture and not want to go out and kill, singlehandedly, every Jap."
(82) If you don't believe that, read *LINCOLN'S NEGRO POLICY*, by Earnest Sevier Cox, published by the Noontide Press, Los Angeles, (1968). It's still in print. Lincoln advocated not only freeing the slaves but their recolonisation in Africa. And he supported this policy up to the end of his life (contrary to some claims), along with many blacks as well as whites. (Liberia was founded for this purpose).
(83) This pamphlet was actually published first in 1974.
(84) Haven't we seen this somewhere before?!
(85) Like you, my good doctor, though I don't think you'll be drawing a fat salary from the University of Bath for much longer.
(86) Yet another plug, I'm afraid: the reader is referred to the current writer's critique of professional survivor Kitty Hart in his book *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?* This is just one tiny example.
(87) Anyone who is familiar with the works of Antony C. Sutton will realise that this *aid* is hardly a new thing, for in the words of Stalin himself: "...two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with United States help or technical assistance." [From *NATIONAL SUICIDE: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*, page 17. [The author is quoting from U.S. State Department Decimal File, 033.1161 Johnston, Eric/6-3044: Telegram June 30, 1944.]
(88) This is a fact the current writer has divined by his researches into the BNP, something which Gerry Gable refers to as associating with fascists. There are two reasons most people believe that the vast majority of the BNP - and similar parties' supporters - are skinhead thugs: 1) the media focuses on such supporters; 2) because of the sustained campaign of hatred and violence against such organisations, for the most part only the very brave,

the very tough or the very foolhardy dare show themselves. Skinheads may be many things (including intelligent, incidentally), but two things these sort of skinheads usually are, are tough and brave.
(89) See for example *A VERY LIGHT SLEEPER: THE PERSISTENCE AND DANGERS OF ANTISEMITISM*, by the Runnymede Commission on Antisemitism, published by the Runnymede Trust, London, (January 1994), page 45. Here the claim is made that there is "no evidence that Holocaust denial has spread beyond extremist organisations..." This publication also libels yours truly, who made them wish they hadn't by publishing a documented reply to their lies and hatred and mailing it to the Gentile members of the Runnymede Commission.
(90) In more ways than one!

I think this Holocaust story
is a right load of old bollocks.

And I think it's time you had
a visit from Red Action.

Published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing,

Distributed by InfoText Manuscripts,
93c Venner Road,
Sydenham,
London SE26 5HU.
England.

ISBN 1 898318 42 5