

# ADELAIDE INSTITUTE



PO Box 3300  
Adelaide 5067

Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: [info@adelaideinstitute.org](mailto:info@adelaideinstitute.org)

Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online

ISSN 1440-9828

March 2010 No 490

## The Prima Facie Case for Holocaust Research

Posted by T on January 30, 2010

20thCentury: <http://firstword.us/category/history/20th-century/>

CurrentDiscourse: <http://firstword.us/category/culture/current-discourse/>

History: <http://firstword.us/category/history/>

The "holocaust" story connected with the narrative of World War 2 is often claimed to be "the most thoroughly documented fact in all of history." It turns out, however, that there are a number of *prima facie* reasons to question the official narrative. Here, I want to succinctly list a couple dozen reasons why I have become open to holocaust research. Number 1 is what opened my mind to the possibility; the rest are based on my preliminary scan of the state of affairs over the course of the last 3 or 4 years. I speak not as a professional historian, but as it were, a Grand Jury member applying common sense as to whether a case should be pursued further. It's an indictment, not a verdict. Some of the reasons are weaker, some are stronger. Sometimes, I indicate some of the evidence; for others, not. For leads on where to start researching a particular item, feel free to inquire via commbox or email. In my mind, the last one in particular amounts to a virtual apodictic proof that at least something about the story is seriously wrong. But taking them all in correlative relation, I think the case for questioning the official story, and for the need for further research into this question, is established beyond all doubt.

(I. plausibility of big picture and motive)

### **1. The logistics needed to support the official story are stupendous**

The number of total victims claimed used to vary wildly. In the 1980's, a cousin of mine returned from an official tour and proclaimed to us with wild eyes that the number exterminated was actually over 20 million! Usually, however, the number of non-jewish victims is always kept just a little below that of the jewish victims, i.e. 5 million compared to their six. So stick with that for a moment.

As a budding Physicist, I was encouraged from a young age to visualize quantities, not just memorize them. If a dinosaur is said to be 30 feet

tall, I look at a building and imagine a head poking in through a third-story window. That makes it vivid. We were also trained to do "order of magnitude" sanity checks of our calculations. One of my students carried out this agenda in a clever way. He supposed that every time a tire rotated, a one-atom-thick radius of rubber was removed by contact with the pavement. He then looked up the inter-atomic spacing of rubber, and calculated how long a tire should last. To order-of-magnitude, the tire life came out to be approximately right. That is the right way to test a model in a preliminary way.

Now, the serious accounts of the holocaust suggest that it took place mainly over a period of about two years — say, mid 1942 to mid-1944. Say there were six "death camps." Then the average camp had to dispatch about 2 million victims, or 1 million per year. That is 20,000 per week, or 4,000 per day, if weekends or other rest days are allowed for.

4,000 per day, day in, day out, gassed, incinerated, and disposed of, for two years without letup, during the time that a desperate war was being waged, in which the Wehrmacht often had to resort to horses and wagons for its own logistics. Look up how long it takes a crematorium to incinerate one body with a Google search, and continue the calculation.

Perhaps, as Rocco in *Godfather 2* said, "difficult; not impossible." But almost impossible. Maybe impossible. It staggers the imagination in any case.

It was this kind of thought that first made me, with my background, open to the possibility of holocaust research. But it took years before I could work up the courage to actually start doing it.

### **2. There is more than one big-picture narrative, and these are contradictory**

For example:

"No one knew" about the holocaust. That's why it was rarely or never referred to explicitly by the officials.

On the other hand, "everyone knew" (e.g. the movie *Amen.*) That's why the mass destruction of the German cities is justified, and never-ending reparations.

Likewise, at Treblinka, the bodies were dug up and burned, and everything bulldozed over without a trace, to remove all evidence prior to the allied victory.

On the other hand, "exterminations continued to the last day of the war" (e.g. the film *We Were So Beloved*).

Listen to enough discussions of the story with ears perked up, and such contradictory covering propositions will quickly be discovered. We know from logic that once contradictions are allowed, anything can be proved.

### **3. If the Germans had set the goal of systematic extermination, bullets to the back of the head would have been much more efficient and cost-effective**

The Judeo-Bolsheviks knew better, when they massacred the Ukrainians. Wouldn't the Germans have learned from their superiors at the art of mass-murder?

### **4. The claim of having the goal of genocide — that is, completely eliminating the jew from the world — is not plausible, in that it was known that millions of jews had taken up residence in the US (for example)**

Indeed, the Germans regarded the US as effectively a jewish client state.

For years the goal of the National Socialists was to induce the jews to leave, as can be seen in the film [We Were So Beloved](#), for example. They knew many thousands of jews had emigrated to lands of safety, at the behest of the Nazis themselves. It is quite impossible to imagine rational people thinking that they could pull off a global extermination.

There is no evidence, contrary to the bar-room chatter, that Hitler had the goal of "taking over America," let alone the world. On the contrary, Hitler envisioned a four-power division of hegemony between the Germans, the Japanese, the British, and the Americans. (See, for example, the Teaching Company's series, *World War II: A Military and Social History*, conducted by Penn professor Thomas Childers.) The British indignation was not at the thought of someone "taking over the world," but at having their own position of primacy challenged.

Thus, the idea that Hitler's goal was to successively mop up all the remaining pockets of jewry, and thus succeed in "genocide," is simply impossible.

(II. Rules of Evidence)

### **5. Much of the "evidence" comes from a group which not only had just been in a desperate war with the Germans, but was their ideological enemy.**

The pictures of mountains of hair, and mountains of eyeglasses, and so forth, come almost exclusively from the Soviets. The Soviets just ten years earlier had conducted the infamous "show trials" in their own land. The Soviets had perfected the art of cinematographic propaganda in the earlier decades, led by Eisenstein. The Soviets had a visceral hatred of the Nazis exceeding even the Nazis' hatred of them. The Soviets are now known to have blamed massacres on the Germans that were carried out by themselves — the Katyn Forest massacre, for example. They are known, documented liars.

### **6. Most of the "evidence" supplied by the Western allies has had to be modified or abandoned in the course of time**

In the 1970s, mention of the word "Dachau" elicited the same horrified shudders that "Auschwitz" does today. But when I visited that camp in 1979, imagine my surprise to see that German historians had been permitted by their rulers to place a sign near the "gas chamber" that declared that no one was gassed to death at Dachau.

Likewise, any number of American WW2 veterans involved with the "liberation" of Buchenwald swear up and down that they "saw the evidence of the holocaust" with their own two eyes. Yes, the conditions were harsh. Yes, many perished there in the cold or due to unjustly harsh treatment — the Reformed pastor [Paul Schneider](#) for example. But no one suggests anymore that anyone was gassed to death at Buchenwald. Buchenwald was a punitive labor camp: nothing more, nothing less.

Today, the idea that jews were turned into lampshades has been exploded.

Likewise, the stories about human soap — now abandoned.

Human hair for mattresses — absurd. No mattress stuffed with human hair has been produced. Think about it. If human hair had been seen as a desirable commodity, would not the Germans have first started a program of human-hair recapture from the civilian barbers — where the hair would be clean, not lice-infested, and plentiful, coming from repeat customers? Yet no such program has ever been made public.

By an amazing coincidence, it appears that all of the camps liberated by the Western allies have now been cleared of the charge of being death camps. All the camps still listed as "death camps" were liberated by the Soviets.

### **7. Even the Soviet accounts have been slowly revised and otherwise rendered suspect**

It is now admitted that the main gas chamber at Auschwitz was reconstructed after the fact — “to reflect how it really was,” of course. (See other details about Auschwitz in the three videos that begin [here](#).) The number of victims at Auschwitz has been revised downward by millions, yet the total number is never affected.

#### **8. There is precious little actual eye-witness testimony**

Examining the accounts carefully, one often finds the testimony qualified by “I heard that...” or “someone said that...” This is known technically as hearsay.

#### **9. The detailed “eye-witness” testimony is often mutually contradictory**

Some of the original “eye-witnesses” claimed the death chambers worked by electrified floors. Some said the floors were designed to open up and dump the bodies into railroad cars underneath that could haul the corpses quickly to their graves. Others said they worked by evacuating the air. Others said the holocaust occurred by people being thrown alive into burning pits. None of these tales are accepted in the official account any more.

#### **10. The detailed “eye-witness” testimony is often absurd**

Adolf Eichmann spoke of blood spurting up out of the burial grounds.

The prison confession of Rudolf Gerstein, whose story is amplified in the movie [Amen](#), is a serious case in point. His details are simply impossible. The pile of clothes would be ten stories high. The body counts would pack more than one victim per cubic foot of space. Unfortunately (or fortunately?), Gerstein died in Allied prison under suspicious circumstances before he could be cross-examined.

#### **11. Eye-witness testimony that runs against the official story is always discounted, making the account look like a non-falsifiable dogma**

Red-cross reports on camp inspections, for example.

#### **12. Video pictures, absent verbal testimony giving the interpretation, are nearly worthless**

We have all seen the footage of bulldozers pushing emaciated bodies into mass graves after the war. But who were the victims? Germans starved to death by the infrastructure destroyed by Allied napalm? Prisoners that died of typhus because the means for dealing with it was similarly destroyed? Without a narrative, including dates, times, and places, raw images are worthless.

At Buchenwald, there is a picture showing a mass of bodies. As time ran out toward the end of the unconditional-surrender destruction of Germany, these corpses could not be buried or cremated in

time. It is now known that Buchenwald was not a death camp.

The maker of the *Night and Fog* documentary admits they were operating with little documentation. See [my review](#) for some of the absurdities in that film. Staring at the images in that “documentary” confirmed me as a skeptic. (It can be dangerous taking evidence too seriously.)

#### **13. Doing the “numbers” by census report is unsound**

First, jews are reluctant to be counted, even by themselves (see [Wex’s explanation](#) for this). Second, a reduction in number obviously does not prove foul play, let alone identify the killer. Third, some census figures I have seen show the jewish population *increasing* during WW2. This matter needs to be gotten to the bottom of.

#### **14. The general German concession of guilt does not pass the smell test**

Nuremburg led to a remorseful owning-up by the Germans. It was neither, “Ja, we did that, but you need to hear our side,” nor, “we didn’t know about it therefore we are not guilty.” There is just stunned, remorseful silence: a peculiar combination of assuming guilt even while incognizant.

For example, the interview of Traudl Junge that frames the movie [Downfall](#) shows that she was unaware of the holocaust, though she served as the personal secretary of Hitler. Yet she feels guilty because Sophie Scholl was her age, and Sophie “knew.” But the movie expanding on Sophie Scholl’s life does not put words in her mouth different what any pacifist might say in general terms. What is the chance that Sophie, living in Munich, “knew” while Hitler’s personal secretary did not know? How does Traudl now “know”? Because the Nuremburg Trial proved it. All the years at Hitler’s side, right up to the end, divulged not a hint of it.

(III. General nature of historical evidence)

#### **15. The evidence for the holocaust is quite different from the evidence for other historical “facts”**

Think of the difference between denying the holocaust and denying, say, the existence of George Washington, or denying that the battle of Gettysburg took place.

To do either of the latter examples, one would have to deny the entire continuity of the historical narrative, including finally one’s own existence in a coherent world. But to deny the holocaust, the rest of the narrative of history remains intact.

Suppose someone denied that the Battle of Gettysburg ever happened. But there is the field that can still be visited, with bullets still findable in the soil, and mass grave ditches. There are the official field reports. There are the thousands of soldiers’ memories, that were integrated into the shared experience of the nation and, above all,

their families: widows and comrades, that lived next door to others, and whose descendants still live among us. There were the books written later by the generals that were actually there. These all match the newspaper accounts written as the event was happening. At the end of the day, there is no integrated history of the world if there was no Gettysburg: then the whole world might as well be a figment of my imagination.

This comprehensiveness and coherence that would be lost is hardly the case if it turned out there was no holocaust. The stories of the players and the newspapers are perfectly coherent and comprehensive without a holocaust: indeed, neither the newspapers nor official statements of the time even mention a holocaust in any kind of compelling way.

(IV. Evidence of fraud)

**16. Many of the salient elements of the narrative were broached before the corresponding fact could have occurred**

The "six million" figure was broached several times, long before it could have been a fact.

My favorite is the reference to "gassings" in the Charlie Chaplin movie [The Great Dictator](#), produced in 1940, and long before the alleged "final solution" proposal at Wannsee. (A correspondent suggests it was a reference to WW1 gas. However, since the Allies also used gas in WW1, it would have been awkward for Chaplin to bring this up in his parody of Hitler.)

**17. The Nuremberg trials have many marks of a show-trial**

The Soviets were major players as prosecutors and judges, coming off their own show-trials of the previous decade. The American staff was loaded with resentful and vengeful jews. There was very little cross-examination. There is evidence that torture was used and threatened.

**18. The number of "holocaust survivors" is huge, and continues to grow**

Just a couple months ago, our local rag trotted out another victim of suffering during the Holocaust, who had remained completely silent for sixty-five years!

Before they think about it, people think the vast number of survivors is proof of the holocaust. It is the opposite. It is evidence against.

**19. The story has grown, and grown, and grown**

Evidently, the memoirs of Churchill, Eisenhower, and de Gaulle make scant mention of the Holocaust by any name. The director of the movie *Judgment at Nuremberg* states that he found that college audiences found his material incredible at the time — the early sixties. The Holocaust only became big business in the seventies. And it continues to grow.

Normally, don't we expect details of history to be most vivid near the event, and fade with the passage of time?

(V. politicized nature of subject)

**20. Revisionists are attacked in a way that is entirely unfair, ad hominem, and even criminal**

Robert Faurisson has been beaten up physically, and endlessly reviled in print. Revisionists are routinely accused, without any evidence other than the content of their conclusions, of being neo-Nazis or fascists. Above all, see also #24.

The [charge of "anti-semitism"](#) as the only motive that could lead to questioning the story is question-begging. Perhaps the attackers should entertain the converse: could it be that seeing how questioners have been ridden roughshod over is the very thing that pushes some toward "anti-semitism"?

**21. Questioning the official story is usually not answered by unassailable facts, but by appeal to the authority of the establishment guild**

And this is particularly weak when we realize that the guild is self-perpetuating: dissenters are not allowed in, or are forcibly removed. When discussing the identity of King Tut, we might expect some objectivity from the academic guild, but when discussing a subject for which publishing the wrong answer will lead to losing the royally-rewarded tenure track, academics themselves should be honest enough to recognize their bias. Read the [story of Gernar Rudolf](#), and ask how many other academics you have ever met would be willing to sacrifice the cushy academic life for Rudolf's destiny. Consider [this list](#) of people fired, exiled, and persecuted in Switzerland for doubting the story. Shame, and double shame!

Now add to this the threat described in #24. It is hardly surprising that the guild is united around one story.

The appeals to authority are often coupled with a condescending sneer that suggests that only perversity could even raise the question. Compare this to how someone that believed the earth were flat and the sun revolves around it would be answered. Can you imagine how absurd it would be if the only answer ever given to such a person were, "all the university Physicists disagree with you"?

Anyone — including non-Physicists — that can't rattle off two or three infallible proofs that the earth is round and is rotating on its axis has no right to claim those beliefs.

Anyone that can't rattle off half a dozen infallible proofs for the holocaust has no right to scoff at the questioner.

**22. The manner in which jewish suffering is highlighted, and the suffering of others minimized, smacks of propaganda**

The very term "holocaust" is virtually copyrighted. The Armenians are not allowed to refer to the Armenian holocaust. Nor are the Tutsi in Rwanda. Nor, the Cambodians under the Pol Pot. All these people are only allowed to mention their story as a footnote to the One Really Important Story.

**23. Likewise, the way in which the noses of the "liberators" is rubbed in the muck smacks of propaganda**

Virtually every American city of any size has a holocaust memorial. I thought we were the liberators, that we should be praised. No; we are to feel guilty also.

Finally, the clincher:

**24. Almost everywhere in Europe, people that question the holocaust story are thrown in prison**

Pacifist artist [Ernst Zundel](#) was dragged from his home in Tennessee, shipped to Canada, and then sent to Germany, where he sits in the slammer. Note that the charge of "inciting racial hatred" is identical to the "charge" of denying that the Nazis killed millions of Jews. Note also this chilling statement: "German prosecutors were able to seek his extradition on the ground that a Web site he ran was accessible in Germany." What site is not accessible in Germany? By this criterion, no one is safe that publishes such material on the web.

David Irving — [thrown into the slammer in Austria](#) for denying the holocaust – in a speech he had made seventeen years before!

Gerd Honsik — [extradited from Spain](#) and thrown into the slammer in Austria – for holocaust denial  
Gaston-Armand Amaudruz — Swiss citizen, [thrown in prison](#) – for holocaust denial

Fredrick Toben – [sentenced for publishing](#) "anti-Semitic material" – which are detailed as (1) suggesting the Holocaust did not happen, (2) questioning whether there were gas chambers at the Auschwitz death camp, and (3) hurting some jews' feelings by challenging their intelligence.

Some of these have already been freed. On the other hand, the list is not complete.

Not since the Gulag Archipelago was in full swing has the expression of heretical opinion been treated this way. Does anyone suggest throwing flat-earthers in prison, or Gettysburg-deniers? This shows that the holocaust is functioning as a state religion — in an age that pretends horror at religious persecution.

What academic wants to be thrown in prison, or (if he is American) put in a position of not daring to step foot into Canada or Europe?

What young academic wants to jeopardize his chance for the life-long gravy-train known as tenure?

What academic, tenured or not, wants to face a national campaign by ADL terrorists to have him removed from office and rendered unemployable?

Academics today is all about "getting funding." What is amusing is that in the very era, our own, when every historian is keenly tuned in to the "material factors" that might have "influenced" the Nicean Council, or even a Luther, seem totally oblivious to the material factors that are patently and undeniably steering their own work!

The "academic consensus" in any matter that is so politically and (above all) financially charged as this subject is, has no value whatsoever. It is unfortunate, but true.

When people are thrown in prison for expressing a belief, it is virtual proof that something is going on with the power-holders other than commitment to truth.

**Conclusion**

These considerations do not prove that the holocaust story is false, but the consideration I have outlined do prove that investigating it is not a sign of insanity or bad faith. On the contrary, the mockers and persecutors of revisionists must answer the charge of bad faith, if not outright dishonesty.

The landscape has changed for me, and I think the landscape will be changed for anyone that takes a couple years, part time, to look into these matters. For me, the burden of proof has decisively swung to the side of the received story.

<http://firstword.us/2010/01/the-prima-facie-case-for-holocaust-research/>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Senate Quietly Passes Iran Sanctions Bill  
Grace Huang, t r u t h o u t Report, 30 January 2010**

The Senate quietly passed legislation Thursday implementing tough new sanctions against Iran that advocacy groups say will cause more pain for the citizens of the country than for the government it's intended to cripple.

The sanctions would target gasoline companies and Iranian imports of refined petroleum products. In addition, the bill includes provisions to ban imports to the US and exports to Iran, with the exception of food, medicine and other humanitarian aid goods. Assets of certain Iranian individuals could also be frozen.

Aside from these direct sanctions, the bill, passed in a voice vote after only five minutes of debate, would also force the US to ban trade with foreign companies which continue to do business with Iran that is subject to sanctions.

Thursday's passage came as a surprise to many, as Sen. Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nevada) had implied Tuesday that the bill would not reemerge for weeks.

"We have all watched the Iranian regime oppress its own people on the streets of Iran and continue to defy the international community on nuclear issues," Sen. Reid said in

a statement. "That is why it is so important that we move this legislation forward quickly."

Lara Friedman, director of policy and government relations for Americans for Peace Now, an advocacy group that has frequently weighed in on Middle East issues, speculated in a statement that Sen. Reid pushed the bill forward because he is facing a tough re-election campaign and believed he needed the backing of the bill's supporters.

Addressing the reasons why the Democrats stood firm with the bill rather than with President Obama, Friedman mentioned several factors such as "a sense of defeatism," "blind faith" that the bill would be improved later on and the belief that supporting the bill would cost them the least amount of political capital.

Passage of the bill was swift. With few senators in the chamber, the Senate didn't allow for amendments or a roll call vote, and the legislation passed in its original form.

It is unclear whether Obama intends to sign it into law. The administration has repeatedly stated that it opposes broad sanctions that would harm the Iranian people. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has particularly stressed the need for "smarter" sanctions which would target actual decision-makers in Iran.

The House passed sanctions legislation in December that resembles the House bill, but there are differences in the two bills which will have to be resolved before the new sanctions go into effect.

While broad sanctions can put large amounts of economic and political pressure on a country and compel it to change its behavior accordingly, they can also cause crippling problems for the populace while the decision-making elite can often adapt to the sanctions' demands. Though sanctions have succeeded with various countries, in some cases they can take awhile yield results - and even then it is difficult to know whether the sanctions were the impetus for changes. For example, sanctions on South Africa lasted about 30 years before apartheid ended.

The Iran sanctions are designed to help weaken the regime and raise public discontent in an effort to stop Tehran's nuclear program. However, experts worry that the sanctions, while crippling the economy, will hurt the Iranian people far more than the individuals at the top.

According to a statement released by the National Iranian-American Council (NIAC), the bill will impose "indiscriminant, unilateral sanctions that will hurt the Iranian people ... and play into the hands of Iran's rulers, who continue to commit flagrant human rights violations."

Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Kentucky) admitted on the Senate floor that such unilateral sanctions typically "make little or no difference." However, he continued, this measure "is crafted in such a way that it could actually become effective, with America alone not having to depend on the cooperation of the other countries that tend to be less concerned about whether Iran ultimately becomes armed with nuclear weapons."

"If the Obama administration will not take action against this regime," he argued, "Then Congress must."

Sen. Chris Dodd (D-Connecticut), chairman of the Senate Banking Committee and a sponsor of the bill, noted himself during the discussion that "multilateral sanctions are likely to be more effective than those we impose unilaterally."

But though other multilateral efforts are still on the table, Dodd said in a statement, "It is our job to arm our President with a comprehensive set of tough sanctions designed to ratchet up pressure on the Iranian regime."

Those opposed to the bill, however, say that these policies would actually lock the administration into enforcing the sanctions without much room for flexibility. For example, if President Obama were to disagree with applying the sanctions in certain cases, under the rules of the bill, he would have to seek a waiver each and every time. This would also force the administration to unilaterally sanction countries who continue to trade goods that the bill prohibits, without consulting them.

The passage of this bill might also harm President Obama's efforts to take action with international support. Jamal Abdi, policy director of NIAC, said that the bill will especially harm attempts to get China and Russia's cooperation and support. "This will give them an excuse to say, 'Look, the US is going at it alone, it doesn't care about alienating its allies and partners and it's not going to cooperate with multilateral initiatives,'" he said.

Based on the number of votes the bill received in the House and the current atmosphere of the Senate, President Obama might not be able to veto the bill and avert an override, which would require less than three-fourths approval in the House and two-thirds approval in the Senate.

News of the legislation passing came following the Iranian government's hanging of two political dissidents convicted of trying to try to topple the "Islamic establishment." This was the first known execution of political activists following the Iranian presidential elections in June and the ensuing political unrest.

"We think that the Iranian people are rising up," said Abdi, in regards to the political protests taking place since the election. "The US should stop the sanctions that hurt the people and do nothing to hurt the government."

<http://www.truthout.org/iran-sanctions-bill56532>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Michael Santomauro,**

**February 1, 2010 Let me see if I got this right:**

If you cross the North Korean Border illegally you get 12 years hard labor; the Iranian Border you are detained indefinitely; the Afghan Border you get shot; the Saudi Arabian Border you will be jailed; the Chinese Border you may never be heard from again; the Venezuelan Border you will be branded a spy and your fate will be sealed; the Cuban Border you will thrown into political prison to rot.

If you cross the U.S. Border illegally you get:

A job, a Drivers License, Social Security Card, Welfare, Food Stamps, Credit Card, Subsidized Rent or a Loan to Buy a House, Free Education, Free Health Care, A Lobbyist in Washington,

Billions of dollars worth of Public Documents printed in your language, The right to carry your country's flag while you protest that you don't get enough respect and in many instances you can vote.

**JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE I HAD A FIRM GRASP ON THE SITUATION !**

**Peace, Michael Santomauro , Editorial Director**

[ReportersNotebook@yahoo.com](mailto:ReportersNotebook@yahoo.com)

**Call anytime: 917-974-6367**

[ReporterNotebook@gmail.com](mailto:ReporterNotebook@gmail.com)

**New release: Debating The Holocaust by Thomas Dalton.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Remembering JD Salinger**

**Marjorie Kehe, *The Christian Science Monitor*,**

**28 January 2010**

If you've been to high school in the US in the past 50 years, then you know his book. J.D. Salinger was not as prolific as many authors, but few could even dream of being as influential. Today, Salinger's son announced that, after years of life in seclusion, his father, author of the 1951 classic "The Catcher in the Rye," died yesterday at his home in Cornish, N.H. Salinger was 91. After "Catcher in the Rye," Salinger went on to publish a handful of additional works, acclaimed by critics and fans alike – "Nine Stories" (1953), "Franny and Zooey" (1961) and "Raise High the Roof Beams, Carpenters" (1963). But nothing else would capture the world's attention to quite the extent of "The Catcher in the Rye," with its alienated, disillusioned, prep school dropout narrator, Holden Caulfield.

An early obituary of Salinger credits "The Catcher in the Rye" with long- and wide-ranging impact. "Novels from Evan Hunter's 'The Blackboard Jungle' to Curtis Sittenfeld's 'Prep,' movies from 'Rebel Without a Cause' to 'The Breakfast Club,' and countless rock 'n' roll songs echoed Salinger's message of kids under siege," writes Hillel Italie. "One of the great anti-heroes of the 1960s, Benjamin Braddock of 'The Graduate,' was but a blander version of Salinger's narrator."

For some decades now, "Catcher" has become standard fare in most US high schools. For at least two generations of us, reading the book is one of the indelible memories of 10th-grade English.

But in recent years, there have been debates over the book's continuing merit. While some young readers find Holden's struggles with the "phonies" of the adult world as fresh as ever, others say they cannot relate, and some teachers have questioned the value of insisting that today's kids need to interact with a fictive character rooted in the Manhattan of the 1950s.

At only six years younger than Holden, I am perhaps the wrong age to enter into such a debate. But I will share one memory.

About a decade ago, I was tutoring a New York City school kid who was failing English. Gary was certainly bright enough, but he hated to read. He despised fiction in particular, he told me, and could not bring himself to finish a single book assigned in English class. I met him just as he was encountering "The Catcher in the Rye."

To encourage Gary and keep him company, I bought a copy of my own and re-read the book for the first time in about 30 years. I wondered how it would read as an adult. To my surprise, I felt its poignant bite all over again. I wondered, however, what Gary would think.

At our next tutoring session, for the first time, he was sitting straight up at his desk. "I didn't know people wrote books like this," he said. In part, he meant the language – still surprising in a school book after 50 years. But on another level, he meant something more. "It talks about things that people really think about," he said.

By the time we met again, Gary had read more than the required number of pages and "Catcher" went on to become the first novel he ever finished. Later, his in-class essay on Holden's sense of alienation won him an A. By the time we hit the next novel – Stephen Crane's "Maggie: Girl of the Streets" – Gary had a brand-new confidence. He didn't like "Maggie" nearly as well, but he'd gotten the idea of reading.

He finished English that year with a B.

Gary's experience, of course, is just one story. But I can't help wondering how many times it was repeated over the course of half a century.

*Marjorie Kehe is the Monitor's book editor.*  
<http://www.truthout.org/remembering-jd-salinger56501>

\*\*\*\*\*

## More Holocaust madness from German Judiciary

[http://kehrusker.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=592:solidaritaet-mit-wigbert-grabert-&catid=43:freiheitskampf&Itemid=68](http://kehrusker.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=592:solidaritaet-mit-wigbert-grabert-&catid=43:freiheitskampf&Itemid=68)

**Another German publisher is to be ruined by the German upholders of the Holocaust myth – Wigbert Grabert of Grabert Verlag, was found guilty of 'inciting the masses' and sentenced to 8 months prison suspended for three years and fined Euro 3,000. The authors of the article were not indicted but Grabert, as the publisher, was.**

**A number of times Judge Escher rose from his chair and thumped his fist on the table – this is indicative of what? -please donate - Wigbert Grabert's bank account:**

**Kreissparkasse Tübingen Kto. 54623 BLZ 641 500 20 – IBAN-DE: 456415002000000054623**

### **Solidarität mit Wigbert Grabert! Deutschland – Freiheitskampf**

Wieder soll ein Deutscher existentiell fertiggemacht werden, weil er Charakter bewiesen hat und sich der Wahrheit verpflichtet fühlt. Wigbert Grabert ist den Regierenden schon lange ein Dorn im Auge, er hatte es

gewagt, Bücher zu verlegen, die der verordneten Doktrin widersprechen! Er hat unser aller (jeder nach seinen Möglichkeiten) Unterstützung verdient!

Leserzuschrift 31.Januar 2010 - Wigbert Graberts Berufung abgelehnt - Landgericht verurteilt Verleger wegen Volksverhetzung

Am 12. Februar 2007 verurteilte das Amtsgericht Tübingen (s. *EK* Nr. 2007, S. 1) den Verleger Wigbert Grabert wegen Volksverhetzung in einem aus einer finnischen Zeitung übernommenen Bericht (*DGG* Nr. 2, 2006, S. 10 ff.) zu drei Monaten Haft auf Bewährung und 3000.- Euro Geldstrafe.

Am 12. November 2007 wurde der wieder wegen Volksverhetzung durch Abdruck eines Aufsatzes Dr. Herbert Schauers über strafverfahrenrechtliche Fragen angeklagte Verleger vom Amtsgericht Tübingen zu 500.- Euro wegen eines Verstoßes gegen das Pressegesetz verurteilt (*EK* Nr. 6. 2007, S. 1). Gegen

das erste Urteil legte Wigbert Grabert, gegen das zweite die Staatsanwaltschaft Berufung ein.

Für die Berufungsverhandlung der beiden vom Richter Escher zusammengefaßten Fälle wurden vom 30. November bis 21. Dezember 2009 fünf ganztägige Verhandlungen angesetzt. Das Urteil erging am Abend des 21. Dezember: Wigbert Graberts Berufung wurde verworfen, die der Staatsanwaltschaft im wesentlichen anerkannt. Der Verleger wurde wegen Volksverhetzung in zwei Fällen zu insgesamt acht Monaten Haft, auf drei Jahre zur Bewährung ausgesetzt, und zu 3000.-Euro Geldstrafe, zahlbar in Raten an das SOS Kinderdorf, verurteilt, obwohl der Verteidiger, Rechtsanwalt Thor von Waldstein, unterstützt von Rechtsanwalt Ludwig Bock, auf Freispruch plädiert hatte.

Das Urteil ist in mehrerer Hinsicht skandalös und nicht hinnehmbar. Vor Beginn der Verhandlungen versuchten Staatsanwaltschaft und Gericht, den Angeklagten dazu zu bewegen, seine Berufung zurückzunehmen. Dann werde der Staatsanwalt dasselbe tun. Dieser >Deal< wurde auch während der Verhandlungen noch einmal angeboten. Das beweist, wie unsicher die Anklage sich ihrer Beweisführung war und daß man sich bei der Anklagebehörde, möglicherweise auch beim Gericht, über die Verwerflichkeit, mindestens der Problematik, einer Verurteilung im klaren war.

Bezeichnenderweise wurden die Verfasser beider Artikel nicht angeklagt, obwohl das durchaus möglich gewesen wäre. Das offenbart schon, daß es nur darum ging, dem Verleger finanziell möglichst zu schaden und seinen Verlag in wirtschaftliche Schwierigkeiten zu bringen. Der Richter verlor während der Verhandlungen mehrfach seine Fassung, sprang auf, schlug mit der Faust auf seinen Tisch und gebärdete sich unbeherrscht. Das deutet darauf hin, daß er selbst seinen Argumenten nicht traute.

Er lehnte - bis auf zwei unbedeutende Ausnahmen - alle Beweisanträge der Verteidigung ab, ohne überhaupt auf sie einzugehen, obwohl darin Grundsätzliches zum Schutz der Meinungs- und Pressefreiheit gefordert wurde. Das Gericht versuchte erst gar nicht zu untersuchen, ob überhaupt Volksverhetzung vorliege, sondern setzte das einfach voraus, ohne sich mit den Auslassungen der Verteidiger argumentativ zu befassen. Die massiven Vorwürfe der Verteidigung, daß der Verfassungsschutz in maßgeblicher Weise in den Fall eingegriffen habe, wies das Gericht zurück, ohne die vorgetragene Beweise zu entkräften.

Der anfänglich noch erhobene Vorwurf, mit dem Abdruck eines weiteren Artikels von Georg Wiesholler (DGG Nr.1, 2006, S. 31-34) auch Volksverhetzung verübt zu haben, wurde von der Staatsanwaltschaft fallengelassen und vom Gericht nicht mehr behandelt. Das zeigt ebenso die Willkür in der Anklage. Gegen dieses skandalöse Urteil legte die Verteidigung

fristgerecht Revision zum Oberlandesgericht Stuttgart ein.

Die nebenstehend beschriebenen Prozesse mit Anklagen wegen Volksverhetzung durch Veröffentlichung von Beiträgen in der DGG haben mich viel Arbeitszeit gekostet. Zudem sind, wenn die Urteile wegen meiner Revision zum Oberlandesgericht auch noch nicht rechtskräftig geworden sind, doch bereits erhebliche Kosten angefallen. Ganz offensichtlich wurden die Verfahren von höchster Stelle angestrengt, um den Verlag wirtschaftlich fertigzumachen. Doch so leicht lassen wir uns nicht in die Knie zwingen. Wir brauchen jedoch jetzt zum Überleben die Solidarität unserer Leser. Wenn jeder zu diesem Rechtskampf etwas beiträgt, können wir weiterarbeiten und unsere Aufklärungsarbeit auch in der Zukunft leisten. Darum bitte ich um Ihre Unterstützung in diesem Falle auf das im Impressum angegebene Konto.- Die Gemeinheit der politjuristischen Verfolgung wollen wir mit erhöhter Aktivität beantworten: Der Euro-Kurier soll ab sofort monatlich erscheinen und Ihnen alle vier Wochen in gewohntem Umfang Nachrichten und Kommentare zum Zeitgeschehen neben den Hinweisen auf neue Buchtitel ins Haus bringen. Er soll die Verbindung zwischen Ihnen und dem Verlag noch enger gestalten und uns die Möglichkeit geben, noch schneller auf politische Entwicklungen zu reagieren. Wir wollen diesen Versuch zunächst für ein Jahr durchführen und dann sehen, wie weit er in Zukunft fortgesetzt werden kann. Vor uns liegt ein schweres Jahr.

Gemeinsam werden wir es bewältigen können. Darauf vertraut mit bestem Dank im voraus,  
**Ihr Wigbert Grabert**  
**Kreissparkasse**  
**Tübingen**  
**Kto. 54623 BLZ 641**  
**500 20 – IBAN-DE:**  
**456415002000000054**  
**623.**

