

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300

Adelaide 5067

Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

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

Online

ISSN 1440-9828



July 2016 No 982

>>>another dip into our archive<<<

Adelaide Institute



Adelaide Institute Newsletter Issue 50

Table of contents

- Introduction
 - The Irving Interlude
 - The Faurisson Forum
 - Muirden's Musings
 - Brockschmidt's Thoughts
 - Conclusion
- *****

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

Newsletter No 50 on-line - December 1996

INTRODUCTION

Fredrick Toben - FEAR OF TRUTH - TELLING

In *hungry ghosts - China's Secret Famine*, John Murray, London, 1996, ISBN 0-7195-5433-0, Jasper Becker details how during 1958-62 the world's oldest continuous civilisation was swept by, what Carl Jung called, a 'psychic epidemic' which caused over 30 million people to starve to death. Like the earlier, also politically inspired, 1932-33 Ukrainian famine, the Chinese famine sprang directly out of the utopian Marxist pipe dream.

Since my first exposure to university life in 1963, I was amazed to find seemingly intelligent persons willingly embracing Marxist ideology. As a farmer's son I (a) personally never wanted to see established in Australia a dictatorship of the proletariat and (b) I could not embrace the false consciousness contained in the Marxist class-hatred ideology.

Since the demise of the Soviet Union, communist parties have faded from the world stage. Astonishingly, though, the disbanded Australian Communist Party has recently re-constituted itself. The reason given by its members is that the resurgence of extreme right-wing and neo-Nazi activity has again made the Communist Party a relevant force. Again, I am amazed at how seemingly intelligent people can be drawn towards an ideology that has proven itself to be morally and intellectually bankrupt. It would certainly help their moral and intellectual development if these new communists were to place Jasper Becker's book on their required reading list.

Becker claims that it was from Mao Zedong's absolute power that a collective escape into a world of utter delusion became possible:

All that mattered to the millions in the Party was to pander to the fantasies of its leader. Many knew they were telling lies and that the truth was that the country was starving. (p.307)

Li Zhisui, Mao's personal doctor, claims that reports of the 1958-62 famine left Mao unmoved. This means that Mao did, after all, learn about the famine. Mao's callousness, says Becker, stems from the Confucian influence which taught that peasants are inferior because they cannot be educated and thus must be exploited. (p.309) With such a slave mentality as its philosophical basis it is not surprising that Marxism flourished in China.

However, what was required for a successful transplanting of Marxist ideology into the Chinese social fabric was a dialectic trump card. Becker says that Mao knew how to divide the Chinese into imaginary interest groups by using the Marxist class-struggle concept.

This rendered the Chinese**incapable of discerning their true interests. Thus he was able to incite people to engage in mutual killing or goals that were, in fact, detrimental to their own interests. It was precisely for this reason that he was able to conceal his real face and masquerade as the people's leader.** (p.309)

For me, the mental jump from Mao's China to the Pauline Hanson phenomenon is easy. A media-created Hanson openly challenges Australia's multicultural policies, and the phenomenon has now fuelled the daily media's output to almost ridiculous levels. For many incompetent public figures the Independent member for Oxley has also become a scapegoat. Mention any of Australia's economic and social ills and Hanson is blamed by both Labor and Liberal parliamentarians for having caused, if not that, then having contributed to a worsening of Australia's conditions.

This is how the perceived, divisive race-debate is viewed. Massive publicity campaigns, both within and without

parliament, have attempted to put the lid on the race debate. Yet over a quarter of a century's suppression of discussion of this issue has finally broken free - thanks to the Prime Minister's new-found principle of free speech. How successful Mr Howard will be in leading the country out of its many conceptual prisons is difficult to tell. However, the recent Irving decision has shown how farcical the whole matter has become; either our Prime Minister has sold out to the powerful Jewish-Zionist world lobby, or he lacks the intellectual capacity to understand that the David Irving controversy is, indeed, one of free speech. (contd.p.2) Becker explains Mao's long reign,1949-76, by pointing out that Mao had **created a world in which all beliefs and judgements were suspended.**

Here I am reminded how during the 1970s through to the early 90s our various state education systems prided themselves in providing our children with **value-free education.** As in the above example from China's Mao, the dialectic twist neutralised many of our best classroom teachers so that thousands of educators quit and fled into private schools.

In China the suppression of free speech, and its reward - finding an approximation to truth - created situations where grotesque efforts were made to deceive political leaders.

Says Becker:

No one dared move or act according to what he knew to be true. Instead, even the highest ranking officials moved in a secretive society paralysed by an all pervasive network of informers and spies.....Who could believe that Party officials would plaster and paint trees stripped of their bark by starving peasants to hide the famine from the country's President. (pp.311-12)

Marxist scientific agriculture simply did not work, and Becker reminds us that the most horrible aspect of this artificially induced famine in, for example, Anhui was that the state granaries were full.

Why did the bureaucrats lie about the terrible 1958-62 famine? The answer is obvious to anyone that felt the displeasure of those who are at the social levers of power. Peng Dehuai had criticised Mao's Great Leap Forward and spent years in prison suffering torture and physical humiliation. That is why Hu Yaobang can in all clarity state:

I did not dare tell the Chairman the truth. If I had done so this would have spelt the end of me. I would have ended up like Peng Dehuai. (p.237)

Mao's propaganda war - *Anti-Right Opportunist Movement* - was ruthless and effective:

To be labelled a 'right opportunist' was in some places tantamount to receiving a death sentence. Anyone so labelled, and his entire family, was ostracised along with any outsiders such as landlords, counter-revolutionaries, Kuomintang followers, and rich peasants, collectively known as the five types of bad elements. These received the lowest priority in the distribution of food. (pp.141-2)

Again, relating this mindset to our situation here at **Adelaide Institute**, we all are familiar with similarly used terms, such as *antisemitic, racist, hater, Holocaust denier.* The function of such words is to confuse and neutralise an opponent's critical faculties. Socially the effect is to smear a person's good character, and so the words are used to blackmail opponents into silence. In most instances it works quite well. Of course in our instance it doesn't work! It is obvious for any person with a critical mind that such labelling words as *antisemite* or *racist* become a double-edged weapon because:

an antisemite is anyone the Jews don't like

or,

a racist is anyone who wins an argument with a multiculturalist.

Legitimate criticism can thereby re-establish itself and an open debate on important issues can begin.

Becker cites an example where the truth about the famine does emerge. Zhao Yushu, a party secretary, asked Dr Wang, the head of the Gaocheng hospital in the Wudian commune, whether anything could be done about the many people who had fallen sick. Dr Wang told him that people were dying not from any illness but from hunger. The ideologically blinkered bureaucrats would, of course, not admit that the system - the theory underpinning the ideological fabric - was the cause of the

problem. Any scientist today would as a matter of course change the theoretical structure rather than attempt to change natural laws in order to give a true account of what was going on around him.

The personal suffering inflicted on the Chinese people because of misguided social policies is now legendary. Interestingly, in our society many of our bureaucrats would never be able to get away with blatant acts of brutality that, for example, the public security chief of Luoshan county committed. Chen Rubin personally beat up 200 people whom he believed were hoarding grain.

Becker concludes his book on a philosophical note:

The files may never be opened.....There will be no museums devoted to the victims of the famine. The dead seem destined to remain hungry ghosts unplaced by any memorial or apology, and it is almost too late to charge those responsible with crimes against humanity - and yet, if the Chinese are kept ignorant of what happened, that would be another kind of tragedy. If the famine remains a secret, the country will draw no lessons from its past nor learn that only in a secretive society could so many have starved to death. (p.312)

So, too, it has been for the victims of the so-called Jewish-Nazi Holocaust. While the Holocaust memorials and museums flourish for the alleged victims of Nazism, the German soldiers and civilians have not been laid to rest and their memories blessed - and this after 50 years

The German government, in fact, is still pursuing old men for having been involved in a fratricidal war. At the same time the judiciary is used by the politicians to silence those who wish to pursue the allegation that Germans systematically exterminated European Jewry in homicidal gas chambers.

Industrial chemist, Germar Rudolf, has to date produced a definitive report which clearly disproves the gassing allegations. Rudolf is now a refugee from his native Germany because by writing *The Rudolf Report* he has offended against the Holocaust taboo. If he returns to Germany, then he faces two years' jail.

That is the state of affairs faced by historians and scientists in Germany. It stifles the German creative spirit and suppresses normal human development. What is happening in Germany is reflected in other countries the world over. David Irving and Robert Faurisson show us how courageous individuals can fight the evil forces that seek to enslave us.

In this 50th issue we celebrate **Adelaide Institute's** success in pushing the Holocaust debate onto the world stage. 1996 has been a productive year for us. I personally thank the supporters who made it possible for us to have our work exposed on Internet. If you have not made your 1996 financial contribution to the cause, then please be generous with your donation. We have an important project planned for 1997 and your contribution, no matter how small, is urgently needed. Things are hotting up on the Holocaust front and we must be there to fight for the truth. Remember, in a secretive society truth does not emerge without individuals fighting for its emergence.

Now we wish our friends and supporters all the best for the coming festive season and, we'll be back in 1997.

*

A REPLY FROM THE HON. PHILIP RUDDOCK - Minister for Immigration

17 October 1996

Dear Dr Töben

Thank you for your letter of 22 May 1996 in which you asked whether a visa will be granted to David Irving under the Coalition Government.

Australia's visitor program aims to facilitate the entry of genuine visitors while screening out persons whose presence could in some way be harmful to the Australian community or who are likely to become involved in activities disruptive to the Australian community or a group within the Australian community.

All applications are considered against the legal requirements of the Migration Act 1958 and the Migration Regulations. If an applicant fails to meet all the legal criteria, he or she will not be granted a visa for Australia.

Mr Irving's last two applications for visitor visas were refused as it was assessed that he did not meet the legal criteria for the

grant of the visas. **The visas were refused on the basis that Mr Irving was not of good character. Mr Irving's views on the "Holocaust" had no bearing on the decision.**

Mr Irving sought review of the previous Minister's decisions in the Federal Court. On 31 August 1995, Carr J dismissed Mr Irving's appeal as there was sufficient evidence before the previous Minister justifying his decision. This decision recently was upheld by the Full Federal Court following a further appeal by Mr Irving.

The Full Federal Court's judgement confirmed that the decision in rejecting Mr Irving's applications rested on an assessment of his general conduct as opposed to any evaluation of his views or writings. The issue of the person's character was discussed by Lee J in his judgement when he said: "...the words good character should be taken to be used in their ordinary sense, namely, a reference to the enduring moral qualities of a person, and not to the good standing, fame or repute of that person in the community. The former is an objective assessment apt to be proved as a fact whilst the latter is a review of a subjective public opinion....a person of good repute may be shown by objective assessment to be a person of bad character."

Any further application lodged by Mr Irving will be assessed on its merits against the legal criteria at the time.

Thank you for drawing this matter to my attention.

Yours sincerely

Philip Ruddock

THE GERMANOPHOBIC FALLACY

It is widely conceded today that the kind of thinking which presents any ethnic group in terms of a crude, unflattering caricature is undesirable and sloppy at the very least. Conversely, acceptance of others on the basis of individual merit, without reference to racial or national background is regarded as one of the distinguishing marks of the truly educated man.

One of the most widely publicised reasons offered in explanation of our opposition to the regime of the late Adolf Hitler was its severe policy directed at Jews and other enemies of the regime. By some curious irony, however, many of the same Americans who were so quick to attack the Nazi racial doctrines have been the worst offenders in spreading abroad a fantastic myth of singular German wickedness. As a consequence of this Germanophobic myth, the very word German conjures up in all too many minds an uncomfortable, if vague, image of robot-like, goose-stepping legions of glassy-eyed storm troopers set in motion by the harshly barked commands of an Erich von Stroheim type "Prussian" officer. Furthermore, "militarism," "aggressiveness" and a marked preference for "authoritarianism over democracy have well-nigh universally been regarded as "typically German" national traits.

Germanophobia in the thirties and forties had for the "educated" classes in the West an appeal which could never have been held for such concepts as "white supremacy" or anti-Semitism. It is precisely this academic and intellectual respectability of the notion of unique German wickedness, on the basis of specious racial and historical arguments, that has made of it such a dangerous fallacy.

Dr Michael F Connors *Dealing in Hate-The development of Anti-German Propaganda*, ISBN 0911038558.

A Letter to Mr Ruddock in reply:

28 October 1996

Dear Mr Ruddock

RE: DAVID IRVING'S VISA APPLICATION

Although it took you five months to respond to my letter of 22 May 1996, I still thank you for your letter of 17 October.

I appreciate the constraints under which you are operating, in particular the pressure you are feeling from the powerful Jewish lobby which so vehemently opposes David Irving's visit to Australia.

That is why the final sentence in your fourth paragraph is factually wrong:

Mr Irving's views on the "Holocaust" had no bearing on the decision.

The whole Irving controversy rests on this very issue of the 'Holocaust'.

Irving's 1986 and 1987 visits to Australia were unproblematic because it was not until 1988 that *The Leuchter Report* convinced Irving the alleged homicidal gas chamber claim at Auschwitz concentration camp is factually wrong.

It was only then that the powerful international Jewish lobby began targeting David Irving.

What bothers me about this whole controversy is that someone like the Reverend Ian Paisley and Salman Rushdie are allowed into the country, yet Irving, who has been here before, is not.

Minister, the whole issue surrounding Irving is the fact that it is so unbalanced. Media commentators have done a hatchet job on him without Irving being able to respond. This offends against the British natural justice concept.

Interestingly, those who oppose Irving's visit to Australia, such as academic, Professor Robert Manne; and publicist, Dr Gerard Henderson, claim that survivors of the Holocaust will be traumatized by his visit.

This is a nonsense claim because the 'Holocaust racket', as late Jewish academic, Dr Frank Knopfelmacher called it, is keeping the issue alive

before the public - thereby keeping the wound open as well.

Let me end on a personal note. In 1953 an Australian official visited northern Germany and invited my father to come to Australia, there to farm land. I obtained my primary, secondary and tertiary education in Australia. Since the 1970s the claim that Germans systematically exterminated European Jewry in homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz, has been leveled at me and at my father. Surely anyone who makes such accusations is obliged to prove such allegations. This proof would consist of forensically investigating the alleged murder weapon, namely the homicidal gas chamber story.

In Germany it is a criminal offence to do just that.

In the latest Irving judgment, I do not share Justice Nicholson's expressed concerns about the judicial necessity to restrain debate in Germany on this matter - especially because the claims reap monetary rewards for those who make unproved allegations.

A so-called 'Holocaust denier' will immediately be pursued by those who profit from the homicidal gas chamber story.

That is how Irving obtained his so-called criminal record. Can you imagine a situation developing in Australia where we would face fines or imprisonment for questioning historical matters?

That is what the powerful Jewish lobby wishes to do in Australia by criminalising debates on the so-called Jewish-Nazi Holocaust.

Mr Ruddock, please remember that the Irving matter is of historical significance and your name will either be 'mud', or you will be celebrated as a statesman for having clearly seen through the emotional turbulence this issue is generating.

Sincerely

Dr Fredrick Töben

A Letter to the Editor

10 November 1996

Historical Perversions

Now that British historian David Irving again has been refused an entry visa, it is time to look at the controversy with impassioned eyes.

Both Mr Howard and Mr Ruddock are misguided in their criticism of David Irving's view of the Holocaust. I just do not understand how it can be considered to be an insult to maintain that there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz and that the six million Jewish death figure is far too high?

I would have thought that what David Irving is alleging is good news for all those who suffered the loss of loved ones in the war. There is nothing perverse about this view, and it is a reason for celebrating Irving's view of history especially if his view is soundly based on factual evidence rather than mere conjecture.

Can anyone explain to me how Irving's view can be offensive? If he is right, then far fewer Jews died during the war and none in gas chambers. That is a cause for celebration. For example, at one time it was thought that 4 million people died at Auschwitz. Now with the archives opening up, we have had this figure

reduced to just under one million. Other unofficial sources reduce the death figure to 74,000. Isn't that good news?
Dr Fredrick Töben

*

Email from: CODOH - Bradley Smith USA
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 13:40:45
Subject: Irving rejection

Dear Dr Töben

I received a silly piece of hate mail from a new Net user in Australia this morning (it included the heading "Juden Uber Alles" - unwitting prescience or blatant honesty there). At any rate, the good part of it was that it reminded me to write you expressing my disgust at the remarks of the government fellow you quoted , when he spoke of refusing Irving entry for having been jailed for contempt in England, calling him a criminal in the process.

As Australia's settlement and eventual nation status stemmed directly from its use as a British penal colony, which included not only real criminals but a large number of unfortunates who simply offended the wrong people and were persecuted for it (as has been the case with Irving) I find his remarks not only richly ironic, but bordering on hypocrisy. Perhaps he could ask himself if treatment similar to that meted out might not have greeted an Australian patriot travelling to England in, say 1901 or 1920, carrying the message to the people there that their venal government used Australian men and boys as cannon-fodder in ill-conceived and shoddily executed military adventures that stemmed not from necessity but economic greed.

Very truly yours,
David Thomas.

Michael Barnard - a seasoned critical commentator

On 7 November, a day before Mr Ruddock announced his decision, *Sunday Herald Sun* columnist, Michael Barnard, who can justifiably claim to have begun the current Irving debate with his 18 August 1996 column, stated to **Adelaide Institute**: *The issue of whether David Irving should be allowed to visit - or more accurately, revisit - Australia appears in danger of being swamped by mostly ill-defined allegations that he is an incorrigible rabble-rouser and a threat to civil order here. If, indeed, the British historian does represent such a menace, there is a formidable collection of Australia's best known dailies, including the national newspaper 'The Australian', that have been extraordinarily naïve. Whatever these newspapers have had to say about Mr Irving's controversial views on history (and they certainly haven't blessed him with a series of koala stamps) they have consistently supported his admission to this country.*

"Better to be Irving's host than censor", 'The Australian' editorialised as recently as 27 September, noting that "Awkwardly for those who prefer their intellectual villains to be mad or stupid as well as wrong, Mr Irving is a serious historian of the Third Reich. "Maybe these newspapers missed all the rabble-rousing. On the other hand, may be Mr Irving missed much or all of it too! Why not accede to his visa request to enter Australia, whether for private meetings or a lecture tour, and test the "criminal" issue once and for all? We could then see (a) if - and I repeat if - there was any public disturbance and violence and (b) if so, by whom it was instigated. If blame could be clearly attached to Mr Irving and his supporters (and I mean clearly, not in the manner Pauline Hanson has recently been declared guilty of almost every crime, sin and fit of indigestion in Australia) then Mr Irving could be trundled out of the country, never to return. FINIS.

Those currently out to censor him (as opposed to criticising or questioning him, as in the case of myself) would have had a magnificent victory with far-reaching negative impact on Mr Irving's status; and our intelligence agencies, if on their toes, would have been able to add considerably to their knowledge of domestic Right-wing subversives.

But is it at all likely that this is what Mr Irving intends or wants? What could be possibly gained, proving every worst allegation of his most uncompromising critics? Alternatively, of course, if it eventuated that extreme hostility were to be directed against Mr Irving and his supporters, to the point where his visit became untenable, then another valuable lesson would have been set before us. Best of all, however, is neither of the above but a

third possible and, one hopes, most likely outcome, the "anti-climax" in which Mr Irving is allowed to defend his views and face all the inevitable questioning without untoward behaviour from anyone.

Is that really too much to ask of a 'Clever Country'? Surely not.

Prime Minister's edict
These men unfit for Australia

By Matthew Denholm in Canberra [The Advertiser - Adelaide Saturday, November 9, 1996]

Controversial historian David Irving and Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams were both told yesterday they were "unfit" to visit Australia. In a surprisingly strong attack, the Prime Minister, Mr Howard, said Mr Irving was a "crackpot criminal" and Mr Adams was "a mouthpiece for terrorists."

He also dismissed claims that yesterday's decision to deny the men visas compromised his bid for a new era of free speech.

Mr Howard's comments angered sections of the Irish community, which pointed to Mr Adams's free access to the United States, and civil libertarians accused him of unwarranted censorship.

But the Jewish community expressed relief at the decision to bar Mr Irving who claims the Holocaust of World War II may be a lie. Jewish leaders said Australia's 100,000 Jews had lived in "real fear" that Mr Irving's visit would have sparked neo-Nazi attacks. And the Council of Australian Jewry told The Advertiser the historian may already be to blame for a recent increase in hate mail and verbal attacks on Jews this year.

"It is a relief for those in the community who Mr Irving had quite clearly said he wanted to hurt here in Australia - survivors of the Nazi holocaust," council spokesman Mr Jeremy Jones said. But Mr Irving said the decision was "politically correct" and claimed Australian Jews had been "trembling in their boots" at the thought of his visit.

Mr Howard said both men were denied visas because they were not of "good character". He said Mr Irving had overseas convictions for immigration breaches and that Mr Adams was part of the "mouthpiece" for the Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA. "It's got nothing to do with free speech - it's got to do with the unfitness of both of them on character grounds," he said. "David Irving's books are published in Australia and he will no doubt be on TV tonight probably bagging me. So nothing to stop his views coming out here, but every government has the right to say to somebody who has a record of criminal conviction 'you can't come here'."

Mr Howard linked the decision on Mr Adams to the collapse of the Northern Ireland peace process and the IRA's resumption of bombings.

"I would have thought that was another open and shut case and has precious little to do with free speech," he said.

But Sinn Fein's national executive member, Ms Dodie McGuinness, said Mr Adams had played a central role in the search for a peace settlement in Ireland.

"He has said many times that a democratic peace settlement is his personal and political priority," she said.

The Immigration Minister, Mr Ruddock, defended the decision, saying Mr Irving had been convicted in Germany of "defaming the memory of the dead", and imprisoned in the United Kingdom for contempt of court.

In South Australia, the SA Jewish Community Council president, Mr Norman Schueler, said it was "good to see the Australian principle of fair play being upheld".

Dr Fredrick Töben, the director of the controversial historical revisionist group, the Adelaide Institute, said he was disappointed with the ban.

"Now that Mr Irving is not coming, we must continue the great challenge to ensure we have the freedom of research to investigate the alleged gassings, which were technically impossible," he said.

The Advertiser Editorial Opinion:
Wrong and for all reasons

Are we really so immature, so vulnerable, so anxious a society? The decision by federal Immigration Minister, Mr Philip Ruddock, clearly with the full knowledge and imprimatur of the Prime Minister, Mr Howard, to refuse visas to Sinn Fein leader Mr

Gerry Adams and maverick right-wing historian Dr David Irving was wrong for all reasons.

To begin with the purely practical: anyone wanting to read and, indeed, hear their views has only to walk into a book shop, buy a newspaper or tune into the appropriate TV or radio station. Their opinions are well known. There is - and must never be - no let or hindrance on their distribution via print and electronic media in Australia. So the bans are futile. Another pragmatic objection for those who detest what these two articulate men represent is that denying them entry only serves to give them increased public attention. Witness this article and the many others with interviews which will be said and uttered this weekend.

However, this is almost sophistry compared with the real objection to the Ruddock decision. When what may now be summed up in shorthand as the Hanson debate erupted, the Prime Minister made much of his belief in free speech. It was a commendable stand, even though his Government was simultaneously intervening in the High Court to challenge the ruling on a constitutional implied right of free speech.

This decision makes a mockery of that standpoint. It is a decision against free speech. We have no brief for bombers. Whatever the IRA's case for a republican united Ireland may be, its tactics have been disgusting. We think Dr Irving's views on the Nazi holocaust are pathetic, perverse or both. We understand why they are offensive to Jewish Australians just as we understand why Australians of protestant Irish origin may hate everything that Mr Adams stands for. But to go from there to denial of entry is a symbolic capitulation, symbolic because, as we said, their views are going to be well and truly broadcast anyway. It does not take Australian governments long to acquire what has been defined as the "white car syndrome", the attitude that we know best. The people are not to be trusted, must be protected from themselves. These were foolish decisions. There should be no quarantine on ideas, however bizarre or repugnant. The strongest case can be for exclusion from Australia of people intent on fomenting violence or planning acts of terrorism. There was never the faintest suggestion of such intent here. Essentially this should have been a matter of approving two author tours and of someone in authority quietly telling the authors that their actions and utterances in Australia would be closely monitored and if - the all-important conditional - they broke the laws of Australia they would be bundled out forthwith. Instead, the Government has been silly in treating us as children.

Letter to the Editor: 11 November 1996

In regard to the Adam/Irving banning, the leader of South Australia's Jewry, Mr Norman Schueler (Schueler is German for student), said: it was "good to see the Australian principle of fair play being upheld" (9 Nov.).

This statement doesn't make sense and either *The Advertiser* made a printing error here or Mr Schueler should go back to school in order to learn what freedom of speech really means.

The two words 'fair play' should have read 'foul play' because that is exactly what the Federal Government has done by dancing to the tune of organised Jewry and treating a mature and intelligent Australian people like a bunch of idiots that cannot think for themselves. Brave new world, here we come.

Further, those who claim that David Irving's books and videos are freely available in book shops Australia-wide are either ignorant or lying. Book stores in Adelaide have told me that they do not stock David Irving's books - and they will not tell you where you can get them. They do not even tell you that Veritas, Irving's Australian publisher, is based at Cranbrook, W.A.

Not so with the Gerry Adams book which is freely available in all Adelaide book shops. So, too, are Salman Rushdie's books, and of course the pseudo-historical book *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, by German-hater, Daniel Goldhagen, is enthusiastically pushed on to the Australian book market.

One thing is clear: This Federal Government does not represent mainstream Australia anymore. The Graeme Campbell and Pauline Hanson phenomenon has shown that quite clearly. I hope that soon we shall have in the Senate an Australia First Party as is the case in New Zealand where the New Zealand First

Party holds the balance of power. This would force the established parties to put the people's interest first rather than dance to the tune of the international corporations and the Wall Street money cabal!

**David Brockschmidt,
Associate,
Adelaide Institute.**

Transcript of tail-end of an interview given by Race Discrimination Commissioner, Zita Antonios, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission to ABC Radio on 12 October 1996:

Interviewer: OK, if they don't comply, if they disagree, then it goes where? To the Federal Court?

Zita Antonios: At the moment, if the hearing commissioner finds that the respondent was unlawful, and the respondent doesn't want to comply with what the hearing commissioner said has to be done, it would now go to the Federal Court and so you have to go through a second bout of hearings in the Federal Court, OK. Under the new Amendment that we'll be getting sometime next year there will be no longer any hearing commissioners of the Commission. Once a matter can not be settled by conciliation or if it's declined, then that doesn't matter, or if there is no substance to it, any complaint that has substance that can't be conciliated will go straight to the Federal Court.

Int: OK, so that's a result of the Brandy decision?

ZA: That's right.

Int.: What do you think about that?

ZA: Look, I've got very mixed feelings about it, Ursula. I can see some real benefits in having a matter dealt with by the Federal Court in the Human Rights jurisdiction. I believe it gives it a status because the Federal Court is a national court of the country. I believe that it will save those complaints that we know are in the very big arena and raise very complex and very important issues. The double whammy of having to go through a hearing by the Commission and then on to the Federal Court because they're inevitably appealed, and I think, all of those things are very positive. The down side though, I think, especially in the race area, is that many Aboriginal complaints and others in the race area are going to find the costs involved in going to the Federal Court quite prohibitive. There are no costs currently in having your case heard by a hearing commissioner at the Commission and that we will have to monitor. I also think it's going to be crucial for the Federal Court to ensure that access and equity are paramount in the way the proceedings are run in the Federal Court and that they will not and should not be formal and inaccessible for the clients who would generally be making complaints in this jurisdiction.

Int: Just finally, Zita. How would you define the difference between freedom of speech and racial discrimination in relation to the current debate sparked by Pauline Hanson.

ZA: Freedom of speech is very, very important, and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission is a strong proponent of freedom of speech. It's a very important human right that we all have, but freedom of speech is not absolute. It never has been and it certainly is not absolute in this country. We have all sorts of checks on freedom of speech because we have to recognise that along with freedom of speech comes the responsibility and recognition that public speech can cause real harm, if it's not dealt with responsibly. They're my views... think the new Racial Hatred legislation was being debated that once the laws came in, we would lose freedom of speech, but that is simply not the case. There are exemptions under the new legislation which protect freedom of speech very well and I can say quite safely after twelve months of the new Racial Hatred Act, and I think events of the last few months, have proved me right here that freedom of speech is alive and very well in this country in 1996.

Int: Zita Antonios, Race Discrimination Commissioner at the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Hanson: Give her enough rope....

**From Wellington Lee, president, Australian Chinese
Association, The Age 3 November 1996**

While both major political parties seemed a little slow to repudiate Pauline Hanson's ill-informed, unintelligent, careless and ridiculous remarks, Prime Minister John Howard's stance, in retrospect, was correct and understandable. Ms Hanson is not so much red-blooded as redneck; and if given enough rope will eventually hang herself. Like all racists, she arrogantly creates an atmosphere of hate and then complains about death threats. Ms Hanson's comments demonstrate an appalling ignorance and obvious lack of understanding. She would hardly contribute to any good debate, let alone a debate on immigration. There should always be free, open and balanced debate on immigration. Some Australians are rightly concerned about certain negative aspects of immigration. However, Australia is a migrant nation, and according to the Immigration Department's figures, approximately 40 per cent of all Australians are born overseas or have parents who were born overseas; hence Ms Hanson cannot really claim that her remarks are supported by 90 per cent of the population. We are not a perfect society - but that cannot be blamed on immigration. Immigration and multiculturalism have enhanced and enriched our way of life and brought many benefits.

Holocaust denial letter

By Bernard Friedman, Australian Jewish News, 19 July 1996

Holocaust denial is not new, but a new, crude Australian-made attempt to cast doubts on the Nazi gas chambers and the deliberate killing of Jews during World War II is now in circulation.

It takes the form of an open letter to Prime Minister John Howard by someone calling himself Alexander C McLelland and claiming to be the secretary of "The Small Fortress Association - Ex-POWs of Terezin Concentration Camp".

McLelland bases his argument mainly what he says is a "blatantly untrue" account by Australian ex-serviceman Donald Watt of his experiences in Auschwitz, where he was forced to stoke fires to burn the bodies of victims of the gas chambers.

Donald Watt ended up at Auschwitz after being taken prisoner-of-war in Crete in 1941. His story was published last year under the title *Stoker*.

McLelland also claims to have been captured in Crete and to have been incarcerated in the Theresienstadt concentration camp, for which he received Australian government compensation eight years ago.

In his open letter to Mr Howard, he admits "it is undeniable that tens of thousands of Jews died at Terezin and equal or greater numbers at other concentration camps", but blames the death toll on typhus.

He calls for an enquiry into the facts of the Holocaust and "whether they have been perverted", declaring: "The future of the youth of Australia and the world depends on the truth which sets us free from lies of the past, in particular World War II propaganda. These lies are still promoted by Zionists and their fellow-travellers to promote their own interests".

He says he must expose those promoting race hatred against the Germans or "be a traitor to my country and every man, woman and child in it, in particular those who died fighting Nazism".

McLelland made a point of sending copies of his letter to Attorney-General Daryl Williams, Returned Services League national president Major-General Digger James, the AJN "and other interested parties".

Major-General James has heard neither of the organisation nor of Mr McLelland. "I get crank letters all the time," he commented.

The Prime Minister's Office was still searching for the letter at the time of writing.

A LETTER OF COMPLAINT

16 October 1996

Dear Sirs

Some unsolicited 'www' material from your Institute was sent to my private address recently, in an envelope postmarked in Queensland. Please remove me from your mailing list if I have been placed on it.

The material reprints my letter to the editor of *The Australian* newspaper ('Open Season on Germans') with the comment that suggests that my letter could be a 'mission statement' for your Institute.

I request that you issue a statement in your next mailout that distances my letter and my views from any mission statement you wish to have, and clearly indicates that I have nothing to do with your institute or its beliefs. These are held in abhorrence by most members of mainstream society.

I hope that you will appreciate that I am unable to promote your cause, as it relates to historical and ideological matters, even though freedom of speech and opinion is a value I support.

Sincerely JLFBuchner, Campbelltown, NSW.

Our Reply

18 October 1996

Dear Dr Buchner

I am in receipt of your letter dated 16 October wherein you inform me of having received some unsolicited material from Adelaide Institute.

We have a number of individuals who are distributing our material without our knowledge - even going so far as to make out an order list for material we hold in stock. Some have found it rather offensive to be sent this material - for which we unreservedly apologise.

Your case, however, is slightly different in that we have used on our Internet site a letter of yours published in *The Australian*. I recall briefly talking to you about it and I do not remember whether I asked for permission to reproduce it. In any case it is in the public domain and its exposure world-wide cannot damage you.

However, as we have used it on our controversial site, I shall publish your 16 October 1996 letter so that you are thereby dissociated from the use to which we have put it.

I personally was at your stage in 1984 and then, after losing the family and my professional livelihood, I have come out, so to speak, in support of ripping wide open this constant German bashing. It is always the same story when it comes to power battles with Australians who have a German background. The homicidal gas chambers lurk as a card that is whipped out by those who wish to silence their otherwise sensible opponents, I, personally, have had enough of this kind of nonsense and so I am doing some groundwork which leads me to the questioning of the existence of homicidal gas chambers - the alleged murder weapon used by the Nazis (synonym for Germans) to allegedly exterminate European Jewry. To date I have not been convinced that these gas chambers existed. Technically it is not possible to gas millions in chambers that had wooden doors!

Enough of this Dr Buchner. Please accept my apologies for having caused you some grief, and believe me, I know what you are feeling. Unfortunately this matter that I am involved in requires us to move beyond the merely feeling fear or other such negative reactions. Mainstream society has always limped behind the truth.

It was Arthur Schopenhauer who said: **All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as self-evident.**

In this sense, thank you for your communication and I shall soon have your letter in print.

Sincerely,

Fredrick Töben.

Our Comment: We did not ask Dr Buchner why our beliefs are "held in

abhorrence by most members of mainstream society". Should our society not break out of the terrible belief system which claims that the Germans exterminated European Jewry in homicidal gas chambers? Surely, our news is that it was not possible. Then why is it that people shout us down with - it did happen! It seems to us that some very sick minds are here at work which delight in reflecting on sickening allegations of mass gassings. Why is our society forced to believe the story? The David Irving affair again clearly highlighted how obsessed our leaders are in retaining the story's standing. Legal means are used to uphold a story that forensic evidence does not support. Why are we forced to believe in false suffering and pain? We ask - whose gain?

Ex-PM Hawke goes for gold

By Barry FitzGerald, The Age 9 November 1996

The former Labor Prime Minister Mr Bob Hawke has joined the gold juggernaut of the mining magnate and Melbourne football club president, Mr Joseph Gutnick.

Mr Hawke has been appointed a non-executive director of Quantum Resources, one of Mr Gutnick's stable of companies that has set its sights on breaking into the Chinese mining industry.

Mr Gutnick said Mr Hawke's specific role was to assist in the company's quest to gain a presence in China, as well as the broader South-East Asian region. Unlike other companies in the Gutnick stable, Quantum lacks a project or potential project on which to concentrate.

Its main interests are a 40 per cent share in Johnson's Well and 5 per cent of Mount Kersey Mining.

Mr Gutnick said he knew Mr Hawke when he was Prime Minister, meeting him a few times in Canberra. "But I have only got to know him well in the last couple of months," he said.

Mr Gutnick, a friend of Israel's Prime Minister, Mr Benjamin Netanyahu, said Mr Hawke had been a close friend of the Jewish community and Israel. "We have had many discussions about Israel and many associations with the (Israeli) Prime Minister," he said.

Asked where Mr Hawke fell within Israel's political spectrum, Mr Gutnick said Mr Hawke had strong views about the rights of the Palestinians.

"I might not necessarily agree with him on some issues but we have agreed to disagree," he said.

Mr Gutnick is carrying on the role of special emissary of New York's late Lubavitcher Rebbe, Menachem Mendel Schneerson, to Israel, and he figured prominently in Mr Netanyahu's recent election victory. Mr Gutnick said he and Mr Hawke would travel to China in a fortnight, with Mr Hawke helping the company to open doors. Quantum shares rose 29 cents or 10 per cent yesterday to close at \$3.19.

Kremlin faces dilemma over nationality of Yeltsin-backed security official

By Richard Beeston in Moscow and Christopher Walker in Jerusalem, The Australian, 8 November 1996

The Kremlin was yesterday facing its first serious crisis since President Yeltsin's heart operation as public pressure mounted for the dismissal of a senior security official who reportedly holds dual Israeli and Russian citizenship.

As Mr Yeltsin began his recuperation, it became clear that one of the most pressing issues on his return to work will be the fate of Mr Boris Berezovsky, a business tycoon who was appointed deputy head of the presidential security council last week and who is backed by Mr Yeltsin's increasingly powerful chief of staff, Mr Anatoly Chubais. His selection for the sensitive job triggered an angry response from politicians, who alleged that Mr Berezovsky, who heads the country's main car manufacturer and controls the largest television network, was unsuitable. He has been the target of several assassination attempts. According to one former associate he once ordered the murder of a rival media boss. What has upset liberal, communist and nationalist politicians is that Mr Berezovsky is part of a dangerous new oligarchy. "Our new regime is reproducing the characteristics of the old system," said Mr Grigori Yavlinski, leader of the liberal Yabloko party. "The name is not just banks and television: it is oligarchy and mafia."

Mr Berezovsky, 50, did nothing to dispel the accusations when he boasted that seven media tycoons and bankers, who together control half of Russia's economy, had thrown their weight behind Mr Yeltsin's re-election campaign.

Mr Berezovsky's service in the Kremlin may be curtailed after Izvestia, the Moscow newspaper, revealed that the tycoon also holds Israeli nationality. Reports in Israel confirmed that the Berezovsky family had emigrated to the Jewish State in November 1993 and received citizenship before returning to live in Russia.

"The matter is not Berezovsky's ethnicity nor which country gave Berezovsky his passport," said Izvestia. "It is simply this: nowhere in the world would a country name a person with foreign citizenship to a high government security post."

Many Israelis hold dual citizenship and use their non-Israeli passport when travelling to areas hostile to the Jewish State, which diplomats said was why the appointment of Mr Berezovsky raised few eyebrows in Israel. An Israeli official said successive Israeli governments had raised no objections to the holding of dual nationality.

But the attitude of foreign governments to the practice varied, with not every country sanctioning Jews who had emigrated to Israel retaining the nationality of their country of origin. Mr Berezovsky, who spends much of his time at his lavish apartment in London, responded that the allegations were inspired by anti-Semitism and threatened to take Izvestia to court. "I am a citizen of Russia and whatever I have done in my life had to do with Russia alone," he said

Priebke, Togliatti and the Falsifiers of History –The Western Media!

By David Brockschmidt

You have seen and heard it all in the mass media - "War criminal" SS Hauptmann Erich Priebke standing trial before an Italian military court for killing of 335 innocent civilians. The disinformation section of the western media and the Ministries of Truth of the various governments of the western world cry for Priebke's blood - they want his head.

Then the unbelievable happens: Priebke is not sentenced to life imprisonment as expected because the judges dismiss the case. The reason given is that the shooting of the 335 innocent hostages was legitimate and covered by the Geneva and The Hague Conventions of War.

Now the Ministries of Truth and the disinformation sections of the media run amok, organising street demonstrations and hate campaigns, and accusing the military judges of being fascist sympathisers.

The leading Judge, Agostino Quistelli, states quite clearly: "Go and get him. But if we let the street mob rule, this will be the end of our legal system."

The pain and anger the relatives of those executed feel is understandable. But the anger should not be directed against Priebke because he merely followed the direct orders from Berlin. It should be directed towards the cowards, the killers of the partisan commando Togliatti. These Italian Communist partisans are the true war criminals in this case. There were no freedom fighters against the German occupying force, Italy was an ally of Germany - let us not forget this fact.

The history of Communist partisans in World War II in Italy, Greece and Yugoslavia, for example, reveals a trail of blood which caused the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent lives on all fronts, and it did not effect the fighting power of the Axis power at all.

These people did not fight for the freedom of their country but in the first instance for a political ideology - communism. Alone 140 million people died when this ideology was established in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Now, let's have a look at what really happened on 23/24 March 1944 in Rome. On 23 March 1944 the Communist partisan commando, Togliatti, cowardly killed 23 policemen from South Tyrol and 10 Italian children, in the hope of thereby turning the Italian public against Italy's ally, Germany. This barbarous act of killing men who were retreating and not fighting anybody was surpassed by killing the ten Italian children.

The partisans knew, of course, that if they killed anyone from the German armed forces or anyone from the Italian regular army, the reprisal would be hostage shooting in a ratio of 1:10.

Let us have a look what the ratio of soldier/hostage shooting was in other armed forces during World War II: France 25:1; Soviet Union 50:1; USA 200:1; Germany 10:1.

It is the tragedy of war that innocent civilians are killed on all sides. As Professor Robert Faurisson pointed out, war is a crime in itself!

Now, what is the definition of a war crime? I say that the killing of 23 policemen retreating from Allied forces not fighting anybody, and the killing of ten Italian children, is a war crime. It was this killing which provoked the shooting of 335 innocent hostages because the German and Italian forces could not get hold of these cowardly partisan killers - who hoped to enter the history books of World War II as heroes and freedom fighters.

What the Togliatti Commandoes will now be remembered for is that they killed 23 innocent policemen and ten innocent Italian children.

Not Priebke should stand trial here but the Communist killers of the Palmere Togliatti Commandoes!

THE IRVING INTERLUDE

On Sunday, 22 September 1996, the Australian Prime Minister, Mr John Howard, addressed the Queensland Liberal Party. What Mr Howard said was music to the ears of those who truly believe in freedom of speech. Although Howard dissociates his government from the previous Labor government's ideological straight-jacket, his banning on 8 November of British historian, David Irving and Irish Sinn Fein leader, Gerry Adams, rebuilds the old conceptual prison of **political correctness** which he so effectively demolished on that fateful Sunday in Queensland. Mr Howard may well thank a woman for having exposed his moral and intellectual bankruptcy. After all, it is Mrs Pauline Hanson, Independent Member for Oxley who - following on from Independent Member for Kalgoorlie, Mr Graeme Campbell - opened up the taboo topics of race and immigration. What follows below is an extract from Mr Howard's speech, together with statements by Mr Philip Ruddock and Mr Thomas Keneally, with radio transcripts of interviews that highlight how David Irving's banning from Australia directly challenges John Howard's free speech policy.

***Mr Howard:** *Our opponents, more than any group of people I've seen in the years that I've been in politics, had not only lost touch with the mainstream of the Australian community, they had quite literally stopped listening to the mainstream of the Australian community.*

The only people they listened to were the flatterers and the fawners among those in the national press gallery who themselves had become a self-deluded, political elite, no longer understanding what people out there were thinking. And the leaders of noisy minority groups. Because the vote on March 2 was a vote against government in submission to noise of minority groups as much as it was a vote against anything. Political leadership is very important. Let me tell you what political leadership doesn't consist of. It doesn't consist of believing that you are prime minister of Australia because of some kind of process of divine selection. You are prime minister of Australia through the gift of the Australian people and never forget it.....But, above all, good political leadership represents never forgetting that you are there not to tell people what they should think, or what they should believe, but you are there to give expression to their hopes and to their aspirations, to respond to their concerns and their fears but always to listen to what they have to say to you.....One of the great changes that has come over Australia in the past six months is that people do feel able to speak a little more freely and a little more openly about what they feel. In a sense the pall of censorship on certain issues has been lifted.

I think we were facing the possibility of becoming a more narrow and restrictive society and that free speech could not be taken so easily for granted as we might in our calmer moments have assumed. I think there has been that change and I think that's a very good thing. I hope it continues, but like everything a right such as free speech carries with it responsibilities and I welcome the fact that people can now talk about certain things without living in fear of being branded as a bigot or as a racist or any of the other....expressions that have been too carelessly flung around in this country whenever somebody has disagreed with what somebody has said.....The election of the new Government has done something to make that kind of neo-McCarthyist zealous prejudice reaction against something that you don't agree with, made a little less acceptable and I think that is a great thing for healthy democracy in Australia.

There is an important caveat to that. While we must always welcome removal of restrictions on freedom of speech and we must always treasure the right to free speech as being a cardinal principle, a given of our free and open society, we must always remember that rights always carry with them the responsibilities as well.

And that freedom of speech carries with it a responsibility on all of those who exercise that freedom to do so in a tolerant and moderate fashion and to not convert the new-found freedom, if I

may put it that way, into a vehicle for using needlessly insensitive and intolerant language....I promise you that in what I hope will be many years of federal government, I will continue to lead a Government that listens to what the Australian people have got to say.....I make you that promise and I want you to make a promise in return, and that is that when we stop doing that, you tell us and you tell us before we lose the election, not afterwards, because when we stop listening, we will lose just as surely as Paul Keating and his colleagues lost when they stopped listening.

***Mr Ruddock:** *First, in May 1992, Mr Irving was convicted in Germany under German law of defaming the memory of the dead. In November 1992, Mr Irving was found to have lied, on oath, before a Canadian Immigration adjudicator and Mr Irving was detained and deported from Canada. In November 1993, Mr Irving was expelled from Germany. In February 1994, Mr Irving was found to be in contempt of the United Kingdom High Court for failing to comply with an Order served on him. He was committed to prison for a period of three months. In seeking to purge that contempt, the judge rejected Mr Irving's sworn evidence. Taken together, they reveal a consistent pattern of behaviour that led me to conclude that Mr Irving is not a person of good character.*

***Mr Thomas Keneally,** author of *Schindler's Ark*: *It's very sad that Gerry Adam's name's been mixed up with that of David Irving. Irving is a person of ill-repute who pretends that an historical event didn't occur. I think it's too late to let Irving in. I think he should have been let in in the first place, and as you know I believe the Holocaust occurred, but I think he would have been lost in the crowd if let in in the first place. By now he's become too hot to let in because the very fact that he hasn't been permitted in the past has given him a repute which would create a media scrum and allow too much room for the zany proposition that the Holocaust never happened.*

ABC Radio 5AN:

**Keith Conlon talks with Mr Michael Kapel, editor of Australia/Israel Review
4 November 1996**

Keith Conlon: We've heard from Kerry-Anne Walsh just a few minutes ago Cabinet

will be deciding today on the entry visas on two controversial figures and one of them is the British historian David Irving. Now, in the most recent edition of the Australia/Israel Review, the editor, Michael Kapel, has written a very, very strong piece saying Cabinet should not let him in. So, today, unashamedly from his point-of-view, the case against David Irving coming in. Michael Kapel in Melbourne, good morning, Michael.

Michael Kapel: Good morning, Keith.

KC: First of all, you speak from first hand experience of seeing David Irving in Germany. What did you see?

MK: Oh, that was that incident in Halle several years ago now. That was in Germany in 1991 when Irving was addressing a rally of neo-Nazi skinheads in that town and he alighted onto the back of a truck and several hundred neo-Nazi skinheads descended on what was a quiet sleepy town in Halle and they held a demonstration and goose-stepped in the streets and terrified most of the town and Irving got to the back of the truck and called for the re-unification of a greater Germany and talked about Rudolf Hess, the former vice-Fhrer, Hitler's deputy - how he was a great martyr for Germany, and the crowd went wild and the Nazis started chanting 'Sieg Heil' and later in that afternoon I remember riots erupted and demonstrations in the streets and by that evening there was some violence in the streets.

KC: Now, you also talked about one other person who'd come to that rally and at least some of your case is made out against David Irving on the grounds of the people, of the company he keeps. Who was the person you were concerned about in 1991?

MK: Oh, in 1991, I think there was Gottfried Kessel who was widely referred to as Austria's Führer at the time. He has since gone to jail for weapons possession and involvement in neo-Nazi organisations, but in 1991 Gottfried Kussell was one of the leaders of the neo-Nazi revival in Europe and he was certainly attending David Irving's or his rally which David Irving was speaking at in Halle. But that's indicative of the kind of company he does keep.

KC: What sort of network are you talking about? You mention people in Canada, organisations in the U.K., in the United States. Perhaps you might give us an example or two of what this means about David Irving?

MK: The thing about David Irving is that it is not so much that he is a historian per se. You know, if, the issue I think for a lot of people is less that he is an historian and more that he is actually involved in a whole network of associations and organisations which are part of an internationalist extremist network and neo-Nazi network which exists particularly in Europe but also in America and elsewhere. I mean London, for example, he's quite frequently involved with members of the Clarendon Club which is a far-right extremist group which holds a lot of his lectures, and the British National Party, I don't know you've heard of the B.N.P., which is part of the National Front, and they're also involved in organising a lot of his lectures and addresses and some of those in actual fact become quite violent too, and there is this history whenever he does attend various neo-Nazi rallies and organisations in Europe and England, of violence; it does tend to assume after his attendance and after his speeches..

KC: Yeah, because as I was discussing with Kerry-Anne a few minutes ago, the Cabinet will have to address the freedom of speech issue, just to have an organisation called a neo-Nazi group is presumably not sufficient enough to argue against their existence. What are the things that concern you about these neo-Nazi groups, whether it's the British National Party or the Canadian or United States groups with whom he is associated?

MK: Well, I mean the overall agenda of these groups is to resurrect the values of national socialism and to a large extent that's Irving's agenda too. Now, obviously we're living in a free and democratic society and he's entitled to spout forth his views however offensive they may well be. But when you're no longer just presenting views and when you're actually part of an international campaign and you're a political activist, well, that puts you into another category altogether and that's the argument that's always ensued in this country about David Irving. It's not so much a question of free speech, but when you have somebody who, like Irving, is part of a network of political activists, who are interested in re-resurrecting national socialism and various views of other neo-Nazi movement which obviously includes violence - associated political activity, then you fall in a different category.

KC: Are you saying that because he associates with neo-Nazi groups and they advocate violence that that is the way we should view him?

MK: That's exactly right. I mean, his association with that advocacy of violence, his association with incidents where there has been significant violence, and that's the grounds on which he's been excluded from in many other countries as well.

KC: What's the record on his entry requests, Michael?

MK: Well, in Germany he's certainly banned, and even though he's banned from Germany, he repeatedly flouts that ban and secretly enters that country at night over the border. The German security police have a constant cat and mouse game where they try to arrest him and catch him. But he does frequently circumvent that ban and he has been fined on a couple of occasions in Germany, I think up to \$30,000 for defaming the memory of the dead.

In Austria he was detained and expelled by the Austrian interior ministry and they then issued a warrant for his arrest in a criminal court in Vienna.

In Canada he was arrested in 1992. He was declared persona non grata, he was thrown into jail and then he was deported from the country. In South Africa, there restrictions were placed on his entrance into that country. In New Zealand there've been restrictions placed on his entrance to that country as well.

In Italy he was prevented from entering as well.

I mean, Australia isn't on its own here. There's quite a history of countries around the world who've placed bans on Irving entering.

Well, I mean his different view of history is very offensive to a lot of the country and it's also quite inciteful. I mean he talks about, for example, his comments on women are pretty amazing. He says that women never produce anything useful, that women are mental chewing gum. He suggests that, a couple of years ago he was on British television, he said that "the fight is hotting up. I think, though, the next two years are going to be the last two years for what I can see as final victory. I think the next two years will be very dramatic indeed, with a lot of violence", and that was in reference to his general campaign which was then gathering significant momentum in Europe of neo-Nazi revival, far-right revival. Certainly his views on the gas chambers and on the Holocaust and all of that are particularly offensive to members of the Jewish community.

KC: Are you, perhaps, I think you would have been following the case of whether the visa gets announced?. Do you think Cabinet will look at it today?

MC: Well, yeah, I mean my understanding is that they are likely to look at it today. I mean, there's only three basic criteria which they have to look at, that is under the Migration Act: if someone's been deported from another country or if someone's been excluded from another country, or if someone's been involved in activity that indicate some sort of contempt for the law or disregard to human rights, then Cabinet and the Minister in this case it would be Philip Ruddock, the Immigration Minister, have a legitimate basis on which to preclude him entry, and that was the basis on which the previous government precluded him entry.

KC: Michael Kapel, we've got to leave it there. Thanks very much. The editor of Australia/Israel Review on David Irving, the decision expected today.

*

ABC Radio 5AN:

Keith Conlon talks with Dr Fredrick Töben, director of Adelaide Institute

5 November 1996 Melbourne Cup Day

Keith Conlon: Seven to ten now as we return to a subject that started yesterday at this time on the program - the question of whether David Irving, the British historian, should be allowed into Australia. There was some talk that perhaps a decision would be taken by Cabinet yesterday and we talked on that occasion to Michael Kapel who is editor of the *Australia/Israel Review*. He's written quite a damning piece about what he calls "the historian of hate, David Irving".

Fredrick Töben is director of the **Adelaide Institute** which is an organisation supporting the application of David Irving to come to Australia.

Fredrick Töben, good morning.

Fredrick Töben: Good morning, Keith.

KC: Fredrick, first of all what news do you have of where the application lies in Canberra?

FT: My information is that it should be handed down within the next week or so but nothing is definite.

KC: Now, you took exception to some of the things said yesterday by Michael Kapel. What in particular worried you?

FT: Michael Kapel simply told a lot of lies, outright lies - accusing David Irving of all sorts of things. For example he said he met with Gottfried Kessel, that he associates with far right extremist groups, that he advocates violence, and he just goes on and on.

KC: Well, let's try to have a look at some of the things that he did print in the *Australia/Israel Review*. He doesn't actually say in the *Review* that he met the German leader Kussell. He says he was at the same rally in 1991, that one that went badly wrong at Halle. Do you accept that maybe the two were involved in the same area at the same time?

FT: I personally don't know the issue. All I have in front of me is the fax that you also have from David Irving refuting these -

KC: And he denies that he met him. OK. He also says, for instance, in the fax from David Irving that he's accused of being a member of the British National Party, described by Kapel as Britain's largest and most dangerous fascist group. What he

actually says in his article is David Irving has a long working association with that group.

FT: You see, but that is what Kapel does. What he basically does, he uses words that are very powerful, for example to be called a racist, or to be called an antisemite, and that neutralises and polarises people - and do you remember Terry Lane when he wrote that letter in 1992 to the Australian Jewish News? Let me just quote this. Terry Lane said:

I have said publicly that I will never write or speak on the subject of Israel or Palestine ever again. Here is why. The Zionist lobby in this country is malicious, implacable, mendacious and dangerous. They have caused me a great deal of lost sleep - and in the end my insomnia has not contributed anything to the resolution of the conflict over Palestine. I might as well keep my mouth shut and get some sleep.

KC: But he's damning the other side.

FT: Just hang on, let me just finish this.

What's more, once the expression antisemite hits the air, or heaven forbid, the sacred formula of six million is uttered, then I know from bitter experience that there is not one manager or editor in the country who will defend an underling. We are thrown to the jackals.

In the end the truly tolerant have no defence against intolerance. I surrender. To the Zionists I say: You win. To the Palestinians: Forgive my cowardice.

And Kapel is following this line. He pretends to be very tolerant when in fact he is the dictatorial voice that wants to stop us from questioning legitimate historical matters, and that's why it is, Keith, this is why the whole matter of David Irving coming into the country is a matter of free speech. Now we -

KC: OK, I mean, that's your point of view, but, I mean, let's clear up some other issues. In some of the material that we've gained from your Adelaide Institute site on the Internet, Christopher Hitchens is a British author and journalist, he quotes David Irving as saying he believes the Jews of the world should all be sent to Madagascar. That's in your own news -

FT: Well, this is Hitchens. The transcript we put on there so that we can discuss these things. I haven't asked David Irving personally whether he, you know, what he thinks of this, but if we are discussing something, let's throw it out into the open.

This is why the Pauline Hanson issue, or the whole phenomenon is so important because we have been suppressed, and you know what happened in China, or even in communist Russia, people, they did not dare speak openly. Everything was secretive - the society was paralysed and that's why we've got this present upsurge in people talking about all sorts of things. But it is only talk. We've got our legal system to protect society when things go wrong or too far.

KC: Let's talk about the **Adelaide Institute** and again I'm gaining this from your own papers:

We are not Holocaust deniers. We proudly proclaim there is no evidence that millions of people were killed in homicidal gas chambers.

FT: Indeed, Keith, indeed. This is the good news because there are about five reports, forensic reports, that the general population of Australia doesn't even know exist, where scientists have actually looked at the murder weapon, the alleged murder weapon, and it appears that the gassings were impossible, technically impossible. But we're not even allowed to talk about this because immediately we are branded as haters, as deniers, as racists, as antisemites.

KC: As you also say in your own material, you've been declared a hate-site on the Internet.

FT: Yes, but that is from the Harvard University Law Library, and this is the interesting point, the word *hate* immediately makes people shudder. Instead of opening yourself to new impulses what people immediately feel is, oh, I'm not allowed to think these things.

KC: Just a minute to the news, Fredrick, the Adelaide Institute, we've confirmed, is under investigation by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. What's their concern?

FT: Oh, it came from Rabbi Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre. He complained., or he wanted to have us looked at and this was then picked up by the Australian - Executive Council of

Australian Jewry. They believe that what we're doing is not legitimate.

KC: OK, well, there are going to be more discussions and I know that

you're listening and we still hope to talk to David Irving, so thanks very much for your time today.

FT: Thank you.

KC: Fredrick Töben of the Adelaide Institute which supports the application of David Irving to come into Australia to talk about his views of German and British history and so on.

Keith Conlon with you tomorrow from 8.30 through till the news at ten.

ABC Radio The Sound of Australia - AM:

Ellen Fanning Radio National - AM: Peter Thompson

On 8 November 1996 both programs featured the same Julie Posetti interview with David Irving . However, in each of the interviews the ending differs.

This is AM. I'm Ellen Fanning. This morning the deputy Prime Minister, Tim Fischer, joins us as he begins to defend his leadership of the National Party - that's ahead, but we begin with the historian who could fan the race debate in Australia, the British historian, David Irving. He's testing John Howard's declaration that he's restored free speech in Australia by again applying to enter the country. The Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock, will today announce whether he'll be allowed to. Mr Irving argues there were no Nazi gas chambers and he's a strident apologist for Adolf Hitler. Those views have seen him banned from Canada and from Austria. Mr Irving was also banned from entering Australia back in 1993 when ahead of the planned visit synagogues were attacked and fire bombed and Nazi stickers and literature were circulated.

Julie Posetti asked him what he thought his chances were of getting official approval for another visit to Australia.

*

David Irving: I'm 50/50 about that. My own belief is that it's not unlikely that the Australian government would find that for reasons of political correctness it would have to allow IRA terrorist, Gerry Adams, to come to Australia, but at the same time, for political correctness, it would have to deny the British historian, David Irving, his permission to enter - which would be the proof that the bomb is more powerful than the pen.

Julie Posetti: If your application is successful, though, how would you interpret its approval?

DI: Well, I will rejoice for Australia, for the Australian people, that freedom of speech has been restored with all the benefits and the blessings and all the downside that that brings.

JP: What action will you take, though, if the application is refused?

DI: Well, if it's refused, then there's an immediate line of action that we can take and that is on the basis of natural justice and we shall certainly immediately take that path and it'll be round the mulberry bush in the law courts in Australia again, I'm afraid.

JP: You've been banned from Canada as you mentioned earlier and I think in fact in 1992 the Canadian Secretary of State described your views as abhorrent and an incitement to racism and you were later declared persona non grata there, but you did chose to enter Canada illegally and were arrested while giving a speech to neo-Nazis apparently at a Chinese restaurant. You've also ignored bans imposed on you by some countries in Europe. If Australia does refuse you entry, would you choose to come here by stealth, anyway?

DI: Oh, no. Good Lord, no. I'm a great believer in abiding by the law. I don't give speeches to neo-Nazis. The audience who come to attend my talks in restaurants or private halls or wherever, they're usually middle age, respectable gentlemen and their wives, wearing collars and ties and eating with knives and forks. No jackboots on site, no skinheads or Nazi flags. This is just a picture that is concocted by my enemies to try and make me unappetising.

JP: Well, in fact, the accounts that I've read of some of your addresses, including one in Germany, there were neo-Nazis chanting slogans; you spoke from the back of a truck; Nazi salutes were being given and you were being guarded by white supremacists; neo-Nazi thugs were present. None of that's true?

DI: Repeatedly in Australian television they show the scene of me speaking from the back of a truck in Halle and skin heads in the front of the audience giving the Hitler salute and shouting "Sieg Heil" - and what I say is, show the whole film, please, because then you will see me saying to these idiots in the front row who've been hired by the local television cameraman to do precisely that, me shouting through the microphone, "Why are you giving these outdated and discredited salutes and slogans of the past when I've just said to you you're Germany's future and the eyes of the world are on you".

JP: There's another account - in March 1991 - where you address a rally of around eight thousand people in Passau. Apparently rioting followed that as well and you were reported in The Independent newspaper afterwards as saying, "I am a mob orator". What did you mean by that? Were you hoping to incite the masses?

DI: Oh, good Lord, no.

JP: But in the historical context, a mob is usually used to describe the masses of people who rise up and revolt.

DI: I take your word for it, yea.

JP: Have you heard of Pauline Hanson and talk of the outbreak of racial hatred in Australia which has been linked to the attacks on Aborigines and Asians here?

DI: I read her parliamentary maiden speech with great interest and I understand that is what triggered this whole recent avalanche, and it's a very interesting phenomenon. I think it's symptomatic of governments that get out of contact with public feeling.

JP: What did you think of her speech?

DI: I thought it was a very fair attempt.

JP: Although you were here eight years ago, you did attempt to come here to Australia in 1993 but you were banned, and while your trip was being planned, there actually was an outbreak of violence in Australia and a lot of threats against Jewish people - synagogues were vandalised. One was actually daubed with the words, 'Irving was here. Six million lies and white power'.

DI: I like the way you use the passive voice. I always call it the cowardly passive voice. Synagogues were vandalised - whom by? We don't know who did that.

JP: But you were banned as one of the catalyst for that unrest.

DI: Well, may be, can I be extreme enough and suggest that there were certain people who had an interest in daubing synagogues with my name in order to ensure that I'm kept out.

[At this point Peter Thompson's AM program differs - see below]

JP: Such as Jews?

DI: I didn't say that, I didn't say that. I'm not saying they're the only people organising the campaign to keep me out.

JP: At the same time in 1993 you were reported as saying on radio in Melbourne, with reference to the Holocaust survivors in Australia, "Now, I'm coming to hit back. I'm coming back and they're going to hurt". Did you say that?

DI: That's right.

JP: What did you mean?

DI: What I mean by that is these people at a range of 12 thousand miles, they can smear me as they like. I think that if they hear tomorrow, or Friday at one o'clock, that I'm going to be allowed into Australia, these people will tremble in their boots because they know I'll be within striking range of them. I can go and see the law courts. I can go and see my lawyers and say let's fill out the necessary actions against these people within the law to call them to order.

JP: Does it concern you, though, that wherever you seem to go, there does seem to be the outbreaks of violence and that you are connected with that violence.

DI: Well, I understand that Jewish and Zionist organisations in Australia have made it known that if they find out where I'm going to be lecturing, then there will be violence organised by them - but in this case they are the criminals and they're the ones who should be deported, not me. I shall be remaining strictly within the law but we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

Ellen Fanning: The British historian, David Irving and he was speaking there to Julie Posetti.

[Continuation of interview on Peter Thompson's AM program]

JP: In recent months survivors of the Holocaust have endured the trauma of recounting their experiences in Nazi death camps. They've been detailing their first-hand knowledge of the existence of gas chambers and mass graves and they lived through it and what you say is a lie. How could you possibly expect them to accept the arguments you're putting?

DI: This is the question historians have to face. They're going to have to explain how it is there are so many eye witnesses and how it is there are no documents. You see, history is very one way - it's written by the victors. It's politically correct history. I don't go for that kind of history. I write for history that I find in the archives.

JP: The Jews were the victors in World War II, were they?

DI: The Jews were victors of World War II? Gosh your questions are loaded. I don't think I want to answer that question. Am I permitted to plead the 5th Amendment on certain questions?

I think so. For the last five years they have made my life, and the life of my family a misery. They have been trying to destroy me and my family world-wide and I would have to put a lot of distance between myself and them before I can speak objectively about them, and I think, in all fairness to them, it would be proper if I didn't try to.

JP: Do you believe the Holocaust didn't actually happen?

DI: Well, there is the word Holocaust. This strange word that's been invented by the marketing people of the 1970s and we don't really know what they mean by it. It means what they want it to mean at any given time. But if you say the word Holocaust means only extermination camps and factories of death and gas chambers, then I have to say, sorry, I've seen no evidence and I've worked in all the archives, believe me. Isn't it an interesting debate that you and I are having and why shouldn't I be allowed to have it in person in public in Australia. What are people frightened of? Why are they frightened of me saying these things to the Australian people when I can talk to you over the telephone from London and say precisely the same things?

JP: Perhaps they're frightened of another Holocaust or the revival of National Socialism?

DI: Well, I think although that's rather a flip remark you made, I think possibly that there is an essence of truth there.

JP: Some people suggest that your ultimate goal is to actually revive National Socialism. Is that true or not?

DI: Well, it's not true - not to my knowledge. Not to my knowledge and belief, as lawyers would say.

JP: According to a quote I read in *The Daily Express*, you said that women never produced anything useful and are in fact mental chewing gum. What sort of reaction was that comment designed to incite?

DI: Women do produce useful things. They produce men. Women's purpose in life is to have us and they have us and I think Darwin would have gone along with that particular statement.

JP: And Hitler did as well.

DI: My daughter just says I'm so sexist. Well, they should know.

JP: You really believe that women's role in life is to breed?

DI: Yes, and I think there's a lot of unhappiness been caused by women going out and taking on jobs from us.

JP: And what, presumably when you hear a woman's voice on the radio you turn down the volume?

DI: I like the old days of the BBC where the news reader wore a dinner jacket and a black tie and on state occasions you had the comfort of not knowing that behind the camera, the cameraman was also wearing a dinner jacket and black tie, and I like to feel as it is our news it should be read by us, by men and not by women. There can always be a women's section at the end of the news bulletin where the woman reads out the local shopping news and things like that. I don't like to see them muscling in on our affairs - basically international politics is us and not them.

JP: Margaret Thatcher might dispute that.

DI: I think she was more on our side of the distaff. I think that her masculine quality certainly came to the fore when she was running the war and running the empire.

Peter Thompson: The British historian, David Irving, with AM's Julie Posetti.

ABC Radio News Item - 8 November 1996:

The Minister for Immigration, Mr Philip Ruddock, has rejected visa applications for controversial historian David Irving and Sinn Fein leader, Gerry Adams. Mr Irving was twice refused a visa in 1992 by the then Labor Government for his claims that the World War II Holocaust was a gross exaggeration. While Gerry Adams wants to visit Australia to promote his autobiography, Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock, says both cases were dealt with individually. However, both men fail to meet the 'good character' requirement under the Immigration Act.

The Hon Philip Ruddock: *I have given consideration to this application against the totality of our law and I have come to a view on those matters on the basis of the material that was placed before me to enable me to take a decision on that matter.*

The World Jewish Congress says that it would have been surprised if David Irving had been allowed into the country. Congress chairman, Isi Leibler, says Mr Irving would have caused a lot of damage to Australia at a time when inter-racial and ethnic relations are already strained.

Isi Leibler: *I think his views are a lot of crap and they don't concern me. It's more the guy is associated with radical right-wing groups, has indulged in the sorts of demonstrations and activities with neo-Nazi groups that we don't need to have here. It's not a question of freedom of expression or censorship. His views are accessible, I think - because of the controversy over him he's probably had more opportunity to promote his views than he would have otherwise.*

David Irving: *They told the media - they held a press conference before they told the person concerned, and I think that that's - I'm dismayed by that. I'm not surprised by the actual decision.*

OUR COMMENT

We take issue with Mr Isi Leibler's claim that David Irving's views are "a lot of crap". This reveals Mr Leibler's well-known hubris on the Australian political scene.

Further, the Irving affair is pivotal to the question of freedom of speech. Mr Leibler knows that the Holocaust story's central core has been rejected by Irving, Faurisson, Zndel, et al. He is also fully aware of the consequences that will face persons who uphold the Holocaust story. Mr Howard will be shamed for having uncritically swallowed the gassing story - and it will not help him were he then to plead that he had accepted the story in good faith. We live in interesting times - and the 50th edition of our newsletter will serve as a record to show how seemingly intelligent people let themselves be bullied into believing what 'King' Isi of Australia has decreed to be the official Holocaust dogma - a deviation from which could have dire personal and professional consequences.

Radio 2 GB:

Ron Casey talks with David Irving - 8 November 1996

Ron Casey:I'm sorry to worry you at such a late hour. You may remember me, and I don't think you would, but I interviewed you last time you were in Australia on this station. I've got to ask you for a reaction today to the news that you'll not be allowed to enter Australia.

David Irving: My immediate thought is what are they frightened of? Are they frightened that I'm going to point my typewriter at someone? It's ludicrous. I use words, I use my fountain pen. I write books - my books are published in the world's leading publishing houses. They're available in all book stores. So, what are people frightened of if I come down there? I received from the Minister the letter faxed through to me twenty-five minutes ago, here in London, in which Philip Ruddock explains the reasons why he's banning me, and he talks about my having lied to courts in Canada and having been convicted of crimes in Germany, and all this kind of thing, and frankly, I've never been subjected to such onslaught in my life.

Ron Casey: I think at this stage, I know of your convictions in Germany and also in Canada, I'd ask you for the listeners, to tell what those convictions involved.

DI: In 1990 or 1991, it's so long ago, I can hardly remember now, I made a public speech in Germany, a private meeting to about 2,000 people, in the course of which I said one sentence which is a criminal offence in Germany, and the sentence was, and I can repeat it to you because it's not a criminal offence in Australia. The sentence was:

The gas chamber in Auschwitz which they show to the tourists is a fake built after the war by the Poles.

The Poles have since admitted this. The Polish government has admitted that what I said is true, but I was fined by the German government \$A22,000 for saying those few words - and that gives me a criminal record. And then you see the Philip Ruddocks and the John Howards of the Australian government saying that is sufficient reason to call me a blackguard, a liar and a man of bad character.

RC: Well, I'm pleased to be able to give you the opportunity to explain exactly what that criminal offence involves because it is not fair that you be labelled as a criminal when all you did was make an allegation. Now, whether the allegation is true or not is up to you to substantiate and you claim you have. Could I put this question to you because I've had some dealings with the Jewish community here in Sydney in recent weeks and I've also visited their Holocaust Memorial in Darlinghurst? Could I ask you this question: Do you realise what pain and suffering you bring to Jewish communities here in Australia with your allegations that the Holocaust was not as devastating and didn't involve the numbers that the Jewish community now claims?

DI: Why don't they come clean? Why don't they debate fairly and squarely with me and prove me wrong? I may be causing them pain and inconvenience, as they say, but why don't they debate with me? Why don't they show me up as a charlatan if I'm wrong? All they come - they come and they whine and they wail about pain and inconvenience and how horrible it is that I say these terrible things, and they've been saying this for about six or seven years and they haven't produced any evidence that I'm wrong. All they do is use this appalling smear campaign and, of course, their brute force methods. I can understand you want to keep Gerry Adams out because he used bombs and pistols but somebody who uses fountain pens and typewriters - what's Australia frightened of?

RC: Could I ask you this: If you came to Australia, if this decision was reversed, would you be willing to undertake a television debate with some of your accusers?

DI: I would indeed. I'd be delighted to but I would be extremely surprised if even one of them accepted the debate in public. They won't do it. They're frightened to debate. They said in public, "We won't debate!" because they can't.

RC: Would you issue a challenge to - and you don't have to come to Australia for this - for an international satellite hook-up for a television debate on this very subject in which you would debate someone nominated by the Holocaust society or by the Jewish community, to debate the issue and make your case in a logical, fair way and also have the opposing view, that is the Holocaust survivors to be able to put their case forward too?

DI: Provided it didn't develop into a shouting match, yes, I'd be more than happy to it, if it can be done in a reasoned atmosphere of logic. But all I've been offered by these people, they say if Mr Irving comes to Australia, there'll be violent scenes and ugly demonstrations and that's the only language they seem to know. But to accept your point, I'd be more than happy to accept the debate.

RC: The last time you were here, we had an interview, and I'm not being sarcastic, I honestly don't expect you to remember because you do so many interviews but you did say to me that the figures of the victims of the Holocaust was higher than you had previously admitted. Now, I don't recall exactly the figure that we settled on but it was higher than you claimed, than you had previously claimed.

DI: I think the real figure is about a million or less. I'm not saying only a million, of course.

RC: No.

DI: Still an appalling crime.

RC: Yes.

DI: But apparently the six million figure is a figure which is holy and somebody who challenges that six million figure is

committing some kind of blasphemy, and that I don't wear. I don't think that's a package you're not allowed to open.

RC: To put a personal twist on our interview, Mr Irving, I visited the Holocaust Museum last week here in Sydney and I was shown around by a lady, a very lovely lady, Olga, and she was actually a survivor of the Holocaust and she told me as we looked at the - I won't call it memorabilia - at the exhibits in this display, she actually recalled in detail and gave me a story about her sister being hidden, but here sister was caught and she survived and all that. I constantly kept thinking to myself, how can there be any doubt that there was a Holocaust because this woman was just an ordinary nice person explaining her experiences to me? Have you had that experience of facing somebody who is a survivor?

DI: Oh, yes, oh, yes- repeatedly, and I talk with them but I think we have a basic problem when we're talking with survivors and eye-witnesses and I think this problem was recognised by the Israeli Supreme Court when they overturned the conviction of John Demjanjuk which was based entirely on such survivor evidence. They said this is not safe evidence, certainly not enough to hang a person on - and as an historian you're faced with, I think any Australian policeman will nod his head in agreement and say, yes, survivors, eye-witnesses, they're not very reliable testimony.

RC: I must say this. I find it very difficult to understand how a memory only in the broader sense can be retained over a fifty-year period, and in a court of law that would make it most doubtful, would it not?

DI: Well, I try and think back to things that happened when I was at university 30 years ago and all I can remember is just one or two events and the rest is just a grey blur and I would have to say, if somebody came and started questioning me about my life at university, I'd be very embarrassed and I realise how wrong it is for me and question, for example, Adolf Hitler's staff on what happened because their memory too - you're not remembering events anymore, you are remembering memories of events like second or third order memories.

RC: Let's go back to the Poles, according to you, building a gas chamber, etc. for tourist reasons. Do you believe that all the concentration camps dotted throughout Germany in the Second World War and before, do you believe that some of them existed, not all of them or none?

DI: Oh, yes, oh yes. There's not the slightest doubt in as far as Auschwitz is concerned. I've said in my latest book, The Doctor Goebbels biography, there is no doubt that Auschwitz was a brutal slave labour camp with an appalling mortality rate. Tens of thousands of people died in Auschwitz from one cause or another. There's no doubt that these places existed. But I'm not going to buy the whole package and that's why, frankly I'm anathema to the Jewish population of Australia and other countries because I refuse to buy their whole package. I want to open it and examine it.

RC: Is it possible in these death camps for six million people to have been cremated, to have been killed in gas chamber? Is it possible physically in terms of, and I hate to put it like this, but to put these people through the process of killing and disposing? Is it possible in the time span of the years of the Holocaust for it to have happened?

DI: That's where you get down to the nitty-gritty of it. Our opponents don't want the discussion reduced to this scientific level at all. You've asked the question - they say a million people were killed in Auschwitz. My question is: what happened to these one million people? Were they cremated? Well, the answer is you couldn't cremate them. There wasn't sufficient crematorium capacity. There wasn't enough coke. It would have taken 40,000 tonnes of coke and we've got the aerial photographs, and nowhere are there any mountains of coke. Were they therefore buried? Well, it would have taken a pit the size of a football field. Once again, the aerial photographs show no such pit. Why aren't the pits excavated and exhumed now to disprove people like me? After all, the Americans are exhuming these mass graves in Bosnia now but nobody wants to do it to Auschwitz. That's why I think that these figures are very suspect indeed, till I'm proven to the contrary and I'm quite willing to be proven to the contrary. I've got no axe to grind, believe me.

RC: Look, you sound so reasonable about it all to me that I'm wondering that if you make these claims and if these claims are open to discussion it's beyond me why you're not allowed into Australia to be able to debate it because I haven't got the knowledge to prove you wrong but at the same time, after visiting the Holocaust museum and talking to these people that I did meet only last week by coincidence, I'm totally convinced, and if there is - there is this doubt in my mind and now I'd like the doubt to be cleared up and the only way to do it is via a head to head confrontation. You can't come to Australia; the way to do it might be with a satellite interview so that the rest of the world can make up its mind about what exactly is the answer. As it is now, all we've got is doubts.

DI: I agree. That's one reason why they build these Holocaust museums because they are so cleverly put together to convince the sceptics. They build the Holocaust museums on the one hand in every town and city around the world and on the other hand they keep the doubting Thomas, like myself, the historians who've been in the Nazi archives - they keep us out so we can't talk.

RC: Excuse me, I've got to ask you one last question - you've been very kind with your time - in your Goebbels book, do you enter the German psyche to understand why this irrational hatred of another ethnic grouping, why it developed? Do you deal with that?

DI: I do in one specific episode. This concerns the man who took the extraordinary, gorgeous colour photographs that are in the book. He was Hitler's film cameraman. He took a lot of colour photographs and he described to me how he went and actually saw a mass shooting of Jews on the eastern front. And I describe this in the book. He told me, he said that it happened because the evening before, Heinrich Himmler, the chief of the SS said, "Mr Frenzt, how'd you like to go and watch a mass shooting tomorrow morning? We're going to be shooting a few thousand Jews". And this photographer said, "Yes", I'd love to go along". Now, an Englishman wouldn't have said that. An Englishman, I think, would have said, "Mr Himmler, tomorrow is a bad day for me. Any other day of the week, I'd love to come and watch what you want to show me."

The Germans, I don't know. They seem to be a different personality and I'm afraid I have to agree to a certain extent with that author, Daniel Goldhagen, who wrote a book suggesting that the German mentality is somewhat different. I'm not going to make any friends of course...

RC: No, no, well, you won't make any friends with me because I've got a German wife and born in Germany but now living here in Australia with me and I'm telling you she's one of the kindest people in the world.

DI: Yep, well that's..

RC: You know, I know I've lead you with my chin by asking the question and her mother and father are the two most beautiful people I have ever met. So you know I don't understand your broad generalisations about Germans.

DI: I agree. It's wrong to generalise about people. That goes for the Germans, that goes for the Jews and I'm sorry if I've offended either of them.

RC: All right, good to talk to you again, Mr Irving.

David Irving, the author and historian who's been banned by the Australian government today from visiting this country because he will upset the Jewish community.

Radio 5DN:

Bob Burns talks with David Irving - 8 November 1996

Bob Burns: Well, you would have heard in the news just a moment ago that Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock, has refused visas for right-wing British historian David Irving and Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams. Announcing the decision in Sydney, Mr Ruddock says each application has been assessed individually on its own merits. He says in a statement, "All applicants for visas to Australia must be assessed for good character. Now, I've spoken with David Irving before - controversial British historian, I suppose, is one way of describing him. I know that he lodged an application or several applications to come to Australia. These were turned down by the former Labor government. He lodged a new application last month after the Prime Minister, Mr John Howard defended

freedom of speech, and he felt that Mr Howard talking about freedom of speech, surely that he would be allowed back into Australia. However, that's not to be. David Irving joins us on the line now from London. David, thank you for being with us.

David Irving: Well, good morning. It's morning in London, of course.

BB: I understand that you've had a very busy night. Lot of press after you.

DI: It has been a long, long night and I haven't gone to bed yet, but eventually I shall, perhaps during the day sometime.

BB: What do you say now about the Prime Minister's 'freedom of speech' speech?

DI: Well, it appears to have been a hollow mockery. I think it was a vote catcher, perhaps, but he didn't mean it sincerely and I'm sorry because I've always regarded Australians as being very square and decent people who mean what they say and are men of their word, and we now know what the word of Mr Howard is worth.

BB: Well, according to Philip Ruddock, though, the freedom of speech issue did not come into it as far as he was concerned. It was to do with the law.

DI: Yes, well, the law was changed by the outgoing Labor government. The Immigration Law specifically changed in order to keep David Irving out, to keep me out. There's no question at all about that. The Federal Court ordered them two years ago - it said the original ban on me was illegal - and ordered the then Immigration Minister to reconsider his act in banning me. The Labor government reacted by changing the law, by moving the goal posts, and that's when the bad character definition came in which is about as wide as you want to make it. In fact, anybody's got a bad character if you want to. I think if somebody goes to prison for 19 years for paedophile offences, he's got bad character, but somebody who's been criticised in Germany for uttering one sentence at a public lecture which is against the law in Germany but not against the law in any other country on earth, but certainly not against the law in Australia. That's a very odd kind of criterion to ban somebody from Australia, I think.

BB: And he's also named your jailing for three months in Britain, February 1994, for contempt of court.

DI: I see the government saying that because I wasn't actually jailed for three months. A policeman turned up at my apartment here in Mayfair in London one Friday afternoon, terribly apologetic, the way that English police are, and said, "We're very sorry, Mr Irving, but we've got orders to take you to prison for three months for contempt of court". You note, not court, to a judge, but straight from my home to prison. No court hearing. In fact it took me ten days to get out of prison - but ten very interesting days, I have to admit that, I've never been in prison in my life before. I then found in the files of Paul Keating the transcript of the court hearing which had sent me to prison, especially asking me to go to prison for two years. It was an attempt to silence me - not the Australian government but other people trying to silence me. But that is what I've had to put up with for the last five or ten years of my life.

BB: Well, Mr Ruddock says and I quote from this Press Release: *Dr Irving is not a person of good character*

DI: Well, that is what freedom of speech is all about. In fact his big boss, Mr Howard, called me a nutter and a crackpot and I think it is a little bit unfair that they have freedom of speech to say things about me and I don't have the freedom of speech to come to Australia and clear my name.

BB: Will you apply again or is that the end of it now?

DI: That isn't the end of it because, believe it or not, Philip Ruddock has broken the law. He's broken the law quite clearly. I've discussed this with my solicitor in Western Australia three or four hours ago. In fact, before we got the word, before the letter from Philip Ruddock came through my fax machine at 2:36 this morning in London - in fact I was tipped off about it by the Australian media first - I'd already discussed it with my solicitor and he said we will immediately launch proceedings again. I might even ask the Australian Civil Liberties Union to come in with me on this because the Australian Civil Liberties Union believes that I should be allowed into Australia. They, too, believe in freedom of speech, but I'm sorry to say John Howard apparently does not.

BB: Now, what does that mean, that you will actually take on the Australian government in a court of law?

DI: Once again, for the fifth round. We've had four rounds in the Federal Court and we now have to go a fifth round. It's becoming a very expensive business but somebody's got to fight for freedom of speech.

BB: And on the last occasion you were found, it was found that you should be allowed to come into Australia, as I understand it?

DI: No, what happened was we lost the first round, that's about three years ago now. We appealed and in the second round the Appeal Court found that the ban was illegal and ordered the Minister of Immigration to think again. The Labor government responded by changing the law in order to keep me out. They introduced the 'bad character' legislation. It's quite open to John Howard, of course, to kick out the bad character legislation and this is the only country on earth that says bad character should ban you from coming in - and John Howard apparently is not strong enough to do that.

BB: So, but if you go to court, I mean, the bad character bit remains, how will you get around that?

DI: In our last appeal, which was three or four months ago before the Full Federal Court, they said in their opinion bad character legislation has been used in my case purely because people disapproved of my opinions - and the bad character criteria were just being used as an excuse - and they sympathised with our viewpoint but said unfortunately as judges they couldn't comment on the law. They couldn't alter the law and had to apply the law as it stands.

But of course that's what governments should do now. They should change the law back to the way it was before.

BB: Is it worth it, I mean, you know you're continuing as you say. It's going to cost you a lot of money. Is it worth the money? Why do you want to come to Australia so badly?

DI: I have a lot of Australians who are backing me coming down - a lot of ordinary Australians have written me letters over the last four years. I've got, I think, ten thousand letters here now which are stacked up on my office floor a heap in two big boxes from Australians all over the country saying how much they're looking forward to me coming, pleading with me to carry on the fight and I don't want to let them down.

BB: So the fight continues?

DI: The fight goes on - la lotta continue - they used to say on the Marxist end of the scale and I'm on the other end of the extreme, so I have been told anyway.

BB: Now, David, you're constantly described in the Australian media at least as pro-Nazi who had denied the Holocaust happened. In a word, could you deny the allegations?

DI: Well, I know the people who make those accusations. That's all they can say. It's just one smear after another. They can't debate me fair and square so they just smear me - they throw mud. I don't want to descend to their level, frankly.

BB: But can you deny that you are pro-Nazi?

DI: I've got a record of writing books. I've written 30 books which have been positively reviewed in the most prestigious newspapers of the world. *The New York Review of Books* just a month and a half ago reviewed my very latest book, reviewed by the United States' leading historian, Professor Gordon Craig of Stanford University, and he says "there is no expert in the entire world who knows more about the National Socialist regime than David Irving and we cannot do without him"

BB: But can you deny that you're pro-Nazi?

DI: Well, you keep on saying this but I mean, I say I don't really want to descend to that kind of level in this discussion.

BB: But surely, it's a simple thing to say.

DI: Well, I mean if you want it, I can deny it but it shouldn't be necessary to ask that. If you've read my books, you know that. If you read the introduction to my Adolf Hitler biography, you'll see that I describe in great detail the crimes that Adolf Hitler committed. But people don't read my books and they're trying to stop me speak as well.

BB: Yes, but understand, there are people here who are saying you are pro-Nazi. I mean it's a simple thing. I know what you're saying.

DI: Isi Leibler and Mark Leibler and his brother 'Adolf Leibler'. There's all these little Hitler's who are trying to stop people from having freedom of speech.

BB: I understand what you're saying but I mean it seems such a simple thing to say - 'I am not pro-Nazi'.

DI: Even if I were to say it, are people going to believe it or not? The answer is not 'read my lips' but 'read my books'. See what I've written, then let people judge for themselves. I don't think anybody who's read my books with an objective mind is going to say 'this man is pro-Nazi'. I think that's impossible. People with evil minds, with evil in their hearts, are making those allegations.

BB: OK, so as it stands at the moment, you won't be coming to Australia. When are you launching proceedings against Philip Ruddock and the government of Australia?

DI: Well, as soon as I can get my barrister in Western Australia to get this new action up and running.

BB: So we'll expect to hear more about this?

DI: That's not the end of the story by any means.

BB: Just by the by, you were quoted earlier today as saying that women's only role is to breed, and I'm quoting here from an article, "he told one British newspaper women never produce anything useful and they are mental chewing gum. Dr Irving says women's purpose in life is to have men".

DI: I wonder why these newspapers their quotes are always anonymous. They never actually say where these strange quotations come from. I think I'll go on record as saying that being a Christian, I've read the Bible like anybody else and I know that God put women on this mortal coil to keep the human race alive and I think this is an important function to perform, quite obviously. But I think that the rest of it - the bits of chewing gum - are stuck on to the story, are a bit over the top.

BB: How did that all happen? Did you actually say those words or was it just a joke or what? How did it all occur?

DI: The chewing gum business, for example, is totally fictitious and I don't know where it comes from. I mean, this is just one more excuse. If only these people would stick to one reason why I shouldn't be allowed into Australia I could begin to believe it myself. But they keep on coming up with one more reason and yet another reason on top of it. The more the excuses, the less their excuses, I think. They ought to stick to just one reason and say, "OK

Irving is a neo-Nazi we don't want", but then I can disprove that. But as soon as I've disproved that, they say, "Hey, he doesn't like women". But the answer to that is I've got five daughters. I've got a beautiful daughter of three and I'm very proud of her and as soon as I've answered that one they say, "Hey, he calls them chewing gum", or "he's a racist", and I say I'm not a racist. My principal private secretary is an Indian girl and her predecessor was a girl from Sri Lanka, a Tamil. "OK, he's answered that one". Then they find something else to throw at me. Why don't they just let me in to debate? What are they frightened of? Are they frightened I may point a typewriter at them or something?

BB: Well, Dr Irving, thank you very much for joining us and I guess we'll get the opportunity to talk again.

DI: Yes, but please don't call me Dr. Call me either Mr or Your Excellency.

BB: You see, that's where it gets you into trouble.

DI: That's OK. Thank you very much.

BB: Nice to talk to you, David. Bye, bye.

David Irving, controversial British historian - very busy night as he said. He's been involved in radio and television and I understand that he's been chased all over the world at the moment - mainly from Australia, guess, to talk about the fact that he has been refused a further entry visa just today. The time is twenty-one past five now at 5DN. Our telephone number: 8305 30231.

ABC Radio 5AN:

Keith Conlon talks with David Irving

11 November 1996 Remembrance Day

Keith Conlon: David Irving, the British historian, has not seen his visa application received well by the Federal Government. You know that John Howard said that he won't be coming in. It's not a freedom of speech issue. He's even gone as far as calling

him on radio " a crackpot historian". David Irving, the British historian involved, joins us now from London.

Mr Irving, good morning.

David Irving: Good morning. I hear you mention the name of Geoffrey Blainey. Of course when I was in Australia seven or eight years ago I have very fond memories of meeting Geoffrey Blainey and I was very impressed by his intellectual capacity as a historian. I think he is one of your country's greatest.

KC: I think people are concerned about the way in which you might associate yourself with those people. At the same time the claim is, of course, that you would incite problems, particularly for Jewish people in this country. Why shouldn't you be left out of the country, Mr Irving, for those reasons?

DI: Well, I rather get the impression that the Jewish people of Australia are claiming some special kind of right to decide who can come into the country and who can't, saying we don't want Mr Irving to come in because it would upset us and I think this is going to cause a lot of problems for the Jewish people in the long run if they continue to demand special rights for themselves like this because non-Jewish people will feel disadvantaged and I think that they are very ill advised.

KC: They claim that they have real fear that your visit would spark neo-Nazi attacks, for instance, that it's not just a question of who comes in and isn't, that they're trying to protect themselves and their property. Do you see that?

DI: I think it's special pleading. I think there is not the slightest evidence that there'd be any neo-Nazi attacks because I come out. They're far more likely to attacks on themselves and their community because the way they make out they're some special case. I don't mean that cynically at all. It's my own, it's a very deep, a very worrying observation that I've had. This particular campaign has gone on for the last eight or nine years to suppress me. I worried, for example, when the same community in the United States managed to prevent my latest book from being published. It was to be published by one of the United States' most prestigious publishing firms. In April this year they started to campaign, of death threats against the publishers which finally ended up with the publishers capitulating in April this year - and as I said to *Time* magazine, and printed it - I said I'm worried that this kind of behaviour will lead to increased antisemitism. The non-Jews will say, "there they go again, throwing their weight around".

KC: I understand, Mr Irving, that you're upset by the Prime Minister's statement that you're a "crackpot historian". What do you claim to do about that?

DI: Well, he can call me a 'crackpot historian' because he's got freedom of speech, and I suppose that at a range of 12 thousand miles he's safe from any kinds of repercussions. But I'm more worried and concerned about the fact that he also said I'm a criminal, that I've got a criminal record in England, Germany, Canada and in half the countries around the world. He said that in a radio broadcast from Melbourne a couple of days ago and that is, frankly, libellous and I've instructed my lawyers in Western Australia to write him immediately a letter before action - because I shall take defamation action against the Prime Minister unless he apologises.

KC: Unless he gets the details right? - because you can see that you have infringed the law in Germany and you've been in jail in Britain for contempt of court.

DI: He said I have convictions in England and Germany and Canada and other countries. The word 'conviction' has a special legal connotation. If you're sent to prison for contempt of court, that's not a conviction, that's an administrative matter where a court has taken umbrage at the fact that you're not paying sufficient attention to it. It's not a criminal conviction. I don't want to be quibbling over this, and he says I have a criminal conviction in Germany. The criminal conviction in Germany is for speaking the truth. It's a free speech conviction and he says this isn't a free speech matter, yet the only criminal conviction I've got is a free speech conviction.

KC: David Irving - with the news to come - thank you very much. The British historian, David Irving, speaking to us from London.

HEAD TO HEAD:

Should Gerry Adams and David Irving be granted visas?

Herald Sun, 15 November 1996

YES: Joseph O'Reiley, Executive director, Victorian Council of Civil Liberties

The decision to refuse visas to David Irving and Gerry Adams is inconsistent with the Prime Minister's statement that since the coalition came to power we now tolerate greater diversity in public debate. The real reason for refusing entry to these people is to avoid controversy. In David Irving's case this gives him and his offensive, incorrect and extreme views more credit than they deserve. The refusal of a visa to Gerry Adams will effectively prevent Australia from having a constructive part in building a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. Mr Howard could do far more for social cohesion by providing firm opposition to racism which already exists in Australia.

NO: Philip Ruddock, Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs

Applications from both men were assessed on their individual merits and both, for separate reasons, failed to meet the good character requirement in the Migration Act. All visitors and migrants coming to Australia are assessed for good character. Australia's commitment to freedom of speech does not override the issue of the character of those coming here. A person who has outspoken views has no greater right to avoid scrutiny of their character than anyone else seeking to come here. Degrading the character requirements of Australia's entry process would undermine public confidence in our system. This is not an issue of free speech because the views of both men are being widely published here.

SLEEPING WITH THE ENEMY

Nicholas Farrell finds that the beautiful young Danish woman who lives with David Irving doesn't share his politics - *The Spectator* 27 April 1996)

They say that, deep down, every woman loves a fascist. Well, Bente Høgh, a beautiful blonde from Denmark whose natural serenity frequently gives way to a girlish giggle, is just such a woman. She is the common law wife of the reviled revisionist historian, David Irving. She is 32 and he is 58 and the couple have a daughter, Jessica, who is two and a half. Yet Miss Høgh is, so to speak, sleeping with the enemy, for she disagrees wholeheartedly with Mr Irving on virtually everything - from Hitler to his diet. Mr Irving, never far from the news, is back in it once again. He has just published his latest work, a biography of Joseph Goebbels, which has been greeted with the usual fanfare of outrage and loathing from most quarters, in particular the Jewish lobby in America. He would probably prefer to describe himself as 'ultra right-wing' rather than 'fascist full stop' or, as Miss Høgh says, 'a mild fascist'. But that is not how most people regard this apologist for Hitler.

Such was the outrage in America at yet another attempt by Mr Irving, who all agree is a brilliant researcher and gifted writer, to shift the blame for the dreadful deeds of the Nazis away from his *Volks* hero Hitler on to Goebbels, that his American publishers felt obliged not to publish the book. In London it is published by Mr Irving's own imprint, Focal Point. Though he has apparently revised his views, Mr Irving has in the past said that the figure of six million Jews exterminated is a gross exaggeration, and has denied that Hitler had knowledge of the Holocaust.

Miss Høgh met Mr Irving in 1991 when she became a tenant of his opulent apartment just off Grosvenor Square. Romance soon began. I decided to seek her out in an attempt to understand how she felt able to reconcile disagreement with Mr Irving about what must rank as the most evil crime committed in the history of mankind with sharing a bed with him. I felt it best to talk out of earshot of Mr Irving. So we set off from the Irving apartment - which is crowded with photocopiers, books, televisions, computers, a bust of Goebbels by the door, all juxtaposed with Jessica's toys - for the sanctuary of a nearby café. Before we left, he made several remarks about the toys everywhere, nobody doing any housework....nobody, in fact, doing any ironing. He is a finicky man, Mr Irving.

But what, I asked Miss Høgh, of him and the Holocaust? 'Obviously I feel that what happened with the Jews,' she said, 'was absolutely horrendous and sometimes I feel a great....It was an awful period of history. And I can appreciate how the

Jews feel a certain anger towards David for what happened to them.'

Not just the Jews. For gradually it emerged that her involvement with Mr Irving has had a pretty dramatic effect on her family, who live in Aarhus. Her father, a dentist, mother, and two sisters have, for example, all refused even to meet Mr Irving, let alone enter into debate with him. But it does not seem to bother her much, this happy-go-lucky girl who came to England to escape the tedium of Danish suburbia 14 years ago - 'a very small, a very nice, very middle-class community where nothing ever happens.'

'Well,' I asked again, 'what about the Holocaust?'

'The Holocaust did happen and an awful lot of people got killed.'

'But was there a masterplan?'

'There was a plan.'

Politically, she herself is a conservative - a pretty robust one. 'It has to stop when Indians can come over here from India with ten children and get a ten-bedroom house. Don't you agree?' Conservative yes, but not fascist. So why did she fall for Mr Irving? 'It's very common for nice women to be attracted to bad men,' she said. 'I just find it interesting to be with him. It appeals to my sense of adventure. I like the challenge. All my relationships have been with powerful men.'

But surely bad Mr Irving's power was not that great - certainly not when compared to that of, say, the Führer himself? 'Well, he has the power to upset every government in the world. Have you met anybody who has got court cases against the German government, the Canadian government, the Australian government...?'

But if she disagreed with him about politics and history they must have some fierce arguments? Didn't she try to argue him out of his views? 'Let's just say we agree to disagree. Do you agree with everything your wife says?' An image sprang to mind of the couple rowing during the washing-up about just how many died in the camps and just who gave the orders.

Once, several years ago, I asked Mr Irving if he was mad. He said that operating as he does on the outer edges of intellectual hyperspace, he sometimes wondered, but unfortunately he had no intellectual thermometer to stick into his brain to find out. Did Miss Høgh think the father of her child was evil? 'He definitely has an evil streak in him.' Was this attractive? 'No, not at all. But he also has a charming side. He's a bit of a split personality. It's a constant challenge being with David. No day is the same. He has all these different moods.'

Moods? What moods? 'The other day I gave him a cup of coffee and I had not preheated his cup. He likes his cup preheated in boiling water. And so he just threw everything in the sink.' She smiled as she recalled the incident. She seems to find much about him amusing. Unlike Hitler, Mr Irving is not a vegetarian, but he has many little domestic obsessions. His beer must be served in a frosted glass. He insists on three-course dinners with soup to start. Wasn't that a bit of a bore for her? 'Not if you buy ready-cooked meals,' she said with a chuckle. 'David does not like to do anything domestic. He thinks that should be entirely up to the woman. Occasionally he comes and grabs the Hoover from me to show me how to work it. Oh, and when you stick stamps on an envelope they must be stuck on completely straight.'

Miss Høgh thought housework should be shared, adding as she often did, 'What do you think?' I replied that my wife liked to sit on the sofa non-stop doing the crossword or else play 'Minesweeper' on the computer all day and that I did most of the cooking as well. She said, 'You'll have to send her on a training course to David, then.'

Come nightfall in the Irving household, dinner and soup out of the way, it is time to wind down and watch television. He likes 'silly American films'. She does not. She prefers documentaries and serious stuff - 'Channel 4 and BBC 2.' More disagreement. But if she went out on her own he would sulk. So she doesn't.

On one issue she is, however, in wholehearted agreement with Mr Irving: his right to publish his views. She is a firm believer in the absolute right of free speech - more or less. Was it all right then, I asked, to call a black man a 'filthy nigger'? She replied, 'That's an insult. That's not a matter of freedom of speech. No one forces people to read David's books. If somebody wants to go around writing that the earth is square they ought to be

allowed to. The more people object to David the more he will carry on. He thrives on the attention. He really feeds on the opposition. They should just leave him alone. He loves controversy, loves to see his name in the headlines. I sometimes think he's got so much going on in his head how does he cope with it all?

I wondered how she coped, to which she replied, 'I personally take everything with a pinch of salt. I try to have a sense of humour about it. At least David is not boring.' She gives the impression that it all, and he, are just a piece of harmless fun.

Internet Censorship in Australia - 26 November 1996

One of **Adelaide Institute's** mutual links has been disconnected - **Australians Against Corruption** (formerly **Corruption Fighters - Raymond Hoser**). On Wednesday, 20 November 1996, Mr Hoser received at his Melbourne home a Sydney-generated defamation writ which required him to be at the Sydney Supreme Court on Friday morning, 22 November.

The writ stated that Mr Hoser had in his latest book, *Smuggled-2*, defamed Vacik Distribution (an export firm) and the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) by publishing allegations that senior officers in NPWS were "party to murder, accepting bribes, corrupt dealings, trafficking in wildlife and drugs and fixing court cases". At 10 am. Justice Levine found that the contents of the book were "not defamatory".

At 12 noon, according to Hoser, Victorian Liberal parliamentarian, Mr Victor Perton, contacted the media in an attempt to "kill the Hoser story because its success in exposing corruption in NSW could flow into Victoria". In *The Hoser File*, Mr Perton is named as "a Member of Parliament who has lied". Perton also contacted Hoser's Internet service provider, Starway Corporation (a franchise operation), which by midday had wiped and disconnected Hoser's site. Mr Perton informed **Adelaide Institute**, "I'm not willing to enter into a discussion with you on Mr Hoser...I bent over backwards to help Mr Hoser until he began publishing defamatory material about me."

Starway Corporation manager, Mr Clive Roberts, stated to **Adelaide Institute**: "No comment."

Without knowing the details of the matter, we are alarmed about this form of censorship and ask: is it coincidental that Jeremy Jones, Executive Vice President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (who has lodged with the Human Rights & Equal Opportunity Commission a complaint against **Adelaide Institute**) has written adversely about Hoser's cross-link to **Adelaide Institute's** site? See p.48 of this edition.

When Hitler 'saved' a trainload of Jews from massacre David Irving's view of Churchill's and Hitler's role in World War II, published in the Herald yesterday, is absurd, according to John Foster who teaches German history at the University of Melbourne - Sydney Morning Herald, 9 October 1987

To those who have followed David Irving's career as a writer, his latest blockbuster comes as no surprise. *Churchill's War* has been in the making for at least 25 years. Churchill was an easy target in *The Destruction of Dresden*. He was the evil genius of **Accident - The Death of General Sikorsky**, in which Irving portrayed him without a shred of reliable evidence, as the assassin of the Polish general. And, of course, he figured in **Hitler's War** as the obstacle to peace which the Fuhrer so fervently desired in June, 1940.

"I hate him," Irving recently told an Australian audience, and so, in this latest book, Churchill appears as "a hypocrite, a cynic, a callous brutal liar, an opportunist who deliberately advanced himself at the expense of Britain".

If the Churchill and Hitler biographies are read together, the message is clear. The obsessive denigration of Churchill and the attempted rehabilitation of Hitler collapses the moral distance between the Nazi and democratic leadership.

The fight against Nazism was a ghastly mistake; it played into the hands of Stalin, and it consumed the energies and resources of the British Empire. It was the great tragic blunder of the 20th century.

This is a familiar propaganda theme of the extreme right. Given Mr Irving's extensive association with neo-Nazi circles, it is perhaps appropriate that his book should be published by the Veritas Press, a Western Australian distributor of conspiracy and racist tracts.

But objections to Mr Irving's work depend less on his associations than on his record as a historian. He bases his claim to be taken seriously on his indefatigable pursuit of new resources. There is no doubting his energy in the chase, but his record in using these sources hardly inspire confidence. In Hitler's War, for example, he claimed that Hitler neither ordered nor knew of the annihilation of the Jews.

On one occasion Hitler categorically ordered that the Jews were not to be liquidated. This was an astonishing claim. The evidence for it was a single telegram from Himmler to Heydrich on November 30, 1941: "Jewish transport from Berlin. No liquidation."

In fact, this telegram referred to a single trainload of Jewish victims destined for Riga, where the semi-public massacres already in progress were causing an uproar among the German occupation officials. By removing the telegram from its context and attributing it to Hitler, Irving invented a Hitler "order" and expanded it into "proof" which absolved the Fuhrer from responsibility for initiating the mass murder program.

But in misrepresenting this document, Mr Irving landed himself in a quandary. If Hitler was unaware that the liquidations were taking place, then how could he order that there be no liquidation?

Selective editing documents can be as effective as misrepresenting their context. As a further proof of Hitler's innocence, Irving offered a statement written by Ribbentrop in his cell at Nuremberg. "How things came to the destruction of the Jews, I just don't know....But that he (Hitler) ordered it, I refuse to believe, because such an act would be wholly incompatible with the picture I always had of him." Conveniently, Irving omitted the remainder of the passage: "On the other hand, judging from his (Hitler) last will, one must suppose that he at least knew about it if, in his fanaticism against the Jews, he didn't also order it."

With this inventive approach to the interpretation of documents, Mr Irving had no difficulty in revising our image of Churchill. In pursuit of power, and in financial difficulties, Churchill fell under the influence of a group of wealthy Jews.

Sharing and reinforcing his anti-Nazi prejudice, they worked with him through a conspiratorial group known as The Focus to exacerbate tensions between Britain and Germany. In due course, they achieved their desired end of war. Once Churchill had his war, he was deaf to Hitler's offer of peace after the fall of France. And since he continued to prosecute the war, ignoring Hitler's genuinely benevolent attitude, then Churchill must bear the blame for the millions of deaths which the war exacted. So Churchill destroyed two empires, Hitler's and his own, both of which Mr Irving would prefer to see intact.

The absurdity of this thesis is equalled only by its moral nihilism. That is not surprising. Irving's book, far from being original, simply fleshes out an interpretation that was not learned in the archives.

In one of his last recorded conversations in 1945, Hitler explained that Britain had made a great mistake. She ought to have allied herself with Germany to defend the imperial possession she was now certain to lose.

"If fate had granted to an ageing and enfeebled Britain a new Pitt instead of this Jew-ridden, half-American drunkard [Churchill], the new Pitt would at once have recognised that Britain's traditional policy of balance of power would now have to be applied...on a world-wide scale. Instead of maintaining...European rivalries, Britain ought to do her utmost to bring about a unification of Europe.

"Allied to a united Europe, she would then still retain the chance of being able to play the part of arbiter in world affairs...[But] I had underestimated the power of Jewish domination over Churchill's England. "The real author of Irving's thesis is Hitler.

*

**Sinn Fein leader may challenge visa denial
The Age, 18 November 1996**

Sinn Fein's leader, Mr Gerry Adams, is looking at how to overturn the decision to deny him entry to Australia. The Federal Government announced two weeks ago it had refused visas to Mr Adams and the controversial British historian Mr David Irving. The Prime Minister, Mr John Howard, cited Mr Adams's connection to IRA terrorists and a criminal record as valid reasons to reject the visa application. Mr Adams has blamed the decision on pressure on Australia by the British Government. His publisher, Reed Books, has planned an Australian tour this month to promote his autobiography, *Before The Dawn*.

"I think at a political level it's disappointing," Mr Adams said here this week about the Howard Government's move. Clearly the decision is the result of lobbying similar to the American visa situation. In Australia's case, it's clear the Government there succumbed to British pressure."

Mr Adams's spokesman, Mr Richard McAuley, said Reed Books had been asked to investigate avenues of appeal against the decision. Mr McAuley denied that Mr Adams had a criminal record, saying the Sinn Fein president's only crime had been escaping from custody after being imprisoned without trial.

THE FAURISSON FORUM AN EXPERT TAKES US TO TASK

On 20 August 1996, Professor Gerald Fleming, Emeritus Reader in German at the University of Surrey, England, had a bone to pick with us. Here is his letter.

Dear Dr Töben

My attention has been drawn by colleagues to 'Internet' information emanating from the **Adelaide Institute**, under the date and time referred 07/15/96 17:30:00. I quote from the item in question:

Swiss historian Jurgen Graf and Italian expert Carlo Mattogno visited the once-secret Moscow archives. Their findings put to shame the work of the British Professor Gerald Fleming [and the French pharmacist Jean Claude Pressac]

Since the comment in question is not only absurd and scurrilous but teetering on the brink of being libellous, I am giving you some factual information regarding my archival research sessions in Moscow (and other) State Archives:

(i) I have worked in Russian State Depositories for seven years, several weeks on each occasion.

(ii) I have seen and examined all relevant Auschwitz documents and photocopied large numbers of these.

(iii) My reports and publications relating to my archival sessions in Russian Archives are well known.

(iv) The expression "put to shame", referring to my work, as compared with the recent visits by two named western revisionist writers, is inappropriately **false** and unacceptably polemical.

(v) Should such or similar comment reappear on *Internet* under the heading **Adelaide Institute**, I shall take action to protect my academic interests and factual historic position. The western revisionist writers named by you will be informed of the 'Internet' comment as here described.

Finally, also for your information, it is I who was the first Western academic historian and researcher who gained access to these important collections of World War 2 files of German origin and important, previously closed materials closely related to these files, all in Russian State depositories.

Finally I note that you enter a caveat in **Adelaide Institute The Intellectual Adventure of the 20th Century**, where you say: "...if I offend because I am politically incorrect...then I claim it as my right, under the free speech principle, to say these things." - The words "put to shame the work of..." are not politically incorrect, they are downright malevolent and quite unworthy of any serious scholar. Let me say, that in 37 years of University work I have not come up against such nonsense before, and I will *not* allow it to pass again.

With regard to your comment about privileged free speech, I cannot easily put out of my mind Dr Goebbels' taunt:

It will always remain the best joke made by the democratic system, that it provided its deadly enemies with the means of destroying it. Quite so!

Sincerely

Gerald Fleming

*

OUR REPLY OF 30 August 1996

Dear Dr Fleming

The tone of your 20 August letter indicates to me that you have been getting away with huffing and puffing and bluffing for a long time.

I refer specifically to the nonsense you espoused in the film *Blueprints* of *Genocide* (See: **Adelaide**

Institute newsletter, No 27). As a credible historian, I would suggest, your time is up for one simple reason: Over these past 37 years you set out to prove that homicidal gassings took place at Auschwitz concentration camp. According to Sir Karl Popper, a reasonable person can prove anything. The scientific method, however, sets out to falsify hypotheses.

We know, of course, that anyone who attempts to approach the *homicidal gassing hypothesis* in such a way is immediately branded by you, et al, as *Holocaust denier*, or worst, as an antisemite indulging in hate-talk.

What you have been doing in your research is attempting to maintain the ideology-religion of the Holocaust. The pain you may justifiably feel when reading our Web site may rest to a large degree on the fact, as Charles Morgan put it:

The effect of superficial education among western peoples has been to make them gullible by the terror of being gulled.

Bearing in mind that it is still not criminal in our western democracies (except in Germany and France, et al, to demonstrate the falsity of premises, let me conclude by quoting Professor Robert Faurisson:

The Nazi gas chamber is alleged to have physically existed; yet no-one can provide us with a representation of it. This gas chamber is immaterial and magical...one cannot describe or draw the alleged homicidal gas chamber of Auschwitz as one cannot describe or draw a square circle or a circular square.

Most sincerely

Fredrick Töben

PS: I shall be placing our correspondence on our Web site.

AN EXPERT TAKES PROFESSOR FLEMING TO TASK When we received Professor Fleming's letter, we asked Professor Robert Faurisson for a comment. Here is his response of 30 September 1996: A KGB novelist: Gerald Fleming

Gerald Fleming, emeritus reader in German, University of Surrey (GB) is, if I may say so, a KGB novelist. He is more a novelist than an historian. He was appreciated by the Soviet authorities and the Soviet publications. Even recently, after the Soviet Union disappeared, he kept paying tribute to the outstanding talent of the Red Army in interrogating German prisoners and extracting from them the desired confessions that the American Army had not been able to obtain.

In 1984, in a review of his book: **Hitler and the Final Solution**, a subservient journalist had to concede:

"His sometimes flamboyant writing and the structure of his book as a kind of thriller will annoy some historians" (*The New York Times*, December 28, 1984, p. c-23).

According to a Jewish fellow, *"His book has been favourably reviewed in Riga and Moscow publications, and he believed that Soviet authorities would grant him permission for a visit to the Red Army archives"*, he said. (*The Jewish Chronicle*, October 12, 1984, p.4).

Hitler and the Final Solution (University of California, 1984) is a translation from his **Hitler und die Endlösung** (Munich, Limes Verlag, 1982). The book was supposed to answer David Irving's challenge for a single document showing that Hitler knew before the end of 1943 that there was an extermination of the Jews going on. Of course, Fleming was unable to provide such a document. So he should have refrained from presenting

his book as an answer to such question, and he should have avoided writing that D. Irving's thesis (that there was no Hitler order to liquidate the European Jews) amounted to "eine Fiktion" (p.37, footnote 56).

It was a nonsense to write a book about the existence of a document that could not be found and shown. But Fleming thought he could bring us another document, perhaps as sensational, a document proving that there was an extermination program of the Jews by the Nazis. This is how he dared to publish **A Resettlement Action Report**, now nearly forgotten but revealed at that time - 1982 - as an extraordinary discovery. It was a fraud. Even a layman, not intoxicated by the *Holocaust* propaganda, could have seen at first glance that this so-called Report with **no date** and **no signature** was full of preposterous details about Auschwitz.

Anyone interested in the matter should read an excellent analysis written by a young Canadian revisionist, Brian A Renk; see *The Franke-Gricksch A Resettlement Action Report: Anatomy of a Fabrication*, *Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1991, p.261-279.)

Readers who wish to get, as quickly and as soon as possible, an idea of G. Fleming as an historian could look at some photos in his book. On one and the same page appear two photos coming from the Archiv des [Kommunist] Polnischen Justizministeriums. One is supposed to show a Gaswagen to asphyxiate people and the other one two German prisoners holding Zyklon B cans as they were supposed to do when they asphyxiated inmates in Majdanek. In fact, the Gaswagen is an ordinary Magirus truck with nothing suspicious about it and the prisoners (obviously afraid) are holding Zyklon B cans which were used for disinfection.

In 1993, the media trumpeted all over the world that Fleming had discovered in the Soviet files the proof that execution gas chambers had been built and used in Auschwitz. He wrote a long and sensational article under the title *Engineers of Death* (See *The New York Times*, July 18, 1993, p. E19; see also *Protokolle des Todes*, *Der Spiegel*, 40/1993 [4 October 1993], pp.151, 156, 158, 160, 162).

In fact, Fleming had not found any such document but only minutes of the Soviet military police interrogation of four German engineers who had, during the war, participated in the building of Auschwitz-Birkenau crematories for Topf and Shne company and who, after the war, were still working in the same company in Erfurt.

The American army had interrogated these engineers and had released them. When Erfurt was handed over to the Soviet Army, the Soviets arrested the engineers, questioned them and....got the confessions they expected.

The most important of those engineers were Fritz Sander and Kurt Prfer. The first died from a heart attack right at the beginning of his interrogation. The second died from a cerebral haemorrhage in 1952; we have a photo of K. Prfer when he was a free man and a photo of the same when he was in the Soviets' hands; the difference speaks volumes and I would say that K. Prfer's face photographed by the Soviets is terrifying (See: *Der Spiegel*, p.160)

The confessions were extremely vague and in the style of; *I heard ... I was told ... I saw from the outside* (Ja, ich sah die Gaskammer - von aussen) (*Der Spiegel*, same page). And it happens that the very rare precise responses do not fit with the details of the story as given today, nor with what we can see today in Auschwitz. For instance, one of the confessed said: *In der Decke (of the Krema II "gas chamber") waren quadratische ffnungen (25 by 25 zentimetre)* (*Der Spiegel* p.162). The trouble is that even today you can see that not one square opening exists in the ceiling. [This fact gave rise to Faurisson's now famous quip: **No Holes, no Holocaust!** Ed.]

In 1994, G. Fleming was the author with the collaboration of architect Robert Jan van Pelt of the film [Auschwitz] *Blueprints of Genocide*. (BBC, May 9, 1994). The climax in this film was reached with a document introduced by the following words:

"It says very clearly, You will be able to kill and you will be able to burn simultaneously in this building"(Crematorium II).

But, first, in the film the document is surreptitiously shown and in such a way that nobody can see the German words. Second,

the document in fact does not say anything of that kind. It is a simple Aktenvermerk of January 29, 1943, about...electricity supply. It has not even the very common *Secret* stamp. In reality, it mentions **Verbrennung mit gleichzeitiger Sonderbehandlung** which means *cremation with simultaneous special treatment*. Note that the swindlers translated **special treatment** into **to kill** and that they went so far as to change the word order putting first **to kill** and afterwards **to burn**. The German text, even with such a translation, could never have designated a criminal activity consisting **first** in gassing people and, **afterwards**, burning the bodies of the gassed people. The word "**Sonderbehandlung**" could mean, by its place in the phrase, anything except **to kill** because this **special treatment** was **simultaneous** with burning.

It is obvious that, if Fleming and Van Pelt had discovered any German text which says very clearly what the *Holocaust* historians had been trying to find for such a long time, that very text would have been published, shown and commented on in every newspaper, film, book and *Holocaust* Museum. R. Hilberg, E. Wiesel, S. Wiesenthal, S. Klarsfeld would have celebrated the discovery of the century. Instead, they did not say one word.

At the end of that film, G. Fleming totally misquoted what the German engineers had confessed to the Soviets. This film contains nothing on the technique and operation of the *Nazi gas chambers* and there is nothing about the alleged quadratische Offnungen in the roof of the Krema II gas chamber.

On January 28, 1995, Jan Taylor announced in *The Sydney Morning Herald* that Van Pelt was due to *construct a computer model of the [Auschwitz] camp*. We are still waiting for the result. I. for one, would be interested to see if he dares to show the four special openings in the roof of that *gas chamber* through which, we are told, the Zyklon B pellets were dumped.

People interested in the transcript of [Auschwitz] *Blueprints of Genocide* have the choice between the British and the American versions. The British version gives a *text adapted from the programme transmitted on 9 May 1994*; the German document appears on p.20 with a deceitful comment in English (1). The American transcript is more faithful although we are told: *This transcript has not been proof-read against the videotape.* (2)

Therefore, G. Fleming is in fact not only a KGB novelist; he is a fraud.

Footnotes

(1) Horizon, *Blueprints of Genocide*, Text adapted from the programme transmitted 9 May 1994, 26 pages + 6 pages. See Mariette Jackson, Acting Publishing Manager, Broadcasting Support Service, 252 Western Avenue, London W3 6XJ UK.

(2) Nova Show # 2204. Air Date: February 7, 1995, 8 pages (2 columns), WGBH Educational Foundation. Journal Graphics, Box 2222 , South Easton, MA 02375 (USA).

NO EVIDENCE OF THE NAZI GAS CHAMBERS Robert Faurisson, Vichy, 3 September 1996

It has to be now admitted that finally there is no proof, no evidence whatsoever that the Nazi gas chambers ever existed, claims French "historian and novelist" Jacques Baynac.

Extremely hostile to revisionists and especially to Robert Faurisson (with whom he had a dispute in October 1980) and a friend of exterminationist historian Nadine Fresco, with whom he published a few years ago an article in *Le Monde* against R Faurisson, J Baynac seems now desperate. In a long article published in two issues of a Swiss newspaper (*Le Nouvelle Quotidien*, September 2, p. 16, and September 3, p.14), he draws the conclusion that obviously no one can bring any proof that the Nazi gas chambers ever existed. The strange solution he advocates is to try instead to find the proof that the non-existence of the so-called gas chambers is impossible!

The article is bursting with hard criticism against the historians, the lawyers, the journalists who, in his opinion, have been, for so many years, accumulating so many methodological and tactical errors that today, as a result, the revisionists appear, on the scientific plane, as a winner. A major blunder, he thinks, was to trust and to use Jean-Claude Pressac.

In France, according to the Fabius-Gayssot law (13 July 1990), inspired by Great Rabbi Ren-Samuel Sirat, it is a criminal offence to dispute the existence of "crimes against humanity" as

defined and punished by the International Military Tribunal at Nrnberg in 1945-46, or by any French or international court. As a matter of fact, this means that, in Voltaire's country, anyone who questions the Holy Jewish Trinity - the alleged genocide, the alleged Nazi gas chambers and the alleged 6 million - is liable to a prison sentence (1 month to 1 year), or a fine (2,000F to 300,000F) and other possible penalties.

But, as we see now, the trouble is that none of those judges did care for any evidence of the Nazi gas chambers.

Therefore, how should anyone in France be sentenced for not believing something which obviously was not proven by those judges?

PROFESSOR FAURISSON'S TRIAL POSTPONED The Jaques Baynac Affair

On 15 November 1996 Professor Robert Faurisson had to appear in a Paris court for having published on 19 April 1996 at the beginning of the Abb Pierre affair - a press release wherein he stated that he was pleased to see people like Roger Garaudy, Abb Pierre, and three of their friends, apparently coming on to the side of the Revisionists who claim that **the alleged genocide of the Jews and the alleged Nazi gas chambers are one and the same historical lie.**

Faurisson and his defence lawyer, Eric Delcroix, raised the following argument:

The 1990 Fabius-Gayssot law (alias "Lex Faurissonia") which forbids anyone to contest so-called "crimes against humanity" as defined and punished in 1945-46 by the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, is not a law but an "act of violence" against the French judges who, according to that communist-socialist law, are deprived of their normal right to look into the basic FACTS and to decide whether the accused has the FACTS right or wrong. Strangely enough, judges are left with only one right - to determine how hard they are going to sentence a revisionist.

E Delcroix and R Faurisson announced they had just asked the "Cour de cassation" (Supreme Court of Appeal) to decide whether such a law infringes not so much the rights of an accused or of any individual than the very rights of the judges themselves.

The Tribunal could have refused to wait for a decision of the Cour de cassation and could have immediately continued the proceedings, as demanded by the public prosecutor and the Jewish attorney and his five associates.

The tribunal decided otherwise and Faurisson's trial is now postponed until the Cour de cassation hands down its decision.

Apart from the legal argument something else happened which unsettled the prosecutor, the Jewish attorney and the three judges. Faurisson had warned them that on 2 and 3 September 1996 in a Swiss newspaper, *Le Nouveau Quotidien*, French historian Jacques Baynac, had published two long articles in which he claimed that today - even if it was "heartbreaking to say it or to listen to it" - one has frankly to admit there is no real evidence that the Nazi gas chambers ever existed.

Faurisson concluded that the difference between the historian and himself is this:

Jacques Baynac says: There is no evidence, but I believe.

Robert Faurisson says: There is no evidence, so I refuse to believe.

Further, Baynac enjoys freedom of speech, whereas Faurisson faces one month to one year in jail, a fine of 2,000F to 300,000F (\$US400 to 60,000) and other penalties.

The Jewish attorney, Serge Lorach, looked worried because he was not aware of Baynac's articles. After the hearing he approached Delcroix and Faurisson and requested a copy of Baynac's articles, and of Faurisson's press statement.

Another Expert Challenges Professor Fleming's Credibility We asked Swiss historian Jürgen Graf to comment on Professor Fleming's letter to us. Here is Mr Graf's response.

Basel, 11 November 1996

In August 1996 I corresponded with Professor Fleming and although he did not answer a single one of my questions I was surprised by his letter's civil tone. Of the questions directed at him, here are the two most pressing ones:

1. During his research in the Moscow archives, did he find any documentary proof that there were homicidal gassings? I am still waiting for a reply. His silence leads me to conclude that he did not find any such documentary proof because no such documents exist.

In January 1945 about 90,000 pages of Auschwitz files fell into the hands of the Soviet liberation army. It appears that the retreating Nazis had heedlessly left behind these documents which they could have easily destroyed before evacuating the camp. The Germans didn't think that these documents could later incriminate them!

Had anyone found the much desired documentary evidence which would prove homicidal gassings, then this would have triumphantly been presented to the world. But no - for over four decades the Soviets hid in their archives the mountain of paper. Why?

Instead of offering us documentary evidence to prove the gas chamber Holocaust, Fleming produces the Soviet prison confessions made by Kurt Pfifer and other engineers of the Bauleitung.

If these confessions are acceptable as proof, then the 1937 confessions extracted from the old Bolsheviks for the Moscow show trials - who confessed to being Fascist and Imperialist agents - now also become a credible historical source.

2. For some unexplainable reason, Fleming cites in his **Hitler und die Endlung** (Limes, 1982) the so-called *Franke-Griksch Report* as an important documentary source for the Holocaust. This report is a crude forgery because it is full of absurdities. For example, it states that the ovens of Birkenau could burn 10.000 bodies per day; the corpses of recently deceased persons burned especially well; Jews hid jewellery in hollow teeth, etc. Besides Fleming, there is only Jean-Claude Pressac who takes this report seriously. Pressac refers to it on p.238 of his tome **Auschwitz, Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers**, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989.

Neither Reitlinger nor Hilberg, neither Paliakov nor the **Enzyklopedie des Holocaust** list Franke-Griksch in their index. Why not? They should if the document offers such clear proof that the gas chambers and the Holocaust happened.

Fleming did not answer my question why the "Holocaust experts" do not take seriously the *Franke-Griksch* report.

Without doubt Gerald Fleming is an expert in his field, German Linguistics. However, as far as the 'Holocaust' is concerned, he is a third-rate propagandist.

Who is JÜRGEN GRAF?

In 1993 French and Latin teacher at Therwil secondary school, Baselland, 42 year-old Jrgen Graf, published his book **Der Holocaust auf dem Prfstand** (Guideon Burg Verlag, Postfach 52, CH 4009 Basel, Switzerland). He was dismissed without notice from his teaching post. A little later Graf published an enlarged version of his book under the title **Der Holocaust-Schwindel** which summarises the revisionist arguments up to 1992. Other books followed: **Auschwitz Ttergestndnisse und Augenzeugen des Holocaust**, August 1994, and **Todesursache Zeitgeschichtsforschung**, October 1995, both published by Verlag Neue Vision, Basel.

In all his books Graf contends that there is no documentary nor forensic evidence which confirms the orthodox view that mass extermination of Jews in homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz is a proven historical fact.

In July/August and November/December 1995, together with Italian Auschwitz specialist, Carlo Mattogno, Graf visited the special Auschwitz archives in Moscow. After carefully sifting each of the 90.000 pages of documents, he concludes that there is not a single document available which proves that the gas chamber Holocaust did not occur.

After a particularly primitive and degrading campaign to have anti-racist laws in Switzerland, the referendum of 25 September 1995 adopted Paragraph 261 with 54.7%.

In April 1995 Sigi Feigel began an action against Graf and his publisher, Gerhard Frster, for having written and published the Auschwitz book. Graf hopes that because the book was written

before the new law came into effect the judicial concept - **nulla poena sine lege** - (no crime without a law) will not be replaced by a Stalinist show trial.

Graf and Frster have been interviewed by police but to date nothing has followed therefrom. The obedience displayed by Austrian, French and German authorities towards religious and ethnic minorities is not, as yet, followed by the Swiss judiciary.

On 15 February 1996 the Jewish paper, *Maccabi*, asked why Graf had not already been imprisoned on account of his political extremist views. Graf was likened to a serial rapist because there is little likelihood that he, and Frster, will stop their work.

If such incitement to hatred continues, then perhaps the anticipated trial can only lead to a guilty verdict. Then the judge would have to display heroic courage in finding both Graf and Frster innocent. Sadly, heroic judges are far and few between because few persons with backbone are appointed to the bench. It is therefore expected that the Swiss judiciary will also adopt the *Offenkundigkeit* of the Holocaust (taking judicial notice of the Holocaust without requiring any evidence to be led in court to prove the allegations).

Graf claims that the Swiss will then be forced to believe that 20 to 30 persons can fit into a space of one square metre; that the Sonderkommandos in Auschwitz were immune to Prussic blue gas; that it is possible to throw Zyklon granules through non-existing holes in ceilings; and that corpses would burn nine to fifteen times faster at Auschwitz in 1943-4 than in 1996. In this way police power turns a 'free democracy', which finds itself in its final phase of pure idiocy, into a state ideology. (Freely

translated from Jrgen Graf's **Vom Untergang der schweizerischen Freiheit**, available from Zndelsite: <http://www.webcom.com/ezundel/english>)

Mr Le Pen Congratulates President Bill Clinton From our Paris correspondent, 13 November 1996

Jean-Marie Le Pen congratulates Bill Clinton on his brilliant re-election and wishes him good luck in fulfilling his new mandate as president of the United States. Now that Bill Clinton is no longer tormented by election concerns, Le Pen hopes the President will return to a more humane foreign policy which is more in accord with freedom and consideration for all peoples as embodied in the spirit of the American constitution.

Le Pen said, "It is highly desirable for the harmony of the entire world that the president of the United States at last distance himself from the internationalist lobbies and that he stop making his country be the executor of the dirty work of the New World Order. With this in mind, the first evidence of his good will could be to lift the deadly embargo which strikes the Iraqi civil population. Such a decision would be a good omen for all persons who seek peace and justice."

It is hard for any non-French to imagine the pressure felt by the French: cars are burning every night somewhere in France, people can no longer find any work, but the ONLY concern of our president and government is to fight against the National Front.

MUIRDEN'S MUSINGS

DID CHRISTIANS CREATE THE HOLOCAUST?

Geoffrey Muirden stems from a pioneering family that settled in South Australia during the 19th century. For many years he was a teacher-librarian within the Victorian Department of Education. Mr Muirden is a practising Christian. The following is a transcript of his address given to The Conservative Speakers Club, Melbourne, 7 August 1996.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your invitation to speak, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for attending.

Cross into Swastika

It may seem an act of distortion to twist a cross into a swastika but this is the feat managed by those Jews who insist that the Christians are the ones responsible for the Holocaust.

It may seem to most people that the Jews, if they were asked who was responsible for the Holocaust, would reply "the Nazis", but this is becoming less and less common. The propaganda line is now generally that the Big H was the culmination of centuries of Christian so-called 'anti-Semitism', culminating in the Holocaust. It's suggested that the Christians backed the Nazis coming to power and endorsed their programme, so that they bear the moral responsibility for the massacre of that era.

The tone of certain comments seems to indicate that the matter of Christian 'guilt' is beyond all doubt or debate. It's implied that the case for the prosecution has been established for all time, and that Christians should be bound with a giant guilt complex for having perpetrated it. Now that a Holocaust Museum has been built in Washington, D.C. and more holocaust museums around the world, perhaps the next step would be to create a 'Wailing Wall' for Christians to go and cry their eyes out with bitter lamentations of their vast responsibility for Jewish persecution.

Many Churches Buying It

This attempt to create a guilt complex for Christians is bad enough, but what is worse is that many Christians, especially those within major mainline denominations, including Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Uniting Church, Baptists, Lutherans, etc, appear to be endorsing it.

Some of the comments made show the endorsement of shabaz goyim. For example, one Roman Catholic theologian, Harry James Cargas, has said that "what died in Auschwitz was not the Jewish people but Christianity". He's also getting ready for the Wailing Wall for Christians because he says "we Christians need to get on our knees and repent our sins against the Jewish

people". (*Malcolm Ross, Spectre of Power*, Moncton, Canada, 1986,p.91)

Another Judaiser says "asking the Jews to become Christians is a spiritual way of blotting them out of existence and this only reinforces the effect of the Holocaust...for after Auschwitz and the participation of the nations, it is the Christian world that is in need of conversion".

So he doesn't feel that his primary loyalty is to Christ and preaching the gospel. No, his primary loyalty is to the Jews who must not be subjected to the horror of being converted.

Council Of Christians And Jews

A recent sign of this continued grovelling to Jews is the publication in 1995 by an outfit called The Council of Christians and Jews, of a booklet entitled ***Rightly Explaining The Word of Truth***, put out by Shalom Centre, 179 Cotham Road, Kew, Victoria, 3101. This booklet is intended to help train Christian clergy. It jumps into bed with the Jews, endorses the idea of the Holocaust, and has not a single word of defence for Christianity in the booklet.

So there's a lot of support in the Christian mainline churches for this thesis of Christian responsibility for the Big H. They also go along with the Jewish propaganda line that ever since the Christian church has been founded, whenever there has been a clash between Jews and Christians, it has always been the Christians that are to blame, never the Jews.

Dark Sunglasses Theory of History

This is the dark sunglasses theory of history: the idea that the haloes around the Jews' heads are so dazzling that they irritate the eyes of the goyim, by this blinding goodness, and who should therefore wear dark sunglasses so they can endure the brightness of those haloes. And this is the solution to the Jewish problem.

But there's no time to go into the history leading up to the Nazi era. We need to concentrate on certain aspects of the Holocaust thesis.

Hysterical Rather Than Historical

The first thing is that it is based on an exaggeration. It is hysterical rather than historical. In the booklet, ***Rightly Explaining The Word of Truth***, we are told that the Holocaust is "the ultimate in all horrors in the history of mankind".

But there's a kind of Holocaust blindness that leads Jews to exaggerate the Holocaust and ignore or minimize the Holocausts of the goyim.

Because the Jewish Holocaust has been exaggerated, it needs to be trimmed down to size before we even talk about it.

Revisionist historians have been accused of "holocaust denial", but the reality is that revisionists do not deny that Jews died and suffered during World War II. What they say is that the extent of this suffering has been exaggerated.

'The Six Million' Myth

Demographic figures based on Jewish populations before and after World War II show that the six million could not have died during World War II, and the actual figure is thought by many revisionists to have been less than 1 million.

A demographic study shows that during the war years the Jewish population of the world actually increased by 3 million or, if Hitler actually killed 6 million Jews, by 9 million, i.e. the 3 million increase plus 6 million births to replace 'the six million'.

However, an increase of 9 million Jews in ten years represents an increase in population in only ten years of 50%, an impossibility for any group of people, even the Jews.

Ben Weintraub

The writer, Ben Weintraub, author of *The Holocaust Dogma of Judaism*, makes it clear that the 'six million' figure is a religious dogma.

The book refers to a Rabbi Blech who, based on his studies of the Kaballah, determines that, owing to a deliberate error of scripture, in the phrase from Leviticus 25:10 the phrase "you shall return" leaves out the letter "vav" which has the numerical value of six. "We Jews did return" claims Blech triumphantly, "lacking six - an all-important six million of our people who perished in the Holocaust" (Weintraub, p.3).

Gas Chambers

Revisionist scholars such as Faurisson, Butz, Irving, and others, have shown that the gas chambers are a propaganda myth, and that the aim of 'The Final Solution' was to deport Jews, not to exterminate them.

Auschwitz, to take another example, was thought to have killed 4 million people, yet the number of victims has been officially reduced to just over 1 million. However, this may also be an exaggeration, as figures from the commandants of the Auschwitz camp suggest a death toll of about 74,000 which includes Jews and non Jews.

This means that before we even get started, the dimensions of the Holocaust have to be reduced, and the claim that it was "the ultimate of all horrors in the history of mankind" cannot be sustained.

Holocaust Blindness

This holocaust blindness of the Jews prevents them from seeing that the goyim, the gentils suffered more in persecutions, such as those of the Communists, under the Bolshevik regime, which was created and sustained by Jews, and who killed perhaps 20 millions.

This is important in the context of moral guilt for the Holocaust. Even if it were true, as claimed, that the Christians had been responsible for the Holocaust, the Jews would have to cast a mote the size of a Mack truck out of their own eyes first because of their responsibility in massacring Christians.

There was also massive suffering under the Ukrainian regime, where about seven million were killed under Stalin's attempt to starve the Ukrainians out of existence. Many of the NKVD agents sent to murder and enslave the Ukrainians were Jews, which endorses the comments of Demidenko-Darville and suggests another moral responsibility for the Jews.

There was also the publication in 1941 of the book by the Jew, Theodore Kaufman, entitled *Germany Must Perish*, which advocated, through sterilisation, the genocide of the German race

The Morgenthau Plan implemented at the end of World War II was intended to starve Germans on a massive scale and in the book by Alfred M de Zayas, entitled *Nemesis At Potsdam*, there is mention of the policy of genocide of Germans advocated by the Russian Jew, Ilya Ehrenberg. In 1943, Ehrenberg wrote in his book, *War*, "if you kill one German, kill another. There is nothing more amusing for us than a heap of German corpses. Do not count days, do not count versts. Count only the number of Germans killed by you. Kill the Germans - that is your grandmother's request. Kill the Germans - that is your child's prayer. Kill the Germans - that is your motherland's loud request. Do not miss. Do not let through. Kill!" (de Zayas, p.66)

In *An Eye For An Eye*, Jewish author John Sack documents the way in which Jews took control of concentration camps after World War II and set about killing captured Germans. Of an estimated 80,000 German POWs only 20,000 survived.

And all this creates a problem for the moralist. Christianity is under attack because it allegedly supported the attempted genocide of Jews. Revisionists suggest that this is an exaggerated claim, but even if it were true, the Jews - as I said earlier - would have to cast a mote the size of a Mack truck out of their own eyes first, since they are themselves guilty of attempted genocide, of the Christians under Bolshevism, of the Germans under Jewish attack. If Christianity is to be rejected on the basis of it supporting attempted genocide, Judaism is equally culpable for supporting genocide itself. These facts seem to escape the attention of the Jews and most of the Christian clergy who go along with them. How strange that it has escaped their attention.

Yet neither the Jews nor the Christian clergy have shown any serious attempt to find them responsible, or to suggest that this shows a moral failure in Judaism, because this would be terrible 'anti-Semitic prejudice'. No one shows any concern about anti-Christian and anti-goyim prejudice.

So the Jewish Holocaust pales by comparison with these and many other massacres of history, a fact never mentioned by most Jews and shabaz goyim.

But now we need to get down to business and examine the claim that Christians backed the Nazis.

Some of them did, but the reason **why they did has seldom been mentioned.**

The background to it has been mentioned by one Rabbi Reifer, who points out the extent to which support for Nazis was the outcome of a nationalist reaction against Jewish-led Communist attacks in Germany.

Rabbi Reifer Comments

Rabbi Manfred Reifer wrote a commentary which appeared in the magazine *Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2 September 1933. A translation reads as follows:

The present situation of the German Jews, is the conclusion of an historical process. It is a development, the beginning of which can be traced back to the time of Bismarck. It had to come this way, if one understands the deep historical import of this anti-Semitic movement, of which Adolf Hitler is the strongest exponent. Anyone who did not foresee that was afflicted with blindness. One tried to close one's eyes to the events and acted according to the vulgar principle: "what one does not want, one does not believe". That was a convenient way to avoid fundamental questions, to look at the world through rose-coloured glasses. The advocates of assimilation attempted to throw a veil over things and to play liberalism - long dead - as their last card. They thought they could evade the course of history by declaring themselves Germans of the Mosaic faith by denying the existence of a Jewish nation, by severing all the ties that bound them to Jewry, and by striking out the word 'Zion' from their prayer books and introducing Sunday Service, they looked upon anti-Semitism as a passing phenomenon which would be eliminated through intensive propaganda, through organization of a society for fighting it. Such were the thoughts of the great majority of German Jews. And hence the disappointment, the deep resignation in connection with Hitler's victory, hence the nameless despair, the spreading psychosis that culminated in suicide, the complete loss of morale.

But he who judges the events in Germany according to the principle of causality will have to judge the Nazi movements as the culmination of a natural development: he will also understand that history knows no accidents, that every epoch is the result of the preceding one. And here lies the key to the understanding of the present situation. The fight against Jewdom has been conducted in Germany for half a century and with German thoroughness. Scientific anti-Semitism has taken root in German soil.

All this the German Jews failed to see. They fed themselves on false hope, overlooked reality and dreamed of cosmopolitanism, of the time of Lessing and Mendelsohn. The uprooted Jews gave themselves fantastic ideas and nourished cosmopolitan dreams, and this expressed itself in a twofold manner; either they

became the liberals or they became the standard bearers of Socialism. Both fields of activity furnished new food to anti-Semitism.

So what Rabbi Reifer says to this point is that the Jews are afflicted with a kind of blindness that led them to ignore the evidence of mounting anti-Jewish feeling until it was too late. The field for the rise of Hitler and his Party were laid down decades before they arrived.

Next, Rabbi Reifer mentioned that the Jews interfered in the lives of the German people, which antagonized the Germans, and guaranteed the rise of anti-Jewish feelings:

*In all good faith, to serve themselves and humanity, the Jews began to reach actively into the life of the German people. With characteristic Jewish passion they threw themselves upon all fields of knowledge. They took hold of the Press, organised the working masses, and strove to influence the whole spiritual life in the direction of liberalism and democracy. **This of course would necessarily cause a deep reaction on the part of the host people.** When the Jews, for instance, took hold of the so-called international disciplines, whenever they achieved distinction in the fields of Physics, Chemistry, Medicine, Astronomy, and to a certain extent in the field of Philosophy, they might at most cause envy among their Aryan colleagues, but not general hatred of the whole nation. One did not like to see Jews become bearers of Nobel prizes but accepted it silently. But in the field of national discipline things are quite different. Here every nation strives to develop its own original powers and to transmit to the present and coming generation the fruits of the spiritual labours of the race. It is not a matter, who celebrates Mass, who urges going to church. The people of every nation wish that their young be educated in the same spirit. But while great parts of the German people fought for the maintenance of their kind, we Jews filled with our clamour the streets of Germania. We posed as world reformers and sought to influence public life through our ideas. We rang the bells and called to silent prayer, we prepared the "Lord's Supper" and celebrated resurrection.*

We played with the most holy possessions of the people and at times made fun of all that was sacred to the nation. We trusted to the imperishable rights of democracy and felt ourselves as equal citizens of the State within the German community. We posed as censors of the morals of the people, and poured out full cups of satire upon the German Michel. We wanted to be prophets in the pagan fields of Germans, and forgot ourselves so far that all this had to draw destruction on us.

So, Rabbi Reifer is saying that the Jews abused the beliefs of their host nation, and tried to take control in a way that offended the native Germans. They therefore prepared the way for their own destruction.

Manfred Reifer continues:

We Jews made revolutions, and ran as eternal godseekers, ahead of the masses of the people. We gave to the international proletariat a second Bible, one that was adequate to the times, and we roused the passions of the third estate. The Jew Marx from Germany declared war upon capitalism and the Jew La Salle organised the masses of the people in Germany itself. The Jew Eduard Bernstein popularised the Marxian ideology; and the Jews Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg brought the Spartacist movement to life. In Bavaria the Jew Kurt Eisner created the Bavarian Soviet Republic and was her first, and last, President. Against all this the German nation rebelled. She wanted to forge her own destiny and determine the future of her own children. Can we blame her?

What we objected to first of all was the world citizenship, the cosmopolitanism, which had Jews as its front fighters. These uprooted persons imagined they possessed the power to transplant the ideas of Isaiah into the valleys of Germany and to storm Valhalla with the Book of Amos; or rather, in so far as we succeeded, we buried the Jewish people under the ruins of a world that has collapsed.

Next Rabbi Reifer makes an amazing admission. He concedes that the Jews historically have rebelled against foreign influences, and that German nationalists have the right to do the same against foreign Jewish influences. Perhaps he had in mind the way Communist terrorists, mainly Jews, clashed with SS units in the streets of Germany:

Let us try to understand the Hitler regime. Have not we Jews rebelled, and conducted bloody wars against everything foreign? What were the wars of the Maccabees, but protests against a foreign, non-Jewish, way of life? And of what else did the long fight of the Prophets consist? Surely of nothing else than eliminating foreign elements. Consisted the foreign elements and foreign gods, and of keeping scared the original nature of Jewry? Have we not rebelled against the racially related Kings of the house of Idumeans? And have we not excluded the Samaritans from our community because they practised mixed marriages? Why should not the German nationalists do the same, when a Kurt Eisner appropriates to himself the prerogatives of the Wittelbachers? We must learn to look truth in the face and to draw lasting consequences.

In other words, we Jews should accept responsibility for our own actions.

We should not want to be false prophets, but to dodge facts does not mean solving the problem. What is occurring in Germany will come tomorrow in Russia. For all crimes which were the consequences of the Communist system, the Jews in Soviet Russia will have to suffer some day. We shall have to pay dearly for the fact that Trotsky, Joffe, Zinoviev, had leading posts in Soviet Russia.

So the good Rabbi is conceding what was earlier demonstrated: that Bolshevism was a Jewish invention which would generate a backlash from non-Jews. He even goes on to concede that Hitler came to power by democratic elections, whereas the Russian Revolution was imposed by force.

Was there not more sin against the democratic form in Soviet Russia than in Germany? While in Germany Hitler obtained in the election campaign a majority. In Russia there was no such thing. There a small minority - today after 15 years an organisation of barely four millions - proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat.

*The Jews attempt in Soviet Russia also to be announcers and pronouncers of the new absolute truth. They strive to interpret the Bolshevik Bible and to influence the way of thinking of the Russian people, **a process that calls forth earnest resistance and even today leads to anti-Semitic disruption.***

What will happen when the Soviet government will have fallen and democracy in Russia will celebrate its solemn entrance? Will the Jews fare better than today in Germany? Will not the Russian people behind the Trotskis the Kamenevs, Sinovievs, etc., discover their old Jewish names, and let their children suffer for the sins of their fathers? Or will it not even last that long, so that even the fathers' turn will come yet? Are there not examples for that? Did not thousands of Jews lose their lives in Hungary because the Jew Bela Kun erected a Soviet Republic on the soil of Stephan the Holy? The Hungarian Jews have paid very dearly for their prophetdom. Within the Internationals the Jews are the most radical elements. Germans, French, Poles, Czechs have a home and their internationalism lives itself out in Germany, France, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia. They are autochthonous, under home rights. That shows itself in practical rights. The Germans in 1914 burned their red flags in the Tiergarten at Berlin and went with the "Deutschland" on their lips, forth to war. The Polish socialist Daszinski stood in the forefront in the fight for the resurrection of Poland, and the Czech socialists sang with enthusiasm their Ratikwah "Kde domov muj"; only the Jews would hear nothing about home and fell as ostensible patriots on the field of liberty. The Jews Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner, Gustav Landauer.... "No Kaddosh will be spoken, no mass be read.."

They, and the children of Liberalism, all surely desired the best, but they attained the opposite; all those poets, authors, artists, journalists, prepared the present times, nourished Jew hatred, furnished the grounds, the material for the era of National Socialism. They were cursed with blindness, they saw not the approach of Nemesis, they heard not the footfall of time, the heavy footfall of time, the heavy footfall of the Nemesis of History.

So Rabbi Reifer says that the Jews largely brought 'Nazism' (and by extension the 'Holocaust') on themselves by ignoring the natural wishes of the host people for national self-realization and freedom and seeking to impose and exploit them for their

own ends. So the Jews generated a 'backlash' by Germans who wanted to maintain their own culture. Few Jews have been as magnanimous as Rabbi Reifer in conceding this.

German Christians v. Confessing Christians

Certain Christians did support the Nazis and thus, by implication, the events that led to the Big H., as long as we omit some of the exaggerations.

They were opposed by a minority group within the Christians called the Confessing Church which supported Protestant Christianity and broadly traditional teachings, expressed in the Barmen Confession of 1934, that sought to separate the Church from State influence, and declared that the Confessing Christians were the "true Church" while at the same time seeking recognition from the State. Certain churchmen, such as Niemler, came into conflict with the Nazis. In 1936 the Confessing Church issued a declaration condemning so-called anti-Semitism and demanding an end to state interference in the churches. Many were imprisoned and some were executed. This is part of the Christian holocaust we hear nothing about, not only from the Jews but from today's Christian clergy.

German Christians

But the German Christians, who did support the Nazis and succeeded in creating a Reich Bishop, were only 'useful idiots' in Hitler's plan. The comments of Hitler and his top henchmen show they did not support the Church, even the German Christians, and intended to supplant them. Thus, in effect, the church was being double crossed.

Nazis Opposed Christianity, Favoured Paganism

The Reich Bishop, Kerrl, said: "*The Party stands on the basis of Positive Christianity, and Positive Christianity is National Socialism....National Socialism is the doing of God's will....God's will reveals itself in German blood....Dr Zllner and Count Galen (the Catholic bishop of Mnster) have tried to make it clear to me that Christianity consists in faith in Christ as the son of God. That makes me laugh...No, Christianity is represented by the Party, and the Creed....True Christianity is represented by the Party, and the German people and now called by the Party and especially by the Fhrer to a real Christianity...the Fhrer is the herald of a new revelation*" (Shirer, **The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich**, p.239).

Martin Bormann, Hitler's secretary, said, "*National Socialism and Christianity are incompatible*". (Shirer, p. 240)

The Nazis were not especially impressed by the German Christians, who supported them. There is an internal note in the Propaganda Ministry:

...The endeavours of the organisation...are well meant, but there is no interest either in assimilating Christian teaching in national socialism or in proving that a reshaped Christianity is not fundamentally Jewish (Gene Edward Veith: **Modern Fascism - Liquidating the Judeo-Christian Worldview**, St Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1993.

Catholic Front

Hitler kept up a 'front' of being a Roman Catholic, and ordered officials such as Gring and Goebbels to remain on the rolls of their churches. But to party insiders, Hitler revealed that he had long ago renounced Christianity, and wanted to solve the 'Church Problem' after the war:

The war is going to be over. The last great task of our age will be to solve the church problem. It is only then that the nation will be wholly secure...this sort of thing cannot be rushed. It must rot away like a gangrened member". Hitler boasted that "*I have six divisions of the SS composed of men absolutely indifferent on matters of religion. It doesn't prevent them going to their deaths with serenity in their souls*". (Veith, p.66)

Christian churches were forced to merge their youth groups with the Hitler Youth, but this did not lead to endorsing of their views in the Hitler Youth. Hitler Youth songs made it clear that they rejected Christianity:

*We are the happy Hitler Youth,
We have no need of Christian virtue;
For Adolf Hitler is our intercessor
And our redeemer.
No priest, no evil can keep us
From feeling like Hitler's children
Not Christ do we follow but Horst Wessel!
Away with incense and holy water pots.*

*Singing we follow Hitler's banners;
Only then are we worthy of our ancestors.*

I am not Christian and no Catholic.

I go with the SA through thick and thin.

The Church can be stolen from me for all I care.

The swastika makes me happy here on earth.

Him will I follow in marching step:

Baldur von Schirach, take me along.

Some Nazi officials tried to restore the paganism of ancient tribes. Gring recognized ancient Celtic rites. The Farmer's Almanac of 1935, published by the Ministry of Agriculture, tried to replace Christian holidays with days commemorating Wotan and Thor. Good Friday was replaced by a day commemorating those killed by Charlemagne in attempting to convert the Saxons. (Veith, p.68)

In short, National Socialism was not a creation of Christianity, but was opposed to it. Any alliance between Christianity and Nazism was short lived and the Christians were punished by being arrested and having their church brought under control.

Zionism

There is, however, a group that strongly collaborated with Nazism, and that was the Zionists.

In The Holocaust Victims Accuse (Naturei Karta of USA, GPO Box 2143, Brooklyn, New York, 11202, USA) the author Orthodox Jew, Rebe Moshe Schonfeld, complains that Zionists collaborated with Nazis during World War II and put the needs of a Zionist state after the war before any consideration of the suffering of Jews during World War II.

Rebe Schonfeld maintains the myths about the six million, the gas chambers, the 'bars of soap' but makes Zionists his target.

He mentions that Zionists were the 'kapos' 'trusties' in German prison camps, and that these 'kapos' treated Jews worse, in many cases, than Nazi prison guards. (pp.20-21) Schonfeld mentions that at the 1937 London Zionist Congress Dr Weizmann refused to extend assistance to European Jews if they were old people that would be of no value to a Zionist state (p.25). With friends like this, who needs enemies!

Greenbaum Rejects Jews

In 1943, Yitschak Greenbaum, chairman of the acting committee for the rescue of European Jewry, gave a speech in which he mentioned that "when they (Jews) came to us with the two plans - the rescue of the masses of Jews in Europe or the redemption of the land - I vote, without a second thought, for the redemption of the land. The more said about the slaughter of our people, the greater the minimisation of our efforts to strengthen and promote the Hebraicisation of the land If there would be a possibility today of buying packages of food with the money of the 'Keren Hayesod' (United Jewish Appeal) to send it through Lisbon, would we do such a thing. No! Once again, No!" (ibid. p.116)

For such Zionists, it was quite acceptable to refuse to send money, food or assistance of any kind to starving or suffering Jews. For them, they were expendable units: all that counted with the forthcoming Zionist state was young agile workers.

Rebe Schonfeld gives many more details of those he calls "Jewish war criminals" (just as well he, a Jew, said it, and not a 'goy') but he gives the title of "emperor of those war criminals of the Holocaust" to Dr Mordechai Ehrenpreis, the Chief Rabbi of Sweden (ibid. p.108).

When, in 1939, the Swedish parliament passed a law which allowed entry to tens of thousands of German Jews, Ehrenpreis insisted that this law not be carried out and it was cancelled (ibid. p.111)

This action in blocking refugees from Germany entering Sweden, is said to have cost the lives of thousands of Jews (ibid. p.111)

Christians Not Guilty

In conclusion, therefore, ladies and gentlemen, we shall have to present a proper view of history based on historical rather than hysterical evidence, finding that the Jews contributed to the rise of Nazism and that Zionism contributed to the murder of Jews.

Some Christians did support Hitler, partly as a reaction against the murder of Christians by Communist Jews, and partly as an attempt to revive the fortunes of the Christian Church. But they alone cannot be held solely morally culpable.

The Rev. Professor Robert Andrew Anderson, AM

Professor Anderson is the Chairman of the Special Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council of Christians and Jews to 'present areas of the New Testament in a manner without exciting hatred'

In answer to Michael Mazur's concluding comment in his letter to Professor Anderson - Adelaide Institute newsletter No 44 - the following extract appears in Who's Who In Australia:

Anderson, Rev. Robert Andrew, MA, BD; Professor of Old Testament Studies Ormonf College since 1965; son of RA Anderson; b. Aug. 20, 1928; ed. RNA Coll., Univ. Edinburgh; Chrmn. Cl. Christians and Jews since 1985, Haileybury Coll. Cl. Since 1983, Princ. Uniting Church Theological Hall Melb. 1977-80, Moderator Presb. Church of Vic. 1973-74, Pres. Melb. Coll. Of Divinity 1972-73, Princ. Theological Hall Ormond Coll. 1965-77, Prof of Old Testament Studs. Emmanuel Coll. Brisb. 1961-65, Minr. St. James' Presb. Church Prosperpine Qld. 1959-60; V-Pres. Asian Christian Youth Assembly 1965; Editor Life and Service of Asian Youth Today; publication, Signs and Wonders: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (1984); m. Dec 22, 1956, Jean, T. T. Beveridge, 1 s. 1 d.; recreations, gardening, reading; address, 2 Studley Avenue, Kew, Vic 3101.

Lutheran apology for views on Jews

By Religious Affairs Writer Nick Smart, *The Advertiser*, 25 October 1996

The Lutheran Church has admitted it has treated Jews with "prejudice and misunderstanding". In a written apology released by its Council of Presidents, the Church says teachings encouraged the persecution of Jewish people.

The admission has been welcomed by Jewish leaders as an important step in strengthening ties between the two religions. The statement, published in this month's edition of the church paper, *The Lutheran*, calls for an end to anti-Semitic attitudes among church members and for Lutherans to treat Jews with "love and understanding. We declare that all forms of anti-Semitism are contrary to the Christian way of life," the document says.

It draws attention to the anti-Jewish writings of church founder Martin Luther, which have been used to justify the persecution of Jews. "It is also true that the stress in Australian Lutheranism on the doctrinal gulf between Judaism and Christianity has led to instances of unloving attitudes by Lutherans who, through ignorance, envy or fear, accept bigoted information put out by extreme right-wing groups," the statement says.

The church's national president, the Reverend Dr Lance Steicke, said yesterday that while the church felt it was necessary to apologise for negative views expressed in the past, it also wanted to "celebrate" church members who had treated Jews with respect.

He cited the example of a Lutheran pastor who wrote to German Jews in 1938 deploring the views of the Nazis and inviting Jews to settle in Australia with the support of local Lutheran communities. However, the statement released by the church admits that Lutheran papers before and during World War II often published German propaganda against Jews.

Dr Steicke said the church's apology showed it could move beyond its past and "develop a better dialogue with Judaism".

The Chief Minister of the Adelaide Hebrew Congregation, Rabbi Baruch David, said: "I see this as part of the process that began at the end of World War II when the Christian church was confronted with the terrible truth that the Holocaust happened in Christian Europe.

"This group has gone a long way towards righting the wrongs of Christian teaching against the Jews," he said.

Our Comment: It is now time for Rabbi Davis to apologise to all non-Jews for the hatred and filth that is found in The Babylonian Talmud. Individuals who have been exposed to its contents are taught how to become immoral. Only when the good Rabbi apologises for the disgusting hate material in The Babylonian Talmud will the religious moral equation be in balance. Martin Luther was well aware of the hate material contained in the various volumes of The Babylonian Talmud. If the reader does not believe us, then go to your library and read the books.

Race debate an ugly affair, says Dame Elisabeth *The Advertiser*, 8 November 1996

The mother of media owner Mr Rupert Murdoch yesterday described the current race debate as an "ugly affair" as she launched a brochure designed to teach Australians about the Jewish Holocaust.

Speaking in Melbourne, Dame Elisabeth Murdoch said a particular woman had caused "enormous damage" but she had faith in the Prime Minister, Mr Howard, and the general public. Although Dame Elisabeth declined to name anyone it was understood she was referring to controversial Queensland MP Mrs Pauline Hanson, whose stance on immigration and public funding of Aboriginal programs has sustained an on-going racism debate.

Dame Elisabeth was launching a publicity brochure for the modest south east suburban Melbourne Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre, to which she recently donated a substantial sum.

She said the brochure was timely because it was being launched during the "very ugly affair of the racial (debate)".

"I won't name her, but I think unfortunately she has done enormous damage, but of course it can be repaired.

"Really, altogether I think we are tolerant and understanding" Dame Elisabeth said she believed Mr Howard was handling the fallout of statements by the woman appropriately.

Russia, UK straighten nazi record

The West Australian, 30 October 1996. NB: This newspaper uses a lower case **n** in the word Nazi. Russia and Britain made moves yesterday to set the record straight on Nazi atrocities. Russia's Federal Security Service has turned over copies of 15,000 pages from the archives of the former Soviet KGB to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. The documents may shed new light on the first mass killings of Jews after the German attack on the Soviet Union in 1941.

And Britain was to hand back 1.5 tonnes of gold, worth about \$25 million, to the Albanian Government. The gold, stolen from the Albanian central bank during World War II, has been held in the Bank of England since 1945.

The Russian documents were taken from wartime field reports and post-war Soviet legal proceedings. They are expected to offer fresh evidence of the brutal attacks by the German units known as Einsatzgruppen - killing squads that rushed into Soviet territory behind the invading German troops and slaughtered more than a million Jews and others in 1941 and 1942. Most of the documents have not been seen before in the West and experts have yet to determine their significance. The decision to turn them over to the museum in Washington marks another milestone in Russia's gradual path towards revealing the Soviet Union's darkest secrets. Director of the museum Walter Reich said the documents would contribute to a chronicle of the massacres by the Nazis just after the June 1941 invasion of the Soviet Union.

Of the 5 million Jews living in the Soviet Union at the start of the war, more than 2 million were in areas overrun by the Nazis. According to historian Nora Levin, they were primarily in Ukraine, Belarus and western Russia. She said the most savage slaughter was outside Kiev, where 33,000 Jews were killed in two days in the ravine Babi Yar.

Russian historian Vladimir Naumov, who helped assemble the materials, said the documents showed the extent to which the German regular army cooperated with the executions. Britain's decision to hand back the gold follows lengthy diplomatic negotiations since the fall of Albania's communist dictatorship in 1991.

Britain had blocked the gold's return until Albania accepted responsibility for the death of 44 Royal Navy sailors killed in 1946 when two destroyers hit mines in the strait between Corfu and Albania. The Albanians were to hand the British Government a warrant for \$2.7 million compensation at a ceremony at the Foreign Office in London yesterday. Veterans of the "Corfu incident" criticised the exchange because the compensation was a tenth of the \$27 million awarded to Britain by the International Court of Justice in 1951. When Albania refused to pay, Britain blocked Albania's claim for the return of gold looted under Nazi occupation.

BROCKSCHMIDT'S THOUGHTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE AND ANTI-GERMAN PROPAGANDA

This is how The University of Adelaide's Department of Continuing Education advertised a five session course of evening lectures:

Could it happen again?

Heinz Kent lived through Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime and is well placed to pose the question: Will history repeat itself? Heinz draws on his own experience as well as world events to put forward his powerful - and often disturbing - points of view. This course has proved tremendously popular in the past.

Hitler's Germany: Will History Repeat?

Dr Heinz Kent lived in Germany when Hitler came to power. He will challenge you to consider, why and how the holocaust happened and what it was like. The big question is, could it happen again there or elsewhere? Dr Kent is a regular visitor to Germany.

Heinz Kent experienced the rise of Nazism in Germany. He was arrested by the Gestapo in 1933, and on his fortunate release went to Denmark where he studied agriculture on the island of Bornholm and at Copenhagen. Having gained his diploma he moved to England and then to New Zealand where he was farm manager. He served in the New Zealand army. He joined the University of New Zealand as a mature age student. Upon completing his degree he worked in adult education and lectured in history at the University of New Zealand. He later went to Cambridge where he received his doctorate. He joined the staff of The University of Adelaide and retired after 26 years as a Reader in History. Heinz Kent is also a prize winning author.

Both David Brockschmidt and Fredrick Töben of the Adelaide Institute attended Professor Kent's course. Here are their personal observations.

Fredrick Töben Reports

I shall leave it to Associate, David Brockschmidt, to recount what we learned in Dr Kent's seminar. I merely wish to point out how Dr Kent belongs to a wider network of university educators who are literally misleading their students about World War II history. Little wonder then that critical thinking at university level has sunk to an all-time low. Any disagreement or any challenging statement about historical facts is regarded as a disruption, a personal attack, a sign of antisemitism or racism! No wonder the history departments at our universities resemble ideological faculties reminiscent of Marxist-Leninist state-run institutions. Anyone who does not toe the official party line can kiss good-bye to an academic career.

Professor Kent's course reminded me of a dogmatic, anti-German- bashing session to which most of the twenty or so students willingly yielded. The age of students ranged from about 20 to 70, and youthful-looking, softly-spoken, silver-haired and gentlemanly Dr Kent was the oldest in the room.

This created a problem for me. Should I bite my tongue and not ask pressing questions that arose in my mind during the seminar in my quest to learn new things or should I override Dr Kent's disarming and charming monologue and seek clarifications? I need not have worried because Mr Brockschmidt drew the fire instead and because his knowledge of German history is extensive, he could not let Dr Kent get away with blatant falsehoods.

Dr Kent, for example, claimed that Germans have a pathological hatred towards Jews and he shared Daniel Goldhagen's expressed view on this topic. Correctly, Mr Brockschmidt pointed out to Dr Kent that the roots of antisemitism lie in **The Babylonian Talmud**, and that it flourished long before Martin Luther's perceived antisemitism.

During session four, Dr Kent distributed a copy of the following letter addressed to *The Advertiser* newspaper:

July 6, 1996

Dear Sir/Madam

An item in your Saturday paper dealt with an antisemitic group here in Adelaide that among other things accuses the Talmud of

being anti-Christian and anti-gentile. Most people will know how to evaluate such slander, but the gullible may possibly be taken in. As a university lecturer in Judaism I can assure your readers that the Hebrew Scriptures (the "Old Testament" as Christians call it) teaches, the Talmud therefore reaffirms, and the Jews believe, that one does not need to be Jewish to be saved: the entire Book of Job is about a non-Jew, Job, who is a lofty model of righteousness also for Jews, and the Book of Jonah makes clear that even the normally polytheistic Ninevites needed only to live up to the best and purest teachings preserved in their own religion to be acceptable to God: they did not need to convert to Judaism.

The Talmudic rabbis almost two thousand years ago systematized this teaching in their doctrine of the "Noahite covenant": God made a covenant with all of humanity at the time of Noah, they taught, and any non-Jew fulfils it who is a godly, good and kind persons (extending this also to elementary kindness to animals); all such people are assured of salvation, for Judaism holds that God is truly merciful, relates directly to every person and every culture, and would not exclude people from salvation because of mere doctrine. Jews have therefore never felt the need to declare crusades to "save people's souls," and they have been able to participate in a wide diversity of cultures and gladly affirm righteous persons of any religion.

The Talmud teaches that every human being is in the image of God and deserves our care; charity should be given to non-Jewish poor and needy along with Jewish recipients, and one is obliged according to Talmudic sages to deal honourably with everyone in business and everyday life regardless of religion. The law of the land is even given priority over Jewish law, as long as it does not specifically attack fundamental Jewish values and community.

Since Christianity has largely arisen out of Judaism, there is much in it that Jews fully and lovingly endorse. Naturally, they do not agree with all of its basic doctrines, or they would be Christians. The Talmud has next to no clear-cut reference to Christianity. The great medieval Jewish Talmudist, Maimonides, however did teach that both Christianity and Islam have served a providential purpose in disseminating the Torah, the Teachings of God contained in the Hebrew Bible, to the ends of the earth, spreading the love of God and righteousness everywhere. Jews have historically been happy to join with all non-Jews in supporting such values, and believe that when all humanity peacefully practices them, it will be the longed-for messianic era.

Sincerely, Dr Evan M Zuesse, Religion Studies, University of South Australia, Underdale, South Australia 5032.

Mr Brockschmidt responds

26 September 1996

Dear Dr Zuesse

I refer to your letter of 6 July 1996 addressed to *The Advertiser*, and handed out by Dr Heinz Kent in his five session course 'Hitler's Germany: Will History Repeat?'

Would you please confirm for me that there are no anti-Goyim, anti-Gentile and anti-Christian remarks in *The Babylonian Talmud*. From the contents of your letter, I cannot quite work out whether *The Babylonian Talmud* makes any derogatory comments about anything or anyone.

Yours sincerely,

David Brockschmidt.

Needless to say Mr Brockschmidt is still waiting for a reply.

*

Interestingly, Professor Kent categorically denied the fact that the Barr-Smith Library, at The University of Adelaide, did not hold a copy of *The Babylonian Talmud*. We prepared a Press Release for the final session. Likewise, Dr Kent had "his students" hand out and handed it out at the final session. The fact that 'great minds think alike' must explain why a 45-odd page package was handed out to Dr Kent's students. The unsigned, unnamed cover sheet claimed that:

This document has been produced by students of Dr Kent's course in German History within the University of Adelaide Department of Continuing Education.

Unfortunately the course has been disrupted by the activities of two students who appear determined to harass Dr Kent and intimidate and insult other members of the class.

Consequently, the following documents have been obtained over the Internet to cast light upon the activities of people who call themselves Historical Revisionists but are better known by the Historical community as Holocaust Deniers.

The Internet is a useful tool for conducting these enquiries and though it is not in itself an absolutely reliable source of information the texts presented here are predominantly adequately sourced and attributed.

The following documents are presented for your appraisal in order to help us all deal with and understand the motives and actions of those who have tried persistently to prevent the serious consideration of Dr Kent's lectures.

1. David Irving. *Australia urged to Bar Entry of Holocaust Denier* (Boston Jewish Advocate, Dec 25-31 1992.)

2. David Irving's *Hitler a Faulty History Dissected*. (sic) Two essays by Eberhard Jckel.

3. Quote "The attempt..."

4. Auschwitz. *Compiling the Estimates on Numbers Exterminated*

5. Auschwitz. *How many people died at Auschwitz?* Nizkor Project Ken McVay

6. *Responses to Revisionist arguments* Copyright Simon Wiesenthal Centre 9760 West Pico Blvd. Los Angeles Ca. 90035 USA

7. *Open Letter to Fredrick Tben Nizkor FTP archive, Usenet-alt.revisionist news group*

8. *Adelaide Institute Homepage. The views and arguments of two Adelaide-based Holocaust deniers*

9. *How Loud is The Voice of The Survivor, Generation Journal generation Vol. 3 Number 4 November 1993.*

*

That was not the end of it. All students were sent the following letter from The University of Adelaide Continuing Education's Deputy Director, Jenny Ransome:

23 September 1996

Dear Student

I am writing to all students who participated in the class called *Hitler's Germany: Will History Repeat?* I am well aware that for some of you this was not the most positive experience and I apologise that the course could not be run in a spirit of open enquiry and tolerant debate. I am proud of the fact that our program is open to everyone, however, I am extremely disappointed that some people were disruptive and stifled the debate.

The student information guide printed on the back of the map you received when you enrolled states that it is unacceptable to tape any Continuing Education lectures without the expressed permission of the presenter. If any part of the course was taped please destroy the tapes at once. It has also come to my attention that photographs were taken: this is also prohibited and I ask that these are destroyed immediately.

Once again I apologise if you were upset by the behaviour of some other class members. I hope that in the future all Continuing Education students who enrol in our course will be able to participate fully in the discussion without any threat from their fellow students.

Yours sincerely, Jenny Ransome

Our comment: After receipt of this letter Mr Brockschmidt and I wished to speak to Ms Ransome so that we could clarify some matters raised in her letter. She was in her office taking a telephone call, but after ten minutes the Director of Continuing Education, Mr David Israel, appeared on the scene. His slouching and hand-in-the-pocket style of welcoming visitors reflected the intellectual climate of his department. As expected, our seeking clarification was met by his threatening to call security to have us evicted from the building.

Interestingly, Dr Kent's second lecture series: *Tsars and Commissars* was cancelled "due to low enrolments".

Mr Brockschmidt and I are in the process of submitting our proposal to conduct at the university a course on the Jewish-Nazi Holocaust. We would focus specifically on the contentious allegations that homicidal gas chambers operated at Auschwitz.

We are also taking bets on the likelihood of Mr David Israel accepting our proposal.

David Brockschmidt Reports Hindenburg's Hop-Scotch, Hitler, German and European History - according to Dr Heinz Kent

When I looked at the advertisement announcing Dr Kent's course at **The University of Adelaide**, *Hitler's Germany: Will History Repeat?* I was really excited. I thought that Adelaide is not really such a backwater city as a lot of Aussies think it is. There is a saying that Adelaide is a good place to be born and a good place to die - but in between you had better be somewhere else.

Well, at least for these so-called history lectures, which were a pinnacle of political correctness, I wish I had been elsewhere. I am certain that Dr Kent would agree with me because he, too, would have loved seeing me somewhere else. The sad part is that most of Dr Kent's students also would have loved seeing me anywhere but at the seminar. One student even told me that if he had a gun, he would shoot me. But then, even our lecturer, while referring to one of his political opponents during his youth in Breslau, now Poland, stated: "If I had had a gun, then I would have shot this man." I asked myself, "Hell, what's going on here? Is this an historian giving a history lecture or is this a meeting of the Australian Shooters Party?"

I soon gained the impression that the main driving force behind these sessions was not a desire to analyse history in order to separate the historical facts from the hysterical facts of war propaganda but rather a feeling of hate - hate against the Nazis, hate against the Germans.

But it did not end there. Within a short time nearly everyone attending the course had been infected by the 'Goldhagen virus', and so, basically we had five sessions of German- bashing, or rather Prussian-bashing.

According to Dr Kent, we now know that the German emperor, Kaiser Wilhelm II, was arrogant, an incompetent ruler and "the greatest fool in Christendom". Bismarck was a war monger whose 'Soziale Gesetze' (social security legislation) existed only on paper. The legislation had never been enacted - something which is not correct. Hindenburg was a silly, senile old fool, and Hitler an illiterate. I wonder who wrote for him his book *Mein Kampf*?

And last but not least, the most important piece of information to emerge out of Dr Kent's course was the fact that Hitler was a Rothschild and therefore also a Jew! So, following Dr Kent's logic, the Jewish-Nazi Holocaust must have been an act of Jewish self-hate when "Adolf" discovered that he was 'one of them'.

Well, hearing all that nearly blew my socks off. I had heard many strange things in my life but I had never heard this before. For me, this history lecture was a mixture between *Woman's World* and *Monty Python*. I thought to myself that this lecturer has a great sense of humour and so Dr Kent should have studied comedy instead of history. However, the tragedy of this lecturer is that he was serious about what he was telling us.

As the story goes, according to Dr Kent, once a week the Wilhelmstrasse in Berlin, running past the Chancellery, was closed to traffic. You wonder why, dear reader? Parades? State visits? Any other official or semi-official functions? Did Hindenburg have a rave party once a week? Nothing of the sort. According to Dr Kent, Hindenburg "the silly old fool" wanted to play hop-scotch. This is actually still a state secret, so please don't pass it on. Hindenburg was addicted to playing hop-scotch, and this addiction changed the course of world history - all this according to Dr Heinz Kent. But there is more.

As the story goes, Hindenburg's son, Oskar, General Ludendorff and other Prussian military brass met secretly to decide that Hitler should become the next German Chancellor. The only problem was how to convince old man Hindenburg that Hitler was the best choice, that he could get them out of the mess into which Germany was dropped by a failed monarchy, a totally corrupt and incompetent Weimar Republic, and by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles - we all know the saying that the political Hitler was born at Versailles - by communists' coup

d'etats and by the manipulation of the Wall Street money mafia who are the real villains in this historical poker game.

So, Oskar von Hindenburg informed his father, Paul von Hindenburg, that his group had decided to make Hitler Germany's Chancellor. The group believed that it was only Hitler who could get the six million unemployed off the streets. Were Hindenburg to refuse their request, then they would threaten to take away his hop-scotch game! What happened next, dear reader, you know yourself. Hindenburg made Hitler Chancellor and continued to play hop-scotch until he dropped dead.

So here we have the first revisionist comedian-historian, Dr Heinz Kent from the University of Adelaide. What an asset for any university. Unfortunately the funny side of Dr Kent ended abruptly when I began to ask historically relevant but politically incorrect questions. Our comedian-historian wanted to be taken seriously, and the fun was over! If his interpretation of history - which consisted mainly of story-telling - is not revisionist history, then I don't know what is historical revisionism. We now know that had Hindenburg not been so keen on playing hop-scotch, then Hitler may not have been made Chancellor and the Jewish-Nazi Holocaust and World War II would never have happened.

You see, folks, that's real revisionist history, and not the way David Irving goes about it by visiting archives. By the way, Dr Kent calls David Irving "a creature" and "a neo-Nazi" propagandist who is not an historian". Isn't it cheap to label and smear people if they are not present to defend themselves? David Irving is the most important military historian of the Third Reich. He, for certain, has done his homework throughout these past 40 years. I can't say the same for our history professor, Dr Heinz Kent. So perhaps Kent is only jealous of Irving's achievements. That's why Kent calls Irving "a creature" and "a neo-Nazi" which he is not. His latest book, *Goebbels, Mastermind of the Third Reich*, is anything but a pro-Nazi book.

[Fredrick Töben made a point of defending Irving's work output by bringing along and showing the *Goebbels* book. Earlier a student had brought along the Goldhagen book, and Fredrick asked why it is that Irving's book is not available in Adelaide book shops while this anti-German *Hitler's Willing Executioners* is everywhere.]

Dr Kent had, of course, 99% of his students on-side. They hopped into me for asking questions which one was not supposed to ask. One gentleman told me that there are certain taboo topics I had better not touch. I personally was surprised that there was any reaction at all from some of the students. Adelaide folks are so polite that sometimes I had the feeling I am sitting among a bunch of 'living corpses'. I do admit, however, that sometimes my temperament bubbles over. This must be the Slavic blood in me because my father's mother was Polish.

But, dear reader, how would you feel after experiencing what I have recounted so far? We talked about antisemitism - which I personally and all **Adelaide Institute** associates condemn - when Dr Kent tried to tell his students that there is no copy of *The Babylonian Talmud* in the university's Barr-Smith Library. In fact he said that *The Babylonian Talmud* does not exist! He said, *Don't listen to this man, David Brockschmidt!*

Well, I thought, here we go again. Our history professor is making jokes again. The tragedy, of course, is that he was serious. I replied:

Sorry, Dr Kent, but if you say *The Babylonian Talmud* does not exist, then that's like saying *The Torah* does not exist, or the Earth is flat, and the Moon is made of cheese.

At this point our history professor lost his humour and said:

Brochs Schmidt, halt die Schnauze or I'll call security.

Translated this means, 'keep your trap shut'. He said this to me on numerous occasions, and his politically correct audience agreed with him. Brave New World, I said, here we come. Of course I did not keep my Schnauze shut, and I kept on asking politically incorrect questions.

Question: Dr Kent, tell us about the roots of antisemitism. Is it not found in the pathological anti-Gentile *Babylonian Talmud* as is so wonderfully explained by Holocaust survivor and former professor of organic chemistry in Jerusalem, and president of the Israeli Civil Liberties Union, Dr Israel Shahak?

Dr Kent: There is no Babylonian Talmud and Shahak must be a crazy man. I don't know him.

Question: Tell us about the Ha'avara Transfer Agreement between the Nazis and the Zionists in then Palestine and their cooperation and collaboration between 1933 and 1943?

Dr Kent: I have never heard of such an Agreement. You're talking nonsense, Brochs Schmidt. Halt die Schnauze! I'm in charge here.

My response: Jawohl, Herr Kent, sorry for asking.

Question: Dr Kent, could you tell us whether Simon Wiesenthal was a Nazi agent and Nazi collaborator? I ask this because the late Jewish president of Austria, Dr Bruno Kreisky said Wiesenthal was a Nazi agent who even had invited a concentration camp commandant to his daughter's wedding?

Dr Kent: Halt die Schnauze, Brochs Schmidt!

Question: You told us the Kaiser was an arrogant fool. Would you **have called his Jewish banker, Jakob Schiff**, a fool? Do you recall that the Kaiser brought Lenin back from Switzerland to Russia in a sealed train compartment so that Lenin could start - with his up to 90% Bolshevik Jewish nomenclatura - one of the biggest genocides in world history? Did not Jakob Schiff also help finance the Bolsheviks as did Olaf Aschberg, J P Morgan Banking, George W Perkins, NYA Banken, Ruskom Bank? And didn't Schiff also help negotiate Leon Trotsky-Bronstein's dealings on behalf of the Bolshevik government in New York in 1917 with the Wall Street mafia?

Dr Kent: I don't know Jakob Schiff or Olaf Aschberg. Brochs Schmidt, you talk nonsense. Shut up!

Dr Kent's students happily agreed with him.

Question: Dr Kent, you told us your hop-scotch version as to how Hitler came to power. What about the German resistance against the Nazis between 1933 and 1945? For example, the White Rose student resistance at Munich; the working class Edelweiss Piraten from Berlin; the Bonhofer Circle; the Rote Kapelle; the resistance groups in the army, air force, navy; the resistance in the party apparatus; in academia; within the Catholic and Protestant churches; individual resistance; and Jewish resistance?

Dr Kent: There was hardly any resistance. They were nearly all for Hitler.

My response: Well, if this was the case, which I know it is not, then Hitler must have done something right for Germany. I cannot believe that nearly 80 million Germans supported an illiterate maniac who had, between 1933 and 1939, done everything wrong. What about the Nazi economic miracle between 1933 and 1939?

Dr Kent: Halt die Schnauze, Brochs Schmidt. There was no economic miracle!

Dr Kent would emphatically slap the palm of his right hand on the desk, and there was controlled hurt surging through to his eyes.

Question: Dr Kent, can you tell us how many members of the established Weimar Republic parties joined the N.S.D.A.P. on their own free will after Hitler came to power?

Dr Kent: I remember one from my own group, the Reichsbanner, who turned up in SA uniform one day.

My response: The fact is that millions joined the Nazi party, approximately 12 million people, and a lot of Jews would have joined had Hitler let them. But we should not forget that they had their own Nazi-fascist and Stalinist-Leninist movements and parties.

Dr Kent: Brochs Schmidt, halt's Maul. I teach history here.

Here is an example how Dr Kent interprets Hitler's Lebensraum - living space - policy.

Wherever Germans had settled in the world, that very spot of settlement became 'holy German soil' which then had to be liberated and incorporated into a Greater Germany. Had this been the case, then large parts of North, Central and South America, Southern Africa, most of South Australia, and many other parts of the world would have had to be incorporated into the Reich. You could then have correctly called Germany, Great Germany - like Great Britain. Of course history, until the outbreak of World War II, tells a different story to that told to us by Dr Kent. The Nazi policy was not to incorporate 'holy German soil' in foreign countries. Rather, the catch-cry was 'Heim ins Reich' - home, back into the empire. It meant that all ethnic

Germans overseas were encouraged to return home to build a new Germany. And they came by the hundreds and thousands, from everywhere, even from the USA. The re-settlement of the Wartegau Germans and the Baltic Germans, for example, took place because these Germans were happy to leave their so-called 'holy German soil' in foreign countries because they wanted to come home into the Reich.

Question: Dr Kent, you explained to us Hitler's Lebensraum Politik. The re-settlement politics of the Nazis for Germans from Wartegau and the Baltic states, for example, contradicts what you have said.

Dr Kent: There was no re-settlement of Germans into the Reich. This is nonsense, Brockschmidt. What are your qualifications? Halt die Schnauze!

A brief digression

Let's have another look at other parts of Europe which wanted *Heim ins Reich*. Austria, of course! Just watch old newsreels of Hitler's triumphant entry into Vienna and other Austrian cities and villages. There is no question that the vast majority of Austrians wanted to live in one German Reich. This is normal of people who speak the same language, have partly a common history and share a common culture. The same happened with the Sudetenland Germans. Of course the Czechs didn't like it because it was the beginning of the end of their democratic country, especially after Slovakia split from them and established its own state. The Slovaks had also become German allies. To this point the German troops had been welcomed with flowers. But when the Germans marched into Prague, thereby breaking the Mnchen Agreement, the Czechs were also betrayed by the Allies who had been the guarantors of the Czech state. Then there were no flowers welcoming them but fists and tears of anger. Unfortunately the Czechs had twice to live through the trauma of occupation, first in 1938 by the Nazis and then in 1968 by the Soviet Communist block.

After Austria became part of the Reich, called the Ostmark, the people of German-speaking South Tyrol, also wanted to join the Reich. They had had enough of being ruled from Rome. In this case, "Adolf" had to let them down because he needed the Duce as his political and military ally for his future plans of re-organising Europe.

At the beginning of World War II in Poland, the German army was not welcomed either. The Nazis and the Bolsheviks divided this country between themselves, but we should not forget that this dissolution of the Polish state has its own history. The Poles were not angels either. In the 1920-21 Polish-Soviet War, which the Poles started, Poland took large slices of Russia, even conquering Kiev and parts of Lithuania. Of course Stalin took all that back from the Poles as a result of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. For their loss of territory, the Poles were given large parts of Germany after 1945. The Poles, of course, had had their own expansionist plans between World War I and II, not only towards Soviet Russia and the Baltic states, but also towards Germany. Had general Pilsudski had his way, the border between Poland and Germany would not have been the Oder-Neisse rivers but the River Elbe. That would have meant that Poland would have swallowed up Middle Germany too, which the Poles claimed as a Slavic settlement area.

I'm mentioning this so that we do not forget that it was not only Hitler who wanted Lebensraum. Other national leaders had similar ambitions, and had they been given a chance, they would have created pacts either by means of war and/or political blackmail. The real reason of the German-Polish territorial dispute rests with the annexation of German territory after it lost World War I. The victors had redrawn the national boundaries and forced the Versailles Dictate on the German nation, and so laid down the groundwork of World War II. We know that the political Hitler was born at Versailles. When he came to power in 1933, all orchestrated and financed by the international financial cabal, Hitler started to take back all lost territories which had been stolen from Germany after World War I, and in flagrant violation of the Geneva and The Hague War Conventions. A similar conflict has been witnessed in our time in the Gulf states between Iraq and Kuwait.

The flower-power welcome for German troops started again when they crossed into the Baltic states, Belarus, Ukraine, large parts of Russia, especially in the Caucasus area. All these

nations hoped that Hitler would bring them freedom from Stalin's communist tyranny. Naturally these nations joined the German army to fight the communists. One of the reasons why so many Jews were killed in eastern Europe and in Russia was that a lot of them, but of course not all, were communist partisans and commissars in the Red Army.

The peoples of eastern Europe and Russia did not forget what a destructive and murderous regime was run mainly by communist Jews. These fanatics even killed their own religious brothers and sisters by the tens of thousands. I refer to Winston Churchill's famous article as it appeared in The Illustrated Sunday Herald, 8 February 1920, p.5. Let me quote two passages from this article:

International Jews

In violent opposition to all this sphere of Jewish effort rise the schemes of the International Jews. The adherents of this sinister confederacy are mostly men reared up among the unhappy populations of countries where Jews are persecuted on account of their race. Most, if not all, of them have forsaken the faith of their forefathers, and divorced from their minds all spiritual hopes of the next world. This movement among the Jews is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.

Terrorist Jews

There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistic Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably out weighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus Tchitcherin, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate Litvinoff, and the influence of Russians like Bukharin or Lunacharski cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky, or of Zinovieff, the Dictator of the Red Citadel (Petrograd), or of Krassin or Radek - all Jews. In the Soviet institutions the predominance of Jews is even more astonishing. And the prominent, if not indeed the principal, part in the system of terrorism applied by the Extraordinary Commissions for Combating Counter-Revolution has been taken by Jews, and in some notable cases by Jewesses. The same evil prominence was obtained by Jews in the brief period of terror during which Bela Kun ruled in Hungary. The same phenomenon has been presented in Germany (especially in Bavaria), so far as this madness has been allowed to prey upon the temporary prostration of the German people. Although in all these countries there are many non-Jews every whit as bad as the worst of the Jewish revolutionaries, the part played by the latter in proportion to their numbers in the population is astonishing.

Let me give you another good example of what caused antisemitism in eastern Europe and in Russia. Take Latvia, for example. Between the end of World War I and the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Latvia - like Lithuania and Estonia - was a small and prosperous country. Its independence, just like the Czechoslovakian independence, was also guaranteed by the Allies - Great Britain, United States of America and the French Republic. The Baltic states were, of course, like the Czechs, betrayed by the Allies. Remember, first Uncle Joe Stalin was Adolf Hitler's ally and later on he became the ally of the western Allies.

Latvia had more than a hundred Jewish schools. The Jewish population of the Baltic states was represented in practically every facet of life - in the armed forces, in politics, cultural life,

science and technology - except in agriculture. Recommended reading: Frank Gordon (whose father Isaac Gordon lives in Israel): *Latvians and Jews*.

As a result of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, east Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, parts of Finland and parts of Rumania (Bessarabia), were occupied and annexed by the Soviet Union. West Poland was annexed by Germany and so the Polish state ceased to exist. When the Russian tanks moved into east Poland and into the Baltic states to establish their terror regime, the leading hands in the NKVD secret police were Bolshevik Jews. So, what happened to the Jewish minorities in the Baltic states during this time? Did they fight with the national freedom fighters of the Baltic states against the Soviet occupation forces? The sad truth is that they did not. Most of the Jewish minority in the Baltic states did not even remain neutral. They turned around and betrayed their host nations and welcomed the Bolsheviks with red carnations and celebrated them as liberators from, as they claimed, the fascist Baltic states. This was after these nations had given them equality before the law, education and a secure and peaceful life between 1917 and 1940. Not only that, a lot of them joined their Jewish brothers in NKVD uniforms and hunted down Baltic freedom fighters wherever they could find them - either by killing them on the spot or by deporting them and their families to Siberia as slave labourers. This is where Professor Robert Manne, one of Australia's leading intellectuals, is wrong and Helen Demidenko-Darville is right!

In all fairness, it has to be said that a minority of the Baltic Jews were neutral; and even loyal to their host nations.

One year later, when the Germans arrived in the Baltic states in 1941, the local Baltic people took bitter revenge against any Jew they could get their hands on. Unfortunately it is always the innocent who suffer in such revenge attacks. Most of the bloodhounds escaped with their NKVD secret police brothers back into the Soviet empire while the Germans continued their advance into that country. A few of these killers were later captured by the Germans and/or their allies and executed. Unfortunately over half a million innocent Jews were also killed by the Nazis and their Allies in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Approximately 1.5 to 2 million Jews escaped into the Soviet Union where they were re-settled behind the Caucasus mountains, there to establish their own Jewish autonomous Soviet Republic.

The killing of approximately half a million Jews back-fired on the Nazis because more Jews joined the Red Army and the Red partisans, the latter killing more than 300,000 German soldiers. As you can see here, there is always cause and effect in history: what goes round, comes around. If you kill one person, you are a murderer, but if you kill millions, you are celebrated as a conqueror of nations!

Return to Dr Kent's History Lessons

As we had enrolled ourselves into his second course: Tsars and Commissars, we were all looking forward to this next series of lectures.

Unfortunately, this course was cancelled. It was quite humorous how we found out about the cancellation. We received a letter from the Deputy-Director of the Continuing Education Department, Ms Jenny Ransome, informing us that a couple of students had prevented an open debate from occurring in Dr Kent's lectures. We wanted to follow up this matter personally with her so as to point out that no-one can hold us to ransom. We visited her office where we were told by the receptionist that Ms Ransome was on the telephone, and we advised that we would wait. Suddenly a man appeared who was introduced to us as Mr David Israel. I asked him what position he held within the department and he replied, "I am the director here".

I was a bit shocked because he looked like a bloke straight out of the Woodstock rock concert, still searching for Janice Joplin and Jimmy Hendrix. His attitude and demeanour towards us, in my opinion, was hostile and unprofessional. His body language compelled me to admonish him for his bad manners. He stood before us with hands in his pockets. He replied to our questions in an arrogant and evasive way. I informed him that I was from Europe where manners count, and I asked him politely to take his hands out of his pocket while addressing me - which he refused to do. He told us he would inform his deputy director of

our wish to see her, and she would let us know "when she could fit you in". We are still waiting for that appointment.

He also said to me, "I know you. You are a very arrogant person". I replied "This applies to you and not to me. Would you please take your hands out of your pockets when addressing me." He again refused and told us that he was in charge of the area and that it is a university building and that if we did not leave immediately, then he would call security.

We have now been informed by letter that our tape recordings of Dr Kent's five history sessions which were taped openly, and the photographs, which we took at the end of the final session, have to be destroyed. I would like to stress that not a single objection was made by anyone in the room to our taping and to the taking of photographs. We therefore view the written request of destroying this material with concern - as a blatant act of censorship. The material is therefore safely stored away in case legal action arises out of it.

Tsars and Commissars: The Short Version - By David Brockschmidt

Lenin and his mob were not only a bunch of mass murderers, killing at least 20 million people between 1917 and the year of his death, 1924, but they were also some Johnny-come-lately revolutionaries because two-thirds of Russia's land had already been distributed amongst the Russian peasants between 1905 and 1917. This was done by the Russian premier, Stolypin, who was an enormously popular reformer. Let me quote from Frank L Britton's *Behind Marxism*:

As an outcome of the 1905 revolution, Tsar Nicholas II set about remedying the shortcomings of his regime in a most commendable manner. At his decree, Russia was given representative government and a constitution. An elective legislative - the Duma - was established, and free elections were held. By these measures and others which followed, Russia seemed well on the way to becoming a constitutional monarchy patterned after the western European model, and as a point of fact it was only the outbreak of World War I which prevented this from becoming a reality.

As would be expected, the Jewish revolutionary parties bitterly opposed these reforms, looking on them as merely a device by which the forces of revolution would be dissipated. Actually these measures did succeed in pacifying the Russian masses, and the years between 1905 and 1914 were ones of comparative quiet and progress. No man deserves more credit for this state of affairs than Premier Peter Arkadyevich Stolypin, who in the year following the 1905 revolt emerged as the most impressive figure in Imperial Russia.

From 1906 to 1911 it is no exaggeration to say that he dominated Russian politics. It was he who gave Russia the famed "Stolypin Constitution", which among other things undertook to guarantee the civil rights of the peasantry, which constituted 85% of Russia's population. His land reforms, for which he is most famous, not only gave the peasant the right to own land, but actually financed the purchase with government loans. Stolypin was determined to give the peasant a stake in capitalism, believing that "the natural counter-weight of the communal principal is individual ownership".

Were the Stolypin land reforms effective? Bertram Wolfe, who is on all points anti-Tsarist and pro-revolutionary, has this to say: Between 1907 and 1914, under the Stolypin land reform laws, 2,000,000 peasant families seceded from the village mir and became individual proprietors. All through the war the movement continued, so that by January 1, 1916, 6,200,000 peasant families, out of approximately 16,000,000 eligible, had made application for separation. Lenin saw the matter as a race with time between Stolypin's reforms and the next upheaval. Should an upheaval be postponed for a couple of decades, the new land measures would so transform the countryside that it would no longer be a revolutionary force. How near Lenin came to losing the race is proved by the fact that in 1917, when he called on the peasants to "take the land", they already owned more than three-fourths of it'.

Russian Jewry wanted revolution, not reform. As early as 1906 an attempt had been made to assassinate Premier Stolypin when his country house was destroyed by a bomb. Finally, in September of 1911 the best premier Russia ever had was shot

down in cold blood while attending a gala affair at the Kiev theatre. The assassin was a Jewish lawyer named Mordecai Bogrov. Thus it was that Russia had since 1902 lost two premiers to Jewish assassins.

Many of Stolypin's reforms were carried out after his death. In 1912 an industrial insurance law was inaugurated which gave all industrial workmen sickness and accident compensation to the extent of two-thirds and three-fourths of their regular pay. For the first time the newspapers of the revolutionary parties were given legal status. Public schools were expanded and the election laws were revised. In 1913 a general amnesty for all political prisoners was given. Not even the severest critic of Tsarism can deny that these measures represented a sincere attempt on the part of the Imperial government to bring about reform. Why, in spite of all this, was the Tsar overthrown?

[Wolfe, B: *Three Who Made a Revolution*, Dial Press, New York, 1948]

I have no time now to speculate and answer this question. But I can say this: What a blessing it would have been for Russia had the Bolsheviks not come to power. Kerenski would have established a democratic Russia where the poor could become rich through hard work. Lenin wanted the rich to become poor by the state distributing their wealth among the poor. Unfortunately the Russian people had to live through this Gulag hell until the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1990.

This so-called 1917 revolution in Russia was, of course, not a revolution but a Bolshevik-Jewish coup-d'etat which destroyed Russia's elite and the already democratic Kerenski government. These so-called Bolshevik heroes and icons, celebrated by western intellectuals, have now been demasked by historical research, and shown to be what they really were: a bunch of ruthless murderers. I hold these hypocritical left-wing intellectuals of the western world as being politically and historically responsible for the Bolshevik-Jewish Holocaust. The Bolshevik Jews in Russia did not want reform and evolution but revolution thereby turning Russia into their power-base. They had tried the same in Germany when staging the so-called Spartacus coup-d'etat. They did this by declaring Bavaria a soviet republic under the Jewish president, Kurt Eisner. The main agitators in this movement were the Jewish revolutionaries, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg. This coup was financed by Lenin and his mob. Lenin had clearly stated that in regard to world revolution, if you have Berlin, you have Germany; if you have Germany, you have Europe.

Our history Professor, Dr Heinz Kent, left Germany in 1933. So everything he knows about German history, he knows from books, documents and hearsay. Dr Kent spent many years, between 1933 and 1945, in Denmark, and New Zealand. He told us the now famous story of how the Danes smuggled out of Denmark into Sweden almost the total Jewish population. This was done in small boats across the Oresund. The Danes were justifiably praised for this courageous and humane act. What Dr Kent did not tell us is the historical fact that the German chief of the military occupation forces in Denmark, SS Colonel Werner Best, governor of occupied Denmark, asked the Danish government and the King of Denmark, to hold free elections in order to form a new Danish government. Both agreed, and free elections were held on 23 March 1943 - against the expressed will of the almighty Fhrer, Adolf Hitler. This Danish election was also opposed by the State Secretary of the German Foreign Office - later ambassador to the Vatican - , Ernst von Weizscker, father of former West German president, Richard von Weizscker. Interestingly, the election was supported by the Chief of the SS, Heinrich Himmler. This historical fact was common knowledge and I wonder why Dr Kent did not mention this to his students.

The Danish election result was startling but not surprising: 44% voted for the Danish Social Democratic Party and only 2% for the Danish National Socialist Party.

Is this not an historical fact worth knowing? It shows us that the presumed power in the Third Reich was not totally in the hands of Hitler alone but divided between the SS, Goebbels, Gring, the foreign office, Hitler and Bormann, and the armed forces. David Irving made this clear in his latest masterpiece, *Goebbels, Mastermind of the Third Reich*, which received critical acclaim from Jewish and non-Jewish reviewers....and then they made

certain that the book was not to be published in the United States!

Another typical example of how limited Hitler's power was in regard to the Axis powers is illustrated by the visit to Germany of the Bulgarian king, Boris, during the early 1940s at Hitler's Berghof at Berchtesgaden. Hitler asked King Boris to deport Bulgarian Jews to eastern Europe. The King's answer was , "My Fhrer, the Jews of Bulgaria are part of the Bulgarian nation and they will stay where they are."

Hitler may not have liked what the king told him but he accepted it, as did Heinrich Himmler who had been present at that meeting.

What we have here is an illustration of how limited the power of the dictator, Hitler, really was. These facts make history so intriguing and interesting. David Irving is correct when he claims that the job of an historian is not only to find out what happened and what did not happen but most importantly why it happened. Since World War II our western education has shied away from imbuing the people with the why-question. Unfortunately this is exactly what Dr Kent did not encourage either - to ask the why-question. Every time I asked our professor why he did not mention this and that, he always responded, "I'm coming to this, Brockschmidt" - but he never did. I could never work out why he did not answer my questions. Was it that he didn't know or was it political correctness protecting the official version of history which is now falling apart? In large measure it is a result of David Irving's untiring work and all those revisionists who care that we are arriving at 'truth in history'.

I remember a saying from Russia: Russia was destroyed by Jewish brains, Latvian bayonets and Russian stupidity.

We all know that the first victim in any war is truth itself and the victors write up their interpretation of history. But history is like the universe - there is no beginning and no end. It is always in the making. That is why it always has to be revised, without any taboo topics so that the search for truth in history is not impeded. We must unmask the politically correct 'no brain-your gain' lobby. In the end you will see for yourself who the real haters are.

I could go on and on describing to you what happened during these five sessions. I mentioned to the group my time spent in Israel risking my life for the Jewish homeland in 1967. The anti-Nazi record of my parents saving Jews and Gentiles from Nazi persecution. They were honoured as Righteous Gentiles by the State of Israel and by Germany. My father was the business partner of Oskar Schindler. It was he who supplied Schindler with trucks and rail permits so that the approximately 1200 'Schindler Jews' could be transported from Cracow, Poland; to Brunnits, Czechoslovakia. But all this did not help me! I had broken the taboo barrier of being politically incorrect - but historically correct. For that cardinal sin I had to be crucified! So here I am hanging on the politically correct cross. The mob screamed for my blood and they got it because our history professor, Dr Heinz Kent, gave them what they wanted - a few funny stories and his peculiar view of history. Now we know who are the Good, the Bad and the Ugly.

Holocaust began in 1941, secrets reveal By Bronwen Maddox in Washington, The Australian, 12 November 1996

British intelligence knew about the massacre of Jews in World War II as early as 1941, according to newly released records of decoded German cables. The 1.3 million pages of intercepted German messages also provide evidence that much of the killing in the early years of the war was carried out by ordinary German police units, not the SS. Transcripts of the secret British code-breaking operation known as Ultra intercepts, disclosed in The Washington Post, are among the earliest records of the systematic killing of European Jews by German forces.

Professor Richard Breitman used the Freedom of Information Act to request the records from the National Security Agency, which had received the documents from Britain.

The intercepts, which are headed "Most Secret. To be kept under lock and key: never to be removed from the office", are still secret in Britain.

The code-breaking records, which cover short periods between July and September 1941, are particularly valuable because the

early stages of the war are poorly documented. After Hitler's invasion of Russia on 22 June, British intelligence had a spell of success in cracking the codes of cables sent by German commanders in Russia back to Berlin.

The documents suggest that the Russian invasion triggered systematic killing of Jews, well before the concentration camps at Buchenwald and Auschwitz began operating in 1942.

The documents will revive controversy about whether Western governments ignored intelligence about atrocities against Jews, concentrating on enemy troop deployments.

They will also fuel demands for a rise in estimates of the number of Jews killed in the war. Professor Breitman, who argues that the total could be closer to 7 million than the usual estimate of 6 million, says that half a million Jews were killed in the Soviet Union in the last six months of 1940.

One cable, filed to Berlin from Belarus by Commander Erich van dem Bach-Zelewski on July 18, 1941, reported: "In yesterday's cleansing action in Slonim (Belarus), carried out by police regiment centre, 1153 Jewish plunderers were shot." Another, from Ukraine on August 27, reports that Order Police Battalion 320 shot 4200 Jews near the town of Kamenets-Podolsk; four days later, it reported another 2200 shot dead.

How Many Millions More?

From **LE TEMPS IRREPARABLE**, Paris, 19 November 1996

In a recent post in Internet, Eric Broomfield of Arizona State University (ericlb@asu.edu, 602-350-9115) wrote this:

On November 10, 1996 on the front page of the Washington Post an article by Michael Dobbs revealed that the codebreakers at Bletchley Park had intercepted and decoded German Police radio and telegram messages documenting German atrocities against Jews at the Eastern Front in 1941.

This article was based on research headed by Professor Richard Breitman of American University. My own research at the National Archives last June parallels and expands Professor Breitman's work. As a graduate student from Arizona State University, I was doing research at the National Archives in College Park Md. My research centres on early Anglo-American intelligence cooperation before Pearl Harbour. In the course of this research I consulted the Historic Cryptographic Collection (recently released as part of the National Security Agency's Open Door Project). I came across a secret history on the joint U.S. and British intelligence efforts during World War II. This history was prepared under American and British supervision immediately after the war.

This secret history is fifteen bound volumes and is broken down by subject. Volume 13 of this history is entitled "The German Police" This volume confirms the information contained in the Washington Post article that the British had early knowledge of German atrocities in Russia and that the so called "Ordinary

Police" as well as the Einsatzgruppen were involved in the roundup and killing of Jews.[...]

So it is clear that from the very beginning the British were aware of German eliminationist policy towards the Jews. Also clear from the secret history is that the British had extensive knowledge of German atrocities against so-called Bolsheviks. This makes it clear that the British, and later the Americans were aware of the Nazi policy to eliminate the communist leadership in territories that were recently taken from the Soviet Union. [...]

The secret history also makes clear that from Ultra intercepts there was never any mention of the gassing of Jews either in the so-called 'Death Vans' or at the permanent death camps in Poland. However the history does make clear that the British, and ultimately American, efforts to break German codes at Bletchley Park became aware of the large scale railroad transportation of Jews in Europe. This knowledge was obtained by breaking various German railroad codes. [...]

The Washington Post added this: "The extraordinary thing about these documents is that they contain new information both about the Holocaust itself and what the West knew about the Holocaust," said Richard Breitman, a professor of history at American University, who filed a Freedom of Information Act request for 1.3 million pages of German intercepts handed over to the NSA by the British." (See the Washington Post website)

This, of course, is complete bullshit. The 'Ultra intercepts', i.e. the breaking of the German codes thanks to a codemachine brought to London by intelligence operatives, is well known more than 20 years. A score of books has already been written and if any special knowledge about the so-called Holocaust had been embedded in these mountains of transcripts, there would have been a wise guy to unearth the precious document. It is not big news to learn that German military police shot plunderers and called them 'Jewish plunderers/ in their daily report to Berlin.

The Ultra intercepts have shown that the Allies knew everything about Germany, from very early on in the war. There was no possible secret. The Germans did not suspect the codebreaking. In these 1.3 million pages and in this 13 volume secret history, there is nothing of the gas chamber. In the 160.000 documents from the Auschwitz SS Construction service scanned by independent scholar J.C. Pressac, not one can be firmly ascribed to a gas chamber, supposedly built by this very service. And no document is missing from these files. It is too much requesting from the historians to ask them to produce the orders and the budget of the gas chamber operations or, if they cannot, to desist from supporting something that has no existence in the millions and millions of pages of available documents. Who are those believing in flat earth theories? This is plainly ridiculous.

CONCLUSION

WHY IS 'THE HOLOCAUST' IMPORTANT?

By **W A Carto**, in: **M Collins Piper, Best Witness - The Mermelstein Affair and the Triumph of Historical Revisionism, 1994, Centre For Historical Review, 132 Third Street, SSE Washington, DC 20003 USA**

WHAT IS THE HOLOCAUST?

The question is often asked of Holocaust revisionists by the naïve, "Why are you bothered by 'The Holocaust,' which is ancient history? You must be a little crazy to doubt it; do you also believe the Earth is flat? Are you a violent anti-Semite to doubt all the eyewitnesses? Everybody in their right mind accepts it. Let people like Mel Mermelstein have their holocaust if they want it. What's the difference?"

The common perception of "The Holocaust" is what is important, not the definition of it because *perception*, not reality is the stock in trade of all salesmen, advertisers, public relations professionals, political campaign managers, "Holocaust" promoters and other merchandisers. People in the mass are moved by their perception of truth, by deep and profound psychological motives and by authority, not by the truth itself, which is normally unknown to them.

Exploiting the moral sensibility and the feeling of guilt which is always close to the surface in Christians, Americans are

constantly reminded that Israel rose "from the ashes of 'The Holocaust'" (etc.) and that it is their moral responsibility to continue to ensure "Israel's survival." Israel, we are assured, is "America's closest ally", and "the only democracy in the Middle East". The result is that American taxpayers continue to shell out billions each year as if buying modern-day indulgences.

Quite literally, and without exaggeration, "The Holocaust" is a religion. The faithful vigorously reject any and all facts perceived as contrary to their faith and their ugly dogma has the internal consistency only of a revelation taken on faith, not a logical story based on commonly accepted facts, not what history is supposed to be. The alleged facts of "The Holocaust" are contradictory; its high priests cannot agree on the details even among themselves, which is why they frantically discourage debate and know nothing else other than to try to ignore or smear those wanting to confront them.

"The Holocaust" is a trigger concept that produces a Pavlovian response. By calling up an image implanted in the minds of the targeted subjects it induces a pliable attitude enabling the professionals who have implanted the image to manipulate the subjects. That the term has in reality little meaning which corresponds to the facts is immaterial; it is the religious attitude of guilt, worshipful horror and fear that counts. This syndrome,

which precisely fits Hitler's famous definition of the "Big Lie" in his **Mein Kampf**, has cost Americans far more than mere money, and the cost increases daily.

"The Holocaust" is alive and growing, not dead and fading. It affects every American every hour of the day and more so today than yesterday. It impacts on every financial decision made by the government and on most decisions made by private parties. Like it or not, "The Holocaust" must be faced and questions must be asked. Continued acceptance of the image by the unthinking, or manipulation by the corrupt and/or cowardly, is no longer acceptable by conscientious and decent Americans, including Jews.

DOLLAR COST OF 'THE HOLOCAUST'

Former Under-secretary of State George Ball has calculated both the direct and indirect costs of the so-called "special relationship" between the United States and Israel during the period 1948, when Israel was established as a state, through 1991. Direct costs, including standard grants, loans, refinancing of Israeli debts to the US, free use of US arms patents, concessionary tariff arrangements, etc., were an astounding \$61,822,000,000.00.

Indirect costs of the US-Israeli relationship included aid to Egypt (to buy Egypt's friendship with Israel); loss to the US economy because of Arab oil boycotts and loss to the US economy because of Israeli interference in US-Arab commerce, etc. is an even larger \$107,356,000,000,00, a total of almost \$170 billion. Extrapolating this through 1993 and including the recent \$10 billion loan guarantee passed by a compliant Congress during the waning days of the Bush administration, the figure hovers around \$200 billion, with literally no end in sight.

This tidy sum figures to almost one thousand dollars for every man, woman and child in the United States.

But wait, there's more. The sum so far does not include tax revenue lost on private tax-deductible gifts (largely from American Jews) which benefit Israel and which have been estimated at \$20 billion. Nor does it include the cost of deployment of US forces in the Middle East for the protection of Israel - including the so-called Desert Storm operation - a cost of some \$340 billion. So the total cost of Israel to the taxpayer of America is over \$500 billion.

The above does not include at least \$135 billion in reparations paid by German taxpayers to Israel and to individual Jewish "Holocaust" survivors since the end of World War II.

Nahum Goldmann, former president of the World Jewish Congress and chairman of the claims conference which was convened following the war to work out the reparation agreement, describing the results of German reparations to Israel, wrote:

Without the German reparations, the state of Israel would not have half of its present infrastructure; every train in Israel is German, the ships are German, as well as the electricity, a large part of the industry...without mentioning the individual pensions paid to the survivors...in certain years the amount of money received by Israel from Germany exceeds the total amount of money collected from international Jewry - two or three times as much.

All of these costs to the American and German taxpayer for the maintenance of Israel, as if flowing from an infinite cornucopia, have brought mountains of corruption to every person and institution involved, illustrating the ironclad historical law that corruption inevitably follows money, and that more money is tacitly endured by the likes of Billy Graham, Pat Robertson and a virtual army of "Christian" Israelites.

And in spite of, or perhaps because of the avalanche of money, Israel itself is in the throes of traumatic moral and economic decline. Israeli journalist, Barry Chamish, writing in *The Fall of Israel*, is one of many journalists and writers who have documented massive corruption and mismanagement that runs rampant, from top to bottom of Israel's government, business and society - a state of affairs leaving the ruling elite to a life of Croesus while the large majority of the Israeli people lives in a perpetual state of financial despair and instability.

SHOAH BUSINESS

As part of the multi-media campaign to promote the desired "Holocaust" image, virtual theme parks, Disneyland style, are now the rage. There have to be dozens of "Holocaust" museums

and memorials in the US, and one is scheduled for Berlin. Even our own Mel Mermelstein has his "Holocaust" museum, the "expenses" of which are of course tax-deductible, including trips to Israel and elsewhere for the distinguished curator.

The American taxpayer-subsidized Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC - literally a stone's throw from the grounds of the Washington Monument and conveniently located next door to the nation's currency factory, the US Bureau of Engraving and Printing (has anyone checked for a tunnel?) - is the primary example.

Much to the dismay of the museum's dedicators, including President Bill Clinton, who departed from his prepared remarks to assail Liberty Lobby (which had organized the demonstration) as "depraved and insensate," several hundred angry American taxpayers gathered outside the building on April 22, 1993, when the museum opened, waving signs and protesting this waste of their tax dollars, pointing out that the museum had no place on American soil in any case.

Among those leading the protest was New York-based revisionist activist Jack Wyckoff who produced highly effective signs that attracted media attention. "Move it to Israel!" read one.

Other protesters included American Blacks who compared the dubious six million to the alleged genocide of millions of African slaves. Finding a precedent for Black reparations in the billions sent by American taxpayers to Israel, they argue that sauce for the Zionist goose is sauce for the Black gander. And the next in line for some sauce, we predict, will be American Indians.

The Holocaust Museum has to be the most grotesque and macabre exhibit, outside of carnival side shows, ever presented to an audience. Graphic sculptures show pathetic Jews being led to gas chambers. Stacks of used shoes, presumably from "Holocaust victims" (although they could just as well be from Goodwill Industries) and other personal belongings replay the horrors of daily life in the concentration camps. Visitors, including children, are urged to adopt the identity of an internee and follow the victim's path to the "gas ovens".

One notable feature of this house of horrors is a documentary film titled *Anti-Semitism* which at least one Christian minister, Rev Dale Crowley, Jr, says is anti-Christian, at best, and violates the very spirit of tolerance which the museum purports to exemplify. The film puts the blame for "The Holocaust" on Christianity itself.

The idea that Christianity itself was responsible for the alleged "Holocaust" is a frequent topic for media treatment. Even the many Christian religious leaders have been convinced or coerced into the *mea culpa* for existing. Christianity, historically, the religion of love and forgiveness, has become the cause of violence and suffering. Christians are evil so they must pay. And pay and pay.

American-born Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, who lives on Israel's West Bank from which Palestinians who have lived there for a thousand years have been deported, said in an inspirational sermon: "The world is divided into two parts: those who actively participated with the Nazis and those who collaborated with them. It was Christianity, especially Catholic Christianity, that fostered 'The Holocaust.' The Church is still dripping with blood because it still has not recognized Israel."

Massive private contributions from a wide variety of associations, unions, service organisations and other entities have been made to the Holocaust Museum, and not necessarily with the assent of their members.

As of April 22, 1993, such contributions included from these unions, are for example: the AFL-CIO; American Federation of Teachers; Communications Workers of America; Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union; International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Workers Union; American Postal Workers Union; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

In Los Angeles, the Simon Wiesenthal Centre has a "Museum of Tolerance" which is perhaps even more intolerant than the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. Wiesenthal collects an annual fee of \$75,000 for the use of his name but the profits do not end there. Wiesenthal's "Museum of Tolerance" is the ultimate in Hollywood high-tech and plays daily to eager customers. Says Judith Miller:

You are led by computer -synchronised light, color and sound through a succession of tableaux that take you back in time. You are in Europe before and during the Holocaust. You hear the actual words of the victims, the victimizers, the heroes and the apathetic bystanders....As a searchlight comes on you are at a replica of the gates of Auschwitz...and you hear echoes of the victims - those who survived and those who did not.

However, museums such as described are only a small part of what some have scoffingly called, "Shoah Business" (The Term "Shoah" is the Hebrew word for "Catastrophe") television, motion pictures, books and almost daily "news" stories in the press help promote "The Holocaust" It has become a major and profitable industry.

THE MOST EXPENSIVE COST

The dollars-and-cents price of "The Holocaust" to American taxpayers and citizens by itself is too expensive to bear but mere money is not the most intolerable cost.

Imagine the likely shape of our world today without this curse and you will be startled by its contrast with reality. It is evident that the image of "The Holocaust" has radically distorted America in every significant way.

Without "The Holocaust" imagine there would be no state of Israel nor its burden on American taxpayers whom would be some half a trillion dollars richer.

Even more importantly, the United States would not be inextricably involved in affairs of the Mideast which do not concern us, nor would Moslems from Casablanca to Zamboanga hate us.

Without the alien and malicious influence of Israel exercised upon Congress and the White House and every one of the 535 sitting members of Congress, domestic affairs could be conducted toward the interest of America, not toward an alien nation. American newspapers and the cognoscenti would concern themselves with soluble American problems, not insoluble foreign ones.

Our contrived obsession with "The Holocaust" as the pivotal and defining historical moment of all time has permeated, inhibited and polluted all academic and religious discourse, twisting its focus from our own needs and objective truth to the real or imagined needs of others. This suicidal bias has infected academic subjects from anthropology to sociology, biology and genetics, not only history.

"The Holocaust" is said to be the ultimate in human degradation but it is the ultimate in Hollywood imagery. It serves elitism by teaching that every nation may become as evil as the Germans if they try to live true to themselves (the definition of nationalism) and oppose the international plutocratic elite. This is why the image of "The Holocaust" serves the major political movement of our day - the move away from The Constitution, national sovereignty and a structured and free society to the formless, chaos and tyranny of the new world order - the Global Plantation.

"The Holocaust" tends to atomize individuals by breaking up traditional loyalties, thus ripening the public to accept revolutionary changes they have not chosen nor do they understand. It cuts the age-old tethers of Americans and all peoples to their own traditions and history, their pride, their instinctive love for kind and country. Indeed, such love - hitherto normal and the essential foundation keystone of political stability - is increasingly viewed with suspicion and hostility by the doyen of political correctness.

Finally, "The Holocaust" has perverted public philosophy and infected public morality by injecting a false standard. The reverse logic of "The Holocaust" is, "If a people as historically cultured and civilized as the Germans - the most advanced and creative people on Earth - can engage in mass murder when they are left on their own and not directed by those moral paragons who direct us, then anyone can." The stigma of real genocide is removed.

Thus, the world tolerates Israel's savage treatment of Palestinians and other enemies. Israel, in fact, is the only country in the world that legally countenances torture of political prisoners, And why not? Weren't "they" (the Jews) treated even worse by the Germans?

But there is more. Such atrocities as "The Holocaust" may be expected from savage third worlders - even excused - but from

highly cultured European Whites? The very people who have literally created the modern world? If so, then Western culture and the White race should be destroyed. This we hear the politically correct chant, "Hey, hey, ho, ho Western culture has got to go" on American campuses.

The evil lie of the dimensions of "The Holocaust" is not a take-it-or-leave-it subject for others. It encompasses the most important issue facing Americans and it cannot be separated from them.

Unless public perception of "The Holocaust" can be changed from the artificial and false to the truth, there is no stopping our decline.

We are facing literally an issue of survival.

This is why All Americans should be concerned with "The Holocaust"

Whether they like it or not.

Revisionism and Haters

In September 1996 Richard Widmann of CODOH alerted the world that Harvard Law School, home of renowned OJ Simpson Defence Attorney, Alan Dershowitz, had defamed revisionists and others on their web site called: **Harvard Law Library's Guide to Hate Groups on the Internet.**

The anonymous author defines hate groups as:

an organisation that advocates violence against or separation from those persons or organisations identified by their race, religion, ethnic origin, sexual orientation or gender. Or an organisation that knowingly spreads lies and half-truths in order to demean or incite hatred against these persons or organisations. Asterisks appear next to those hate pages that are useful starting points for further study.

Mr Widmann urged all revisionists to protest because "We should expect more from this supposed school of higher learning. Apparently dissenting opinions are not welcome at Harvard.

Michael Hoffmann,II, asked the anonymous Law Librarian why Zionist Hate Groups have not been included on the "Hate Guide".

On 16 October the Jewish Defense League (JDL) was added as a hate group in the library's Hate Watch category of Anti-Christian/Anti-Arab bigotry. As well, Hoffmann's own site, together with eight new ones, was added to the Revisionist list.

From: The Law Faculty of the University of Melbourne

On 10 July 1996 a Mr Ron Huttner lawstaff@muwaye.unimelb.edu.au expressed his thoughts to us via Email. Here is our correspondence:

10 July: Huttner: What a pathetic bunch of putrid scumbags you are.

Our reply: Dear Mr Huttner

Your comments have been noted and we thank you for taking the trouble to express your view. Sincerely, Fredrick Töben

11 July: Huttner: I can assure you that calling your mob SCUMBAGS was absolutely no trouble at all. Anytime you'd like me to do it again, it will still be no trouble.

Our reply: Dear Mr Huttner

What a pity you can't get us legally otherwise your intemperate outburst would have been directed at persecuting us through prosecution.

Perhaps the Socratic mirror reveals to you that your scumbag is empty and has been for some time. However, there is help available to solve your impotence.

Then again, your attempt at initiating some infantile emotional blackmail does not solve any historical debate - something we are interested in and you, no doubt, fear - for whatever reason, if any!

We're amazed that you squander your energy in the form you have in this communication.

Best wishes, Fredrick Töben, David Brockschmidt

PS: We shall publish your comments on our website under Views and Discussion.

11 July: Huttner: Thank you for your good wishes - but keep them. I have no need for good wishes from people like you.

Our reply: Herr Huttner

I'm amazed at your antics. It seems you embody some very clear German characteristics in your recent communications: you have no fear and you are dialectically-driven without having absorbed the balancing influences of the Categorical Imperative. This primitiveness is often judged to be some form of naturalness which exudes great energy within declining cultures. Unfortunately your lack of sophistication reflects your obsession with scumbags. I need say no more. Your world is a simple them-us sphere.....and you would like to eliminate us because you disagree with what we have to say. Children behave in such a way, especially when they attempt to huff and puff their opponents into silence. What a pity you misunderstand our good wishes!

Sincerely, Fredrick Töben

19 July: Huttner: Please. I do NOT want to hear from you, or your repulsive group again.

Our reply: Because you are a dictatorial mental midget who hates the principles of natural justice.

Fredrick Töben

21 July: Huttner: On the contrary. Because you and your group are sickening.

Our reply: Lieber Herr Huttner

Your self-hatred knows no bounds. It even throws out the window any form of self-discipline you may have had. You must, by your own definition, have some morbid fascination with "sickening groups". Perhaps I was wrong in insinuating that the Socratic mirror lies not next to your worktable. You remind me of Dorian Gray - and only time will tell whether my analysis is correct in assuming that you are falling apart. Hence the need for your fascination with scumbags. Herr Huttner, I would have thought that your European tradition would have imbued you with some civilizing influences. Street talk is refreshing at times but it does not help solve historical matters -and to date there is no proof that the Germans used homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. You just have to face this fact - no proof whatsoever. Why don't you join us in this, the final intellectual adventure of the 20th century?

Most sincerely, Fredrick Töben

*

To date we have not heard from Mr Huttner again. Anyone who crosses his path at the University of Melbourne may, on our behalf, send him our warmest greetings.

Please note that the views expressed in the various articles are those of their authors.

IN BRIEF

Hanson aide in harassment row

By Gervase Greene, Canberra The Age 18 October 1996

A Labor backbencher yesterday accused a senior staff member of the outspoken independent MP Mrs Pauline Hanson of sexual harassment.

A Queensland MP, Mr Gary Hardgrave, said that the man had intimidated and threatened a woman who worked in his office. He asked the Speaker whether such behaviour could be punished under standing orders, the rules of Parliament.

"A female member of my staff has been subject to intimidation and threat, also aimed at me through her, by a certain male member of the staff of the Honorable member for Oxley (Mrs Hanson)," he said.

Mr Hardgrave declined to name the member of Mrs Hanson's staff, but her assistant, Mr John Pasquarelli, later identified himself as the man involved, and he denied the accusation. He said he spoke to a member of Mr Hardgrave's staff but had stood at least three metres away from the woman throughout the conversation. "I must have a ten-foot dick to have harassed her."

A Word from Mr Doron Ur

The West Australian 7 November 1996

In Perth, WA Jewry president Doron Ur warned Australia had the potential to become the type of racist country Germany was in World War II.

"We are in the midst of a crisis...its name is Hanson, its name is that of a man in Kalgoorlie. It is the closed minds that tell us that Australia should stop being a multicultural country," he

said. "It says Australia should be a regressive country, it should be like that civilization called Germany where only blond hair and blue eyes matter."

Mr Ur was speaking at a ceremony on Tuesday to thank the State Government and Perth City Council for helping to erect a memorial for Holocaust victims in the Supreme Court Gardens.

Our Comment: It was Mr Doron Ur who, in a submission to State Parliament, said if he had his way, he would have all racists killed. We would like to ask Mr Ur some questions about the Jewish-Nazi Holocaust which would direct his attention to the Nazi-Zionist collaboration in the form of the *Haavarah Agreement*, and other matters. Mr Ur's anti-German racism is offensive and malicious because it distorts historical facts, in particular his claims that there were homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz.

War crimes trial collapse

International Express, 6 November 1996

New medical evidence is expected to lead to the collapse of Britain's first war crimes trial this week. Doctor's reports are believed to show that Szymon Serafinowicz, the 85-year-old former carpenter accused of murdering three Jews in 1942, is suffering from Alzheimer's disease. The trial at the Old Bailey is expected to be scrapped on the grounds that Serafinowicz, of Banstead, Surrey, is unfit to plead. It is alleged that Serafinowicz was commander of a police unit operating in the former Soviet Union when he committed the murders.

Beetle's nazi origins shame car company

The West Australian 9 November 1996 - NB: This newspaper writes Nazi in lower case n

Bonn: It's no secret that Adolf Hitler masterminded the Volkswagen Beetle - the affordable people's car. So in the spirit of openness about its nazi past, Volkswagen paid \$1.6 million for one of Germany's most respected historians to write a book about it. Ten years later, the book is out - but Europe's biggest car maker is wondering if its good intentions are going to hurt its business. **Volkswagen and Its Workers During the Third Reich**, by Hans Mommsen, has renewed discussion of VW's use of slave labour during World War II. Complete with photos of Hitler admiring a Beetle, it is the most comprehensive - and potentially damaging - history ever written about the nazi-era birth of the company. Chapter after chapter details how Volkswagen manufactured hardware for the nazi war machine using slave labourers: Jews, Russians, Poles and others, many of them former inmates of concentration camps. Some labourers were beaten. Some were worked to death.

The book says Volkswagen founder Ferdinand Porsche, nazi party member and grandfather of current VW chairman Ferdinand Piech, was morally indifferent to the slave labourers' misery.

"Porsche walked through these crimes like a sleepwalker," says the book, which paints a more damning portrait of the industrialist than any previous account.

It is impossible to say how many slave labourers were put to work by Volkswagen because they were viewed as "second-class people" whose employment wasn't deemed worth documenting, the author said.

The German news magazine *Der Spiegel* has said that Ferdinand Piech was upset about the book's negative portrayal - not only of his grandfather but also of his father, Anton Piech, VW's chief executive during the war.

Volkswagen also was apparently concerned that General Motors Corp. could use the book as a public relations weapon in its battle with VW, *Der Spiegel* reported. The US car maker had accused Volkswagen of stealing GM secrets, a case which is before the US District Court.

Fredrick Töben comments: When I met Professor Hans Mommsen at a history conference in Sydney last year, I was disappointed to meet a man who had "gone to seed". It is a pity that Mommsen lacks the moral courage to question the premise on which the Holocaust story rests. In the light of the above information, Mommsen's dismissal of David Irving as a propagandist, is intellectually dishonest. It is Mommsen who is the propagandist because he is upholding the Nazi-Jewish

Holocaust (homicidal gassing) story. Unlike Irving who questions basic historical premises, Mommsen will not face the facts which contradict his view on the reality of the Auschwitz homicidal gas chambers.

**\$3000 assault fine for National Action head
By Miranda Murphy in Melbourne, The Advertiser 12
November 1996**

National Action chairman Michael Brander has been fined \$3000 for striking an anti-racism demonstrator on the head with a flagpole. But the Adelaide-based right-wing activist remained unrepentant outside court yesterday, claiming he was coming to the aid of a friend.

"If supporters of National Action are attacked I will intervene to defend them," he said.

Brander, 35 of Enfield, was found guilty in the Victorian County Court of intentionally causing injury to William Luxford at a protest involving two opposing groups outside Melbourne's Parliament House on March 18 last year.

**Tortured Jews
Dr Patrick J Bradley, Cremorne, NSW, The Australian, 11
November 1996**

The report that thousands of Holocaust survivors still fear doctors because of their memories of what doctors of Nazi Germany did to them (4 November) is further evidence of the long-term effects of torture on victims. It is therefore regrettable that the State of Israel appears to have gone down a similar path.

In the British Medical Journal (September), The Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture talks of the scandal of the "everyday presence of Israeli doctors in detention centres and prisons, where torture has been institutionalised form many years".

The Foundation also reported that the Israeli Medical Association "chooses not to campaign against torture as an instrument of State policy or to publicise the effects of torture on physical and mental health".

Australian Jewish groups should write in protest to the Israeli Medical Association.

**"Oskar Schindler" a Loser at the Melbourne Cup!
[By David Brockschmidt]**

As you can see, the Holocaust has arrived at the race course! But see what happens if you back the wrong horse, like Steven Spielberg did when making his Hollywood soap opera *Swindler's List*.

I'm sure there will be part two which will be called *Holocaust Park*.

And next year's favourites at the Melbourne Cup will be Adolf Eichmann and Simon Wiesenthal.

**The Hairy-legged Conspiracy Against Car dealers
Precedents, Sydney Morning Herald, 8 November 1996**

Now that John Howard has introduced free speech in Australia, it's cheering to see some citizens taking full advantage of it. In the NSW Equal Opportunity Tribunal last week, Dennis Mulheron, a car dealer from Campbelltown, told Judge David Patten about how Jewish people, black people, feminists and Canberra make life difficult for businessmen in this country. A customer has complained that Mulheron discriminated against her. Representing himself, he began by telling the tribunal:

Dennis Mulheron: I don't know what I'm doing here. Honest to God, we financed a car for a woman, right? She came and complained about a warranty thing, and - can I say it? - I told her to f--- off. What am I doing here?"

Judge Patten: Sit down.

Mulheron: It's all these hairy-legged feminists and Jews in Canberra..

Judge Patton explained about the complaint.

Mulheron: What's the old nag saying I've done?

Patten: What she alleges you have done is that you have discriminated against her in the provision of services because of her race.

Mulheron: Well, what race is she? I'm half English, half Irish. As far as I know she's the same. How can I discriminate?

Patten: Well, perhaps they're matters that will have to be ultimately decided by the Tribunal.

Mulheron: You know she already went to the Consumer Affairs on this matter and they decided. Right. I didn't discriminate against her. If you go to the Consumer Affairs, they've got a list that long. I discriminate equally against anybody. I try to get out of as much warranty as I can...I don't care what they are. I'll try and get out of warranty. That's all we did.

Patten asked him if he understood the procedures.

Mulheron: Listen, I left school at 15, right? I was expelled. All that to me is double Dutch. I don't worry about it, right? You know why it's here - it's because they know I'm a member, I support Adolf Hitler, I hate Jews, I hate niggers, and it's all those people in Canberra down there. This is their way of getting at me. I do my fair share, I've got poofers, dykes, working for me. I do my fair share.

Patten: Mr Mulheron, none of that seems to be relevant to the matter before me today.

Patten then asked him if he had read about the tribunal's procedures.

Mulheron: I can't be bothered reading. I have secretaries...Listen, I've got a business turns over \$56 million a year. I got 136 employees. That's where I should be now, running my business....You know this is a waste of taxpayers' money. Why don't we go out and catch real criminals?

Patten: All right, Mr Mulheron. I take it you're not proposing to have legal representation?

Mulheron: No, I'm smarter than any solicitor ever born. I've got more money than probably everyone in this room...just set the hearing, just set the hearing. I couldn't be bothered replying to any of this.

Patten: You'll be notified of the hearing date.

Mulheron: Well, that's it. That'll do me. But I'm going to get the press and get onto this. This is persecution, persecution. What John Howard said: freedom of speech!

We are pleased to have been able to bring this heroic struggle to your attention.

Our Comment: The absurdity of discrimination legislation is clearly illustrated in the above. It took a person without much formal education to crack the code of hypocrisy which pervades all discrimination legislation. Mr Mulheron put it clearly: discriminate equally!

As we have pointed out on numerous occasions, discrimination legislation is shrouded in intellectual dishonesty. Why? - because the act of thinking is an act of discrimination. Anyone who does not discriminate, does not think. The legislation attempts to socially engineer us into a non-thinking state where our fuzzy feelings reign supreme. It is sad to note that the various tribunals will not admit to us that by acting against an individual, they themselves are discriminating against that person. Far better to have judges who attempt to be just and fair in their difficult tasks of fixing up social problems. What is needed in place of this perverse discrimination ideology is a sound grounding in moral philosophy which offers us the Kantian Categorical Imperative.

**Blowing the Whistle Blowers NETWORKING
By Jeremy Jones, The Australia/Israel Review, 11-24
November 1996**

One of the most over-used clichés concerning the Internet is that it is an enormous repository of material on every conceivable subject. While this is indeed correct, in many senses it is largely irrelevant to the Internet day-to-day use. As individuals and organisations concerned with sensible approaches to regulating the use of computer technology have pointed out, material does not leap out from the computer screen into the unsuspecting lap of the user but comes as a result of searching for information.

Propagators of anti-Semitism have used some basic techniques to maximise their exposure and seek credibility. Through "search engines" - programs which provides lists of places on the Internet in which certain key words appear - Holocaust Denial appears on sites for serious academic discussions on Nazism, Genocide and Jewish History.

While anti-Jewish sites find a virtual breeding ground on the Internet, it is much more disturbing when anti-Semitism is given a degree of credibility by appearing as what is known as a "link", a destination for information which appears on one site by name. When the name is activated by the click of a button the information on that new site appears on the screen.

Australia's most overtly anti-Jewish Internet site, maintained by the Adelaide Institute, has developed links with sites maintained by individuals who find their views abhorrent.

This site, which trumpets its antagonism towards the Jewish religion, historians who have documented the crimes of Nazism and those who would speak out against racism, managed to gain admission to a small group of "other sites of interest for those wanting to know about organised crime in Australia."

Australia/Israel Review research has established that this link resulted from the intervention of Geoffrey Muirden, close associate of Melbourne lawyer and Holocaust denier, John Bennett. Muirden, who apparently made a habit of supplying anti-Jewish material to the manager of this site, had represented the Adelaide Institute as a site which dealt with a matter of suppression and, more importantly, for the individual concerned, one which would provide a link in return.

Another site with a mutual link to the Adelaide Institute came after a conscious decision, and after some soul-searching, to not exclude a "volunteer" who had offered to speak out against "the suppression of intellectual dissent."

The Network for Intellectual Dissent in Australia, maintained by Dr Brian Martin of the Department of Science and Technology studies at the University of Wollongong, contains names and contact details for individuals who span an enormous cross-section of interests. The Network provides the Internet user with "dissenters" on issues such as disabilities, custody and access, mine safety, the Antarctic, journalism - in fact it is difficult to think of many areas free from criticism by at least one of the individuals on the list. Some of the "Dissenters" are university academics, others respected professionals and yet others individuals who have developed a passion for a cause. But not far below Professor Stuart Rees of the Department of Social Work and Social Policy at Sydney University, who enjoys serious respect for his work on bureaucracies, social justice and the "empowerment" of marginal sectors of our community, comes the Adelaide Institute's Dr Fredrick Töben, promoted as an expert on "The Jewish-Nazi Holocaust to question the details of the alleged gassings of millions of people on homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz without being called a 'racist', 'neo-Nazi' or 'hate-monger'".

When the *Review* spoke to Brian Martin, who is also National President of "Whistleblowers Australia," he argued that the Network for Intellectual Dissent was "not an organisation" but a

"list of people". Martin said that he and his colleague, Tasmanian Isla MacGregor, had decided they were not going to censor anyone who put themselves forward as willing to comment or take action on issues related to the suppression of intellectual dissent. "I have spoken to many people regarding the list and you are the first person to raise the issue of Töben being on the list," Martin said. "If someone using the list wants to know about the ABC they call John Millard, and if they are a Holocaust denier they can call Dr Töben," he added.

When asked if there were any limits at all on what qualified dissent as intellectual dissent, Martin said they had not yet "bitten the bullet on that one. Look, we have everything from Töben to a Marxist."

Martin, who explained that he had evaded the draft in the US and was an opponent of Operation Desert Storm as he was of "all violent solutions to political problems," said that he had "no personal sympathy for Holocaust 'Revisionism' in the slightest but he was for open debate with them." When the *Review* suggested that there was a huge difference between open debate and affording legitimacy to an individual by including them on a network with academics and others with a respected role in public debate, Martin's defence was to repeat that he maintained a list of names, not an organisation.

While Fredrick Töben misses out on a guernsey as the South Australian contact for Whistleblowers, this position is occupied by another notorious propagator of anti-Jewish myths, Jack King. King has made a number of notable public appearances, including an address to an ugly crowd from the steps of Parliament House in Adelaide on why "Zionism and Zionists constituted the main influence beyond our serious economic problems and also the main force preventing world peace," commenting to a federal government immigration conference session on Australia's social cohesion that he had "never known any Jew or Asian to make a useful contribution to Australia" and writing to politicians and journalists calling for the "identification" and then "commercial and social isolation of all Jews".

But, King's track record was of no real concern to Whistleblowers Australia, whose President told the *Review* that they "do not make an issue" of the views of members of Whistleblowers on matters not directly related to that organisation's activities.

The promotion of individuals and hate sites under principles that "dissent" is worthwhile in and of itself or that reputations for anti-Semitism are irrelevant to campaigns not specifically relating to Jews, are testimony to the deplorable judgement of individuals and organisations who seek to be taken seriously.

Fredrick Töben comments: In 1997 I shall respond to the outpourings of Mr Jones' intolerant mind.