

B R E A K I N G T H E S P E L L

Breaking the Spell

The Holocaust, Myth & Reality

By Nicholas Kollerstrom



Castle Hill Publishers

P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

December 2014

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, vol. 31:

Nicholas Kollerstrom:

Breaking the Spell: The Holocaust, Myth & Reality.

Uckfield, East Sussex: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

December 2014

ISBN10: 1-59148-071-X

ISBN13: 978-1-59148-071-6

ISSN 1529-7748

Published by CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

Manufactured in the United States of America and in the UK

© by Nicholas Kollerstrom

Distribution: Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 243
Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Distribution USA: TBR Books, The Barnes Review
P.O. Box 15877
Washington, D.C. 20003, USA
1-877-773-9077

Set in Times New Roman

Cover Illustration: panorama view of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp with the main entrance building.

To deny the danger posed by the Holocaust religion and its followers is to be complicit in a growing crime against humanity and against every possible human value. —Gilad Atzmon

It is my position that the veracity of Holocaust assertions should be determined in the marketplace of scholarly discourse and not in our legislature bodies and courthouses.

—Michael Santomauro, Ed., Theses & Dissertations Press

Of course, no physical evidence whatsoever was shown to verify the alleged homicidal gas chambers, despite knowledge of their existence being denied by every single defendant.

—Jason Myers, on the Nuremberg trials of 1946,
Smith's Report, July 2009

If Nick Kollerstrom had been wrong, he would have been refuted – not fired. The mindless persecution of Kollerstrom, and his opponents' inability to answer his arguments convincingly, suggests that the story of the Nazi gas chambers cannot withstand critical analysis. —Dr. Kevin Barrett

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword: The Holocaust Narrative—Politics Trumps Science.....	9
Prelude.....	15
Branded as a Heretic.....	15
Plato’s Myth	19
A Burgeoning Industry	21
Part I: THE HISTORY THAT NEVER HAPPENED.....	25
1. Reason Unhinged	27
2. Illusion versus Reality.....	36
3. Unweaving the Spell	52
4. Towards Dialogue	64
Part II: SCIENCE OR RELIGION?	79
5. One Hundred Times Less	81
6. The Bletchley Park Decrypts	95
7. Chemistry at Auschwitz	107
8. Holo-Religion.....	132
9. Sacred Myths of the New World Order.....	145
Part III: OPENING THE GATES OF MEMORY	155
10. Haunted by Six Million.....	157
11. The Turning of the Tide	175
12. Treblinka – Death Camp or Railway Station?.....	182
13. Auschwitz <i>In Memoriam</i>	189
14. The Purpose of the Camps	209
Epilogue.....	220
Appendices	225
Appendix I: The Enigma of the “Höfle Telegram”	225
Appendix II: Tall Stories	229
Appendix III: They Called It Justice	234
Appendix IV: Your Rights	235
Select Bibliography	245
Index.....	251
About the Author.....	256

Foreword

The Holocaust Narrative: Politics Trumps Science

“The fastest way to get expelled from a British university is by saying you are looking at chemical evidence for how Zyklon was used in World War II, with a discussion of how delousing technology functioned in the German World War II labour camps”—Nicholas Kollerstrom

The situation is completely absurd. No subject generates responses as extreme and irrational as what has come to be known as “the Holocaust”. Unlike any other event in human history, including even the most sacred religious beliefs, for anyone to question, dispute or deny its occurrence qualifies as “a hate crime,” where Holocaust denial is even a prosecutable offense in certain jurisdictions. Unlike any other, this crime involves the expression of forbidden thoughts about a subject that has become taboo.

The underlying desideratum is whether history is supposed to be accurate and true or, as Voltaire has put it, be merely “*a pack of lies the living play upon the dead*”. Just so we know what we are talking about: In its broadest outlines, “the Holocaust” can be defined by means of its three primary elements, which I shall designate here as hypotheses (h1), (h2) and (h3):

- (h1) that Hitler was attempting to exterminate the Jews and succeeded by putting around 6,000,000 to death;
- (h2) that many of those deaths were brought about by the use of a form of cyanide gas in chambers for that purpose; and,
- (h3) that the chemical agent that brought about those deaths was Zykon B, to which the victims were subjected.

The science of the Holocaust does not leave any room for doubt about (h2) and (h3), since laws of biochemistry and of materials science—laws which cannot be violated and cannot be changed—entail that the bodies of those who are put to death using cyanide turn *pink*, while the walls of chambers used for that purpose would turn *blue*. But none of the bodies from those camps has been reported to have been *pink*; and examination of

the “gas chambers” has determined that none of them turned *blue*. Which means that (h2) and (h3) are not simply false but have been scientifically refuted.

As Nicholas Kollerstrom documents in this astonishing and brilliant book, the science of the Holocaust is this “cut and dried”. To the extent to which the Holocaust narrative depends on (h2) and (h3), therefore, it cannot be sustained. The questions that remain about (h1) are a bit more complex but appear to be equally contrived. There are more than 236 references to 6,000,000 Jews who are either in acute distress or about to be assailed in the newspapers of the world *prior to the Nuremberg Tribunal*—the first of which appeared in 1890. The number seems to have no basis in fact but to have theological origins—from a disputed passage in *Leviticus*—as to how many Jews must perish before they can return to “The Promised Land”.

To the extent to which the number of Jews who died in the camps can be objectively determined, the most reliable numbers appear to come from the records of the International Committee of the Red Cross, which visited the camps and kept meticulous records of the identities of those who died and their cause of death. Not one is reported to have been put to death in gas chambers, and the total it reported in 1993 for all of the camps was 296,081 combined. Even rounding up to an even 600,000 victims—gypsies, Jews and the mentally and physically infirm—the empirical evidence thus contradicts the contention that 6,000,000 Jews were put to death and thereby falsifies hypothesis (h1).

Counting deaths attributed to the Holocaust—apart from the records of the International Committee of the Red Cross—turns out to be an exercise in “fuzzy math”, because none of them add up. As Faurisson observed during an interview on Dec. 13, 2006, the Yad Vashem database was built up by “simple unverified declarations emanating from unverified sources and processed in such a way that one and the same person can be recorded as having died several times, even, it seems, as many as ten times”.¹ And even the most complete archives are not collated to make total numbers accessible but only individual cases—which appears an obvious measure to preserve the untestability of (h1), the hypothesis that 6,000,000 Jews had perished.

So, insofar as we depend upon empirical evidence and laws of science, the Holocaust story appears to be false and cannot be sustained. The question that therefore arises is how the Nuremberg Tribunal—widely cited as a paragon of intellectual integrity and of the application of moral principles

¹ “Interview with Professor Robert Faurisson at the Guest House of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran,” www.robertfaurisson.blogspot.com, December 13, 2006.

to historical events—could possibly have produced such a highly misleading account of crucial events at the conclusion of World War II. The answer to this, I believe, has been provided by Robert Faurisson in his paper “Against Hollywoodism, Revisionism,” who explains the daunting task confronting the Allies to conceal or justify war crimes that they had committed in winning the war.²

The Allies’ systematic and massive destruction of German cities not only brought about the deaths of hundreds of thousands of German civilians but also interdicted the railroad lines that would have re-supplied those camps, which were located near major industrial plants and whose inmates were providing labor to run them. It would have been poor business practice to exterminate the work force, but the large number of deaths from starvation because the Third Reich could not re-supply them provided an opportunity to deflect responsibility from the Allies onto Germany, which the Allies seized. A Hollywood director was brought in and shot 80,000 feet of film at the camps, where 6,000 feet (7.5% of the total) was used to shift the blame for those deaths onto Nazi Germany, which was an easy sell, all things considered.

As Kollerstrom explains, Zyklon B was used at the labor camps, not as a method of extermination but for the sake of maintaining hygiene among the inmates. Typhus and dysentery were omnipresent problems, where Zyklon B was applied in copious quantities—but as a disinfectant, not as an agent for bringing about the deaths of millions of inmates. And in response to the color *pink-and-blue* findings, an alternative explanation has been given that they were killed using diesel exhaust fumes, but unlike carbon monoxide, diesel exhaust fumes bring about nausea and severe headaches but usually do not bring about death by asphyxiation.

Among the most valuable contributions of this study derives from Nick’s use of classified records acquired by British authorities, who were skeptical of claims that mass gassings were being carried out and had reports in hand of the use of Zyklon for the purpose of delousing the inmates, where infestations had become alarming. Many tons of Zyklon were consumed at Auschwitz-Birkenau from the summer of 1942 on, as Kollerstrom reports, which is easy to confirm *because it soaked into the walls of the disinfestation chambers and is still there*. His essays on the subject—“The Walls of Auschwitz”, “Leuchter Twenty Years On” and “The Auschwitz Gas Chamber Illusion”³—would become the cause of his removal from a post-doctoral post he had held for 15 years!

As a professional philosopher of science, I appreciate Nick’s references to Sir Karl Popper, who advocated the *method of falsificationism*, whereby

² *Ibid.*, February 3, 2012.

³ See Nick’s online papers at www.codoh.com/library/authors/1580/

the truth of theories in science and in history can be tested by attempts to falsify them. When they resist our best efforts to refute them, then we have good reason to believe they might be true. But equally applicable here are the reflections of Imre Lakatos, who discussed *research programs with hard cores of claims*,⁴ such as Newton's laws of motion or, in the case we are considering, the above-mentioned hypotheses (h1), (h2) and (h3). When the defenders of these hypotheses are confronted by the risk of refutation, they can appeal to *auxiliary hypotheses* in an attempt to deflect the refuting data and thereby preserve their theory.

A stellar example arises in the context of the attempt to explain away why the number of those who died as substantiated by the meticulous records of the Red Cross supports the inference that *less than 10% of the 6,000,000 claimed actually died from all causes—and none from death in gas chambers*. To cope with that finding, the claim has been made that the records are incomplete because large numbers of Jews were taken directly to the gas chambers and never registered—not even by name. Not only are contentions of this kind unfalsifiable, untestable and hence unscientific, but they reflect the degenerating character of the Holocaust paradigm, which has spawned no new data or research that could possibly overcome the mountain of evidence against it.

Another method for immunizing a hypothesis from refutation is by the exclusion of falsifying data.⁵ The defenders of hypotheses (h1)–(h3) have committed a mind-boggling example of fallacious science, which further manifests their commitment to a degenerating research program. When the Auschwitz museum was confronted with the fact that the innocuous *de-lousing* chambers at Auschwitz have blue walls—due to being saturated with blue iron cyanide compounds—but the alleged homicidal gas chambers have *not*, they commissioned their own chemical research. Instead of testing wall samples for the chemicals that had caused the blue stains, the researchers they commissioned simply *excluded* those chemicals from their analysis by employing a procedure that could not detect them.⁶ They justified this measure with the claim that they did not understand exactly how these compounds could form and that they might therefore be mere artifacts. Researchers who don't understand what they are investigating have no business becoming involved. In this case, however, it appears to be de-

⁴ Imre Lakatos, Alan Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge: Proceedings of the International Colloquium in the Philosophy of Science*, London, 1965, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1970.

⁵ Sir Karl Popper systematically investigated the diverse methods of immunizing theories in his *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Hutchinson & Co., London 1968, pp. 82-97.

⁶ Jan Markiewicz, Wojciech Gubala, Jerzy Łabędź, "A Study of the Cyanide Compounds Content in the Walls of the Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps," *Z Zagadnień Nauk Sadowych*, Vol. XXX (1994) pp. 17-27 (www.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/orgs/polish/institute-for-forensic-research/post-leuchter.report).

liberate. They have deliberately ignored an obvious explanation—that Zyklon B was only used for delousing—which would have remedied their lack of comprehension.⁷ As a result of this failure to adhere to the principles of science, they produced a report of no scientific value, which they used to arrive at a predetermined conclusion.⁸

That Nicholas Kollerstrom was booted from his post at University College, London—and without any hearing or opportunity to present his defense, where *the truth of his observations*, one might have thought, would have made a difference—is one of a large number of indications that even our best academic institutions and societies are not capable of dealing objectively with the history of World War II. Indeed, it struck me like a bolt of lightning out of the blue when, during a talk by Gilad Atzmon in Madison, Wisconsin, about Jewish identity politics, I realized that *the Holocaust mythology benefits Zionism and the government of Israel by playing, in the promotion of its political agenda, upon a Western sense of guilt for the death of 6,000,000 Jews during World War II*.

The claim that someone is “anti-Semitic” or a “Holocaust denier” is taken to be the most severe form of ethical damnation possible in this time and age. But distinctions must be drawn between *criticism of the acts and policies of the Israeli government* and *discounting the worth or value of human beings on the basis of their ethnic origins or religious orientation*. Condemning the Israeli government for its vicious and unwarranted onslaught of the people of Gaza, for example, is not “anti-Semitic”. And if exposing the Holocaust narrative as political propaganda makes one a “Holocaust denier,” all of us who put truth before politics ought to wear that label as a badge of honor.

As an illustration of the depths of depravity of those who would uphold the myth, consider that, as an historian of science, Kollerstrom was invited to contribute three entries—including that on Sir Isaac Newton, which is the most important—to the *Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers* (2007), which has more than 1550 entries by some 400 authors from 40 countries. Yet Noel M. Swerdlow of the University of Chicago, a reviewer for *Isis*, the journal of America’s History of Science Society, recommended that the book be sent back to the publisher and pulped *because Kollerstrom had been involved in research on the Holocaust!* This was such an outrage that I wrote to the editorial board of *Isis*, which allowed a Letter to the Editor to appear.

⁷ They quoted but ignored a book which had exposed their fallacious approach (Ernst Gauss, *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1993; Engl.: G. Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010).

⁸ See Germar Rudolf, “Polish Pseudo-Scientists,” in: G. Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz-Lies*, 2nd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011, pp. 45-67.

Something is terribly wrong, when the world's leading society on the history of science does no more to correct a grotesque abuse by one of its reviewers on a book that involved so many contributors and an enormous investment in time and money, where the moral issues are so blatant and obvious. It is ironic that the Nuremberg Tribunal would declare "collective punishment" a war crime. The Allies were responsible for the collective punishment of German civilians by their systematic bombing of German cities. *Isis* has committed a comparable intellectual crime by tolerating collective punishment of 400 scholars for the purported offenses of one. By acquiescing to its reviewer's abuse, *Isis* has committed the fallacy of guilt by association and has displayed an appalling lack of journalistic ethics.

Nick Kollerstrom is the only party here who has displayed a commitment to exposing falsehoods and revealing truths. His defense is very simple: *the hypotheses on which the Holocaust narrative has been based are provably false and not even scientifically possible*. I have written about this in my articles "*The War on Truth: Research on the Holocaust can end your career,*"⁹ "*ISIS trips, stumbles and falls,*"¹⁰ and discussed it during my presentation at the 2014 conference "*Academic Freedom: Are there limits to inquiry? JFK, 9/11 and the Holocaust,*" at which Nick and I both spoke.¹¹ But far better than reviewing them, read this brilliant study by the world's leading iconoclast, Nick Kollerstrom, my dear friend, whom I admire beyond words as a splendid example of what historians should be doing in their professional work *by getting history straight*—lest Voltaire's admonition continue to apply—*including about the atrocities of World War II*. There were real atrocities committed by all sides, just not the ones about which we have been told.

James H. Fetzer



A former Marine Corps officer, **Jim Fetzer** has published widely on the theoretical foundations of scientific knowledge, computer science, artificial intelligence, cognitive science, and evolution and mentality. McKnight Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota Duluth, he has also conducted extensive research into the assassination of JFK, the events of 9/11, and the plane crash that killed US Sen. Paul Wellstone. The founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, his latest books include *The Evolution of Intelligence* (2005), *The 9/11 Conspiracy* (2007), *Render Unto Darwin* (2007), and *The Place of Probability in Science* (2010).

⁹ *Veterans Today*, February 4, 2012; www.veteranstoday.com.

¹⁰ On my blog at www.jamesfetzer.blogspot.com, June 13, 2011.

¹¹ April 26, 2014; for details see www.veteranstoday.com/2014/06/05/academic-freedom-are-there-limits-to-inquiry-jfk-911-and-the-holocaust.

Prelude

In centers recognized from time immemorial as epicenters for free thought and free debate, that so many would take hardened and unfalsifiable stances on the Holocaust is a paradox of the highest nature. —Jason Myers¹

I might as well write Britain's only *Revisionist* textbook, on what has to be the most deeply forbidden topic in our modern world. Just say that word, "the Holocaust," and people shudder – as indeed they are supposed to; but by the same token it is, I affirm, the most important topic in the world for us to find out about. We need to find out how to discuss it calmly, how to respect different viewpoints, and what are the primary sources we should be consulting. Can one hope to avoid abuse and insult while doing so? As the sole member of staff of University College, London (UCL), ever to have been expelled for ideological reasons (in 2008) – after having worked there as a science historian – I should be allowed to have an opinion as regards how the insecticide Zyklon had been used in World War II. That is essentially what drew me into the subject, and I still believe it is the best starting-point.

Branded as a Heretic

After somewhat over a decade of quiet academic research, my life changed rather abruptly as I became ethically damned, thrown out of polite, decent groups, banned from forums and denounced in newspapers, with half my friends not speaking to me any more – while the other half still would, provided I kept off "that awful subject." So as a philosopher I was granted an unusual and excellent opportunity to ponder the difference between what is real and what is illusory.

¹ Myers, review of Mark Turley's *From Nuremberg to Nineveh: War, Peace and the Making of Modernity* (Vandal Publications, 2008), *Smith's Report* July 2009.

I should be grateful to my fellow-countrymen for absolutely refusing rational debate on this topic, for insisting on my silence over it, and for transforming discussion into insult. I know what I have been through. I have been well-cooked, and what you have now in front of you is the end-result.

The damnation cast upon me was ostensibly political – people were suddenly averring that I was “far right,” and I had to try and figure out what that meant and why it was being applied to me – whereas no-one seemed interested in what I had actually done, namely synthesize a couple of chemical investigations concerning residual wall-cyanide taken from World War II labour camps. The damnation cast upon me did not require any opinion from me to confirm it – I was merely informed. And it wasn’t just our corrupt media, the BBC, Sunday newspapers, radio stations; oh no, it was blogs as well.

Going into my local, or even my gym, I felt as if some Mark of Cain had been branded onto my forehead. I had done something so awful that we could not even discuss the matter. The Mediaeval crime of Heresy was back alive and well, even if I was not going to be tortured to recant. From *The Observer* to *Private Eye*, from the *Metro* to the *Morning star*, from the *Jewish Chronicle* to the *Evening Standard*, readers perused the shocking news about my awful heresy, with me being allowed little or no right of reply.

I had long noticed how collective hate against the “Enemy” seemed to be the deepest emotion, collectively speaking, the British people got to experience, whereby for example during the Cold War one could be intensively damned if one did not sufficiently hate the Russians, Reds or Communists. NB, “holocaust” was then used in its proper sense, “the nuclear holocaust,” with no upper-case “H,” and meant a *fiery* process.

Then in 2009 I wrote a book about the new “enemy” of Islamic terrorists, explaining how this had been fabricated by the Establishment to warrant more wars. This got me further ethically damned as an “apologist for terror.” The media could not say why I was investigating the London bombings – i.e. writing the definitive book on the subject² – so I was averred to enjoy a “ghoulish” interest in the dead.

The blessing which Jesus Christ promised to the peacemakers may finally come to them, but in the meantime they are likely to get damned in a war-maker civilization like our own, where hating and fearing the correct enemy is a primary requirement of being a good citizen. That demonizing process is essential, in order that a politician standing up on his hind legs can bray about the “enemy” and thereby call for more military expenditure, a new war, more trashing of our democratic liberties etc. – as Adam Curtis

² N. Kollerstrom, *Terror on the Tube, Behind the Veil of 7/7. An Investigation*, 2009. www.terroronthetube.co.uk.

described in that BBC classic trilogy “The Power of Nightmares.”³ But this rhetoric does a lot more than start new wars: it closes down your frontal-lobe capacity for higher reflective thought and erases what possibility we might have had, collectively, to ponder what it means to be human.

We here try to wonder, which Plato said was the beginning of philosophy, to open the gates of wonder. Please do not regard me as an expert, as you peruse these chapters. Maybe put some brown paper over the book’s cover, or just read it in Kindle. We here look at the primal myth that keeps this nightmare, death-in-life Eternal-War civilization going. Why does the word “Nazi” conjure up images of hate far worse than any modern enemy image, as if the War had just ended yesterday instead of seventy years ago? I, as your guide though this minefield, am a mere science historian, struggling to seek out primary-source data on this matter.

The fastest way to get expelled from a British university is by saying you are looking at chemical evidence for how Zyklon was used in World War II, with a discussion of how delousing technology functioned in the German World War II labour camps. This is considered to be absolutely forbidden. How strange is that? After being a member of my college for 15 years I was thrown out with one day’s warning, having been given no opportunity to defend myself, a fact announced on its website.⁴ What I had done was so terrible that it could not announce what my crime was: I felt like Faust caught making his pact with the devil. The British media had carte blanche for their character-assassination.⁵ Fortunately, a few friends could still bring themselves to talk to me.

I majored in the History and Philosophy of Science precisely because I believed that we are a science-based civilization, and that therefore controversial aspects of historic science and technology should be critiqued and studied. But generally this seemed a crusty academic discipline about to disappear into oblivion under challenges from more exciting college courses.

One day it dawned upon me that there was a chemical angle to “the Holocaust,” because a simple chemical reaction had taken place in walls where cyanide gas had been used in World War II. I understood that young men had gone out, illegally chipped away bits of old wall, then had their

³ 2004 BBC Documentary series, *The Power of Nightmares, The Rise of the Politics of Fear*: on Youtube

⁴ UCL, April 2008: “The views expressed by Dr Kollerstrom are diametrically opposed to the aims, objectives and ethos of UCL, such that we wish to have absolutely no association with them or with their originator.”

⁵ I was “promoting the Nazi agenda” according to a centre-page *Observer* article by Nick Cohen, “When Academics lose their power of Reason” (May 4 2008), to which I was allowed no right of reply. It expressed a death-wish against me; that I needed to be stuffed and placed next to the effigy of Jeremy Bentham at UCL. (Bentham has been described as the “spiritual founder” of University College London; editor’s remark)

careers terminated by what they found out. I was intrigued by the permanence of the iron-cyanide bond, which promised a fairly simple approach to finding out what had happened, sixty years ago. Naively, I did not apprehend that what I reckoned or hoped to be a scientific question was apparently more like a deeply religious one.

As a founder-member of the dynamic 9/11 “truth” movement in London, I liked the people there and their angle on world affairs. I don’t know much about politics: I don’t read the papers or watch television, and I try to forget the names of politicians. I would learn at that group about current events, and hear experts – for that is what they were – debating the apocalyptic and ever-mysterious 9/11 event. Then in 2010 the group broke up, and I found myself being blamed for this and banned from their webforum. This damnation wasn’t because of anything I had said during the meetings, but because of something which they had discovered that I believed relating to events of seventy years ago in Eastern Europe. This turned out to be vastly more important than any mere discussion about 9/11, because it was totally fundamental. Well, if it was so important, could we not discuss the subject? No, it turned out that we couldn’t: the group did not wish to discuss so terrible a topic! After I was expelled, the group disintegrated, for there was nothing further it could do.⁶ The pressure of not being allowed to debate the subject, which was so awful that I had to be expelled, kind of made it impossible to meet any more. That’s why the two UK 9/11 truth websites both have disclaimers – in case you’re interested – asserting that no Holo-debate is permitted.

Thousands of people, or more likely tens of thousands, are in jail right across Europe⁷ for the crime of trying to find the truth of what happened

⁶ I became in 2012 the only Briton to have been invited to speak at a US 9/11 truth event, the Vancouver 9/11 symposium. My paper on what hit the 2nd tower is online:

www.donaldfox.wordpress.com/2012/07/01/nick-kollerstroms-vancouver-presentation/

⁷ According to Gordon Duff writing on *Veterans Today* in 2010: “Two thousand people in Europe are in prison today for questioning some part, no matter how minor, of the holocaust.” (“Who speaks up for Holocaust Survivors?”) That has to be quite an underestimate. Around fifteen thousand German citizens are tried each year for the Thought Crime, so-called “right-wing extremism.” The prosecution of dissidents, patriots and nationalists in Germany has grown increasingly severe in recent years. “Aside from widely publicised high-profile cases, it is impossible to definitively state the specific number of victims who have fallen under the punitive arm of Holocaust denial legislation since these laws were first enacted. It has been estimated that over 58,000 individuals in Germany alone have been prosecuted for various thought-crimes during the period 1994-1999. During the course of one year, 1999, Germany’s aggressive policy of enforcing these repressive laws accounted for 11,248 convictions.” J. Bellinger, *Smith’s Report*, “The Prohibition of Holocaust Denial,” Sept 2009. Germany has also become the only country in the Western world where defending oneself in court can be unwise, because it risks committing the very offence for which one is charged! Ask Sylvia Stolz (Santiago Alvarez, “Germany Proud of Persecuting Dissidents,” *The Barnes Review* newsletter, 5 August 2012; www.barnesreview.org/wp/archives/577)

sixty years ago, and what calls itself a UK “Truth” movement cannot discuss the topic.

You’re reading a treatise about something in history which never existed, a process in history which never took place. The understanding of this will involve a Copernican revolution. I seem to be in the position of taking away from people their worst nightmare, which has been the very foundation of their Unbelief and denial of Divine Providence, and has given us the comic-book concept of Pure Evil which endlessly enables our civilization to hate the collective Other, the Other-who-is-to-be-bombed.

That concept of Pure Evil has ruined our post-war culture. While being hammered with the Three Synonyms “*Nazi! Anti-Semite! Holocaust-Denier!*” I had cause to reflect upon what Jesus meant with his words about the Beam and Mote: we are required to perceive the view of the Other, who is being demonized. Europe needs that honest debate, where people are allowed to express their views and conclusions about What Really Happened without continually having false motives attributed to them. Europe has no worthwhile future unless it is prepared to have that debate. In my opinion, Revisionists are now going to win any such debates, which is why they cannot be allowed to take place.

Plato’s Myth

The old, Platonic question about what is real and what is not has assumed a more ferocious and terrible meaning in this 21st century. The Platonic image of citizens chained so they only see flickering shadows on the wall comes back to haunt us, does it not?⁸ Can we continue to live a life corralled by war-making politicians, given false fears, believing what British/American military intelligence have constructed as a war narrative? This is a *post-Iraq treatise* because only after the trauma of that ghastly war based upon utter lies do we collectively become capable of doubting that the victorious allies administered Justice, pure and impartial, at Nuremberg.

In Plato’s myth, ordinary folk are chained in a gloomy cave and see only shadows, flickering on the wall. They cannot turn around and see the fire which is casting the shadows or the people who are making the shadow-pictures. This famous metaphor acquired a new lease of life with the 1998 film *The Matrix* which had a comparable theme. If any fettered victim were brought out into the sunlight they would suffer unspeakable pain

⁸ Book VII of Plato’s *Republic*; for a post-9/11 discussion see Webster Tarpley’s *9/11 Synthetic Terror, Made in USA*, 2004.

and take a long time to become accustomed to the light. Conversely, if any of them who had dwelt in sunlight tried to explain the world outside to the cave dwellers, he risked enraging them and being torn to pieces. I suggest this story, from twenty-five centuries ago, has a great deal of relevance to what you are about to read.

Plato believed – some have argued – that any culture required a Primal Myth, which did not however have to be true, a notion which has come to be known as the “noble lie.” Karl Popper rebuked Plato for having done this, in his opus *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.⁹ We here try to develop a conversation on this theme, concerning what has to be the deepest, most fervently held belief of our present-day civilization. I say there cannot be a happy future for humankind, so long as this nightmare delusion that people call “The Holocaust” remains in place. This sacred and holy belief, so fervently held and yet undiscussable – the only thing today taught in schools both in history and religion lessons – will hopefully soon exist only in the museum of yesterday’s superstitions.

Current Euro-legislation (see Appendix IV) limits public debate on subjects whose discussion is allegedly liable to provoke violence against a social/ethnic group etc.; which may be another reason for going along with the angle here advocated, whereby one tries to avoid getting caught up in the endless psycho-drama of the “wicked Nazis” and “poor Jews.” A chemical angle has an advantage here: the chemistry of iron is fairly straightforward: the permanence of the ferrocyanide bond *carries the memory* of what happened seventy years ago. We here seek to *remember what happened* then. Inorganic chemistry has the great advantage that experts are not going to disagree a great deal over it. In Germany the Leuchter Report was permitted to circulate, while other Revisionist texts were and still are strictly banned and burnt.

The focus-on-facts approach here attempted will hopefully enable calm debate or at least debate where the other is still speaking to you after the conversation is over (although I can’t guarantee this). I suggest that the dam is about to break, so you might as well be informed about the matter for when this happens.

Clear, chemical logic drew me into this topic, and that remains the firm ground on which I stand. Simple chemistry isn’t everyone’s favourite topic, but I have put enough into this chapter just in case there are any science historians out there wanting to do their job properly.¹⁰ Not a single science journal in the English-speaking world has ever dealt with this subject nor

⁹ So e.g. did Arthur Koestler in “The Sleepwalkers, a History of Man’s Changing Vision of the Universe,” Ch.4. See Wiki, “The Noble Lie.”

¹⁰ It’s text taken from my CODOH Forum thread “Cyanide Chemistry at Auschwitz,” which has had one hundred and fifty thousand hits (2004).

will any history of science or history of technology journal touch it: the Greatest Lie Ever Told does not die that easily.

I came to check out the top-secret British wartime intelligence documents, decoded at Bletchley Park and released into the public domain in the late 1990s, decrypts of weekly messages from the German labour camps. Once they were made public, experts had to be wheeled out to explain the absence of anything resembling “the Holocaust” in these documents: had British Intelligence somehow “failed” to recognize that “the Holocaust” was going on? Or, do these messages demonstrate rather clearly that no “extermination” process was taking place over the year for which they were intercepted? Some colleagues and I have composed Britain’s only Revisionist website (www.whatreallyhappened.info) containing the texts of these decrypts plus helpful graphs and bar-charts, so you don’t even have to go down to Kew Gardens to read them. Normally, the hundreds of books published about “the Holocaust” ignore this most-reliable and detailed source.

Standing in the Wiener Library in Russell Square, with its thousands or tens of thousands of books about “The Holocaust,” I wondered about my arrogance – if that is the word – in writing one more: moreover, one that was going to disagree with *all of these*. Actually, I was not there to peruse this library, but rather to check out a data-source that was just (2013) becoming publicly available: the great International Red Cross database on the German concentration camps, which had been kept and developed for years in the little village of Bad Arolsen in Germany. It had now been fully digitized, and copies were sent there and to other big Holo-centres around the world. I was allowed to peruse it, but to little avail, as we’ll see in Chapter 5.

A Burgeoning Industry

In today’s Britain, “The Holocaust” is big business, with the Holocaust Educational Trust (HET) receiving over two million pounds a year from the government and various other UK Holocaust groups now benefitting from taxpayer money. In 2013, the Beth Shalom Holocaust Education Centre in Newark in the East Midlands got a million pounds, and the Holocaust Recalled Group in Swansea received £791,000, while the Lake District Holocaust Project and the Holocaust Survivors Friendship Association in Leeds have both been given around half a million. The HET has managed to get The Holocaust established as a central part of the National Curriculum, so every UK pupil between 11 and 14 has to learn about it: it is now a

compulsory subject. Thereby London has become a major centre of Holocaust indoctrination. Prime Minister David Cameron is to chair the new Holocaust Commission; he has pledged to visit Auschwitz, and did not shirk from invoking “the Holocaust” to justify military intervention in Syria (August 2013). Some five million has been pumped into the prestigious Institute of Education’s new Centre for Holocaust Education, with a network of Beacon Schools in Holocaust education set up across the country, offering them London seminars and trips abroad. The Anne Frank Trust currently has eight travelling exhibitions touring the country, government funded.¹¹

More than half of Britain’s schools now take part in the HET’s “Lessons from Auschwitz” programme, which has sent about 15,000 pupils on their pilgrimage to Auschwitz. The roots of the current boom go back to a 2000 conference in Stockholm when 31 nations agreed to subject their populations to mass compulsory Holocaust teaching – monitored by a body of government academics, bureaucrats and NGOs which call themselves the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. I guess that’s enough, you get the message.

If anyone can figure out how to get a small fraction of one percent of this gravy-train to perform a repeat chemical analysis of cyanide levels in wall-samples from the old labour camp buildings, do let me know; but frankly I doubt whether this kind of factual issue is the “education” which the authorities here have in mind. We are here talking about education *in which doubt is prohibited*, which (in my humble opinion) more resembles trauma-based mind control than traditional British concepts of education. It is inflicted in History, Religion and Drama classes for a start, plus probably also political-correctness or social-awareness classes, making it the most-taught topic in the British educational syllabus.

Should such funding perchance become available, I would endeavour to approach the Holocaust Research Centre at the Royal Holloway College (part of the University of London), as to whether they would participate.

In our time, the sheer extent to which “Holocaust survivors” have been claiming cash from Germany has been progressively undermining the *primal myth* on which the whole story has been based. The totemic figure of Six Million Jews is real, as being the best estimate of the total number of Jews who have *applied for financial reparations from Germany* on the grounds of being a “Holocaust survivor.” I believe it is now indisputable that the number of these claimants greatly exceeds the number of Jews that ever lived in nations under German control in World War II – even though the exact numbers themselves remain ever-elusive, as if the authorities

¹¹ Source: *Occidental Observer* online, F.C. Begbie, “The Holocaust Industry in the UK,” October 2013.

were wishing to prevent them emerging into the light of day. These “survivors” who claim to be living testimonies to the Holocaust are, as Robert Faurisson has pointed out, by their sheer numbers more like living testimonies that it never happened.

*Who tapped the magic wand, at Nuremberg in 1946,
Whereby ordinary hygiene technology was forgotten
and replaced by – Everybody’s Favourite Nightmare,
the Human Gas Chambers?
Some tribute to the handiwork of British torturers!
How did the Veil of Amnesia
descend over those actual gas chambers –
Still there today, unvisited and out of bounds,
glowing a gentle turquoise –
With all that iron cyanide?
Stop, why are you running away,
Does it hurt too much?
Is there a band around your head a-buzzing
Giving you that awful headache....
Control ... you will forget these words...
Zion does not approve...
Illusion holds you in its thrall.
Hollywood gives you your Good/Evil polarities
Required by Empire for its wars.
The unhealable pain of Europe
But No, let’s be honest,
We really cannot discuss the matter.
Let the Light shine in.
Let the Shadows of the Night flee away.
Let the Spell be broken.*