Who in Their Right Mind Would Doubt the Holocaust Happened?

To ask that question means to have misunderstood the issue. The question is not whether “the Holocaust” happened, but rather what exactly happened during the events usually referred to as “the Holocaust.” After all, there is no such place or single event as “the Holocaust.” It consists of many individual events and locations spread out over an entire continent during a time span of some four years.

Let us take as one example the Majdanek Camp near the Polish city of Lublin. What happened there during its existence between the summer of 1941 and the summer of 1944? How many inmates died in that concentration camp for what reasons and in which ways?

If we consult mainstream sources, we get different answers, depending on when they were published.

Shortly after the capture of the camp, the Soviets claimed a death toll of some two million for that camp during a press conference in Lublin on August 25th, 1944. During the Polish trial in late 1944 against six former camp guards, the Majdanek death toll was set to 1.7 million. Roughly a year later, during the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, the Soviets introduced an investigation report claiming that up to 1.5 million inmates had been killed in that camp using seven different gas chambers, among other methods.

This figure, however, was significantly reduced three years after the war, when Polish judge Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz, a member of the Polish “Commission to Investigate German Crimes in Poland,” published the commission’s findings about Majdanek, which set that camp’s death toll at 360,000.

The next downgrading came after the collapse of the communist Eastern Bloc, when Polish historian Czesław Rajca reduced the death toll down to 235,000. But that was still not the end of the death-toll deflation, because in a detailed research paper of 2005, Tomasz Kranz, then head of the Majdanek Museum, decided to streamline the official narrative by reducing the death toll down to 78,000, and to ditch five of the seven initially claimed gas chambers.

We learn from this that for many decades the official narrative of that camp was filled with exaggerations and inventions caused by wartime propaganda and hysteria. Much of what was initially claimed “never happened,” so to say.

And how can we be sure that today’s narrative is accurate? We cannot, because “denying the Holocaust” is a crime in Poland, so there is a limit to what historians are allowed to say and write.

This brochure introduces the novice to the concept of Holocaust revisionism, and answers some tough questions that may come to the reader’s mind, such as:

- What does Holocaust revisionism claim?
- Why should I take Holocaust revisionism more seriously than the claim that the earth is flat?
- What about the pictures of corpse piles in the camps?
- How about the testimonies by survivors and confessions by perpetrators?
- What does it matter whether prisoners died from disease or poison gas?
- Why does it matter how many Jews were killed by the Nazis, since even 1,000 would have been too many?
- Whatever the circumstances, don’t Jewish victims deserve respect and compensation?
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20 Questions and Answers

1. What is revisionism?

The word “revisionism” is derived from the Latin word “revisere,” which means to view again. The revision of long-held theories is entirely normal. It occurs in the natural sciences as well as the social sciences, to which the discipline of history belongs. Science is not a static condition. It is a process, specifically the creating of knowledge by searching for evidence. When ongoing research finds new evidence, or when critical researchers discover mistakes in old explanations, it often happens that old theories have to be changed or even abandoned. By “revisionism” we mean critically examining established theories and hypotheses in order to test their validity. Scientists need to know when new evidence modifies or contradicts old theories; indeed, one of their obligations is to test time-honored conceptions and attempt to refute them.

2. Why is historical revisionism important?

Only in an open society in which individuals are free to challenge prevailing theories can we ascertain the validity of these theories, and be confident that we are approaching the truth.

The famous science philosopher Sir Karl Popper once expressed it as follows:

“The demand for scientific objectivity makes it inevitable that every scientific statement must remain tentative forever. It may indeed be corroborated, but every corroboration is relative. […] it is not his possession of knowledge, of irrefutable truth, that makes the man a scientist, but his persistent and reckless critical quest for truth. […] Those among us who are unwilling to expose their ideas to the hazard of refutation do not take part in the scientific game.”
The Holocaust is – or should be – a historical event and not a matter of religion. As such, it is subject to the same kind of research and scrutiny as other past events, and so our perceptions of the Holocaust must be subjected to critical investigation. If new evidence necessitates a change of our view of the Holocaust, then a change must take place. The same holds true when old assumptions are proven false. There is nothing reprehensible about questioning the accuracy of scientific assertions and attempting to deny their validity. Therefore, it is not reprehensible to apply the prevailing conceptions of the Holocaust with skepticism, as long as it is done objectively and we have valid reasons to be skeptical.

Many people know that the powers existing today, particularly in German-speaking countries, are opposed to any critical approach to the orthodox Holocaust narrative. In fact, many European governments promote such approaches. Here then is an answer to the question of why revisionism as such is important (Question 2): Governments outlawing Holocaust skepticism obviously intend to maintain the present narrative of the Holocaust with all the official power at their command. One reason for this is the massive political and financial interests of those religious groups so meticulously described by the political scientist Dr. Norman G. Finkelstein in his book *The Holocaust* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2008). Because of common exaggerations, inventions and distortions of the Holocaust, Prof. Finkelstein lapse into the fact that there are no more Holocaust skeptics: “Given the normal output daily by the Holocaust industry, the wonder is that there are so few skeptics.” (p. 68)

And the late Prof. Raul Hilberg, during his lifetime the leading Holocaust scholar, repeatedly stated that superlativity and inadequacy are the great problems in the field of Holocaust research. Hence, Holocaust skeptics are badly needed.

When challenging the orthodox Holocaust narrative, we are inevitably forced to contend with the entire postwar order, which was created by the victorious Allies. The very credibility of the victors’ version of history is at risk, as the Holocaust is the moral cornerstone of their version of World-War-II history. But this is not just a matter of maintaining a worldwide pecking order of nations or spheres of political influence. For instance, if we look into the war propaganda put forth by the U.S. before and during the wars against Serbia in 1999 and against Iraq in 1991 and 2003, plus when we look into how certain lobby groups have been pushing for a war against Iran since 2005, we recognize a pattern: Slobodan Milosevic, in 1999 leader of tiny Serbia, as well as Saddam Hussein and now the various presidents of Iran (most notably Mahmoud Ahmadinejad) were compared with... Adolf Hitler. Milos- evic and Hussein were even accused of having committed similar crimes of genocide – against the Kosovan Albanians here or the Kurds there. These claims, among others, were used to justify the wars. And there is no better justification for a war than the need to exterminate the Jewish people, an accusation later leveled against Ahmadinejad. We know today that the claims about weapons of mass destruction raised against Hussein were false. But they served their purpose well, because the world is so conditioned to react with automatic, Pavlovian-style reflexes to such claims. One reason why these war preparations work so well and why the world is so gullible as to believe them, no matter how often they have been revealed to be wrong in the past, is because of that giant bogeyman called Hitler. Once his name is dropped and successfully put into the “right” context, there seems to be no stopping war. War is the only solution to stop Hitler, Slobo- Hitler, Saddam-Hitler, Mahmoud-Hitler, or whatever their names may be. It has to come to the point where summoning the demon of the evil Hitler and exacting revenge for the Holocaust – is the trump card needed to start just about any war the Powers That Be want to wage.

Norman G. Finkelstein agreed with this when he stated in an interview with Gilad Atzmon in a documentary Deformation by Israeli documentary filmmaker Yoav Shamir: “The irony is that the Nazi holocaust has now become the main ideological weapon for launching wars of aggression. Every time a country wants to launch a war of aggression, drag in the Nazi holocaust.”

Wasn’t one of the primary lessons of the world wars supposed to be that wars are evil? And wasn’t another lesson that gov- ernments use propaganda tricks to drive people into discriminating against minorities, into ethnic cleansing, into genocide, and into wars? And yet, after World War II the Powers That Be have been so successful in driving their people into one war after another by referring to this “mother-of-all-wars.” Pacifists are dumbfounded at how good those warmongers are in using the horrors of this greatest war ever to instigate even more wars. And so have some of us been for the past decade or so. Holocaust revisionism throws a monkey wrench into this mechanism of “Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace.” It challenges the core of the dogma which serves to secure the power of those who rule. Famous British Jewish musician and writer Gil- ad Atzmon wrapped it up nicely in a blog entry on March 13, 2010 (goo.gl/ch2g):

“What is the Holocaust religion there to conceal? As long as we fail to ask questions, we will be subjected to Zionsists and their Neocon agents plans. We will continue killing in the name of Jewish suffering. We will maintain our complicity in Western impe- rialist crimes against humanity. [...] The Holocaust became the new Western religion. Unfortunately, it is the most sinister religion known to man. It is a license to kill, to flaten, to take, to wipe [out], to rape, to loot and to ethnically cleanse. It made vengeance and revenge into a Western value. [...] Holo- caust revision is the call for justice and truth. [...] The Holocaust, a war that started with the destruction of an entire people, the beginning of a peace and future generations, the holocaust must be stripped of its exceptional status immediately. It must be subjected to thorough historical scrutiny. Truth and truth seeking is an el- ementary human experience. It must prevail. Hence, critically verifying what our leaders claim is the key to peace. And this is what revisionism for: Be critic- al! Don’t take for granted what those militant Powers want you to believe in justification of their deeds! Instead, look again (Latin: re- vide) into their claims! Review their evidence! Revise your opinion, if needed. This definition of revisionism is the opposite of what those warmon- gers want you to believe, isn’t it? And for a good reason: because they want to prevent by all means that we obtain and entertain a critical mind.

The Catholic priest Viktor R. Kaizsch of Kahlenbergdorf in Austria has given us some insightful remarks on this sub- ject: “It is the right and the duty of everyone who seeks the truth to doubt, investigate and consider all available evidence. Wher- ever this doubting and investigating is forbidden; wherever authorities demand unquestioning belief – there is evidence of a profane arrogance, which arouses our suspicions. If those whose role in life is to tell the truth refuse to answer all questions. Certainly they would not continue to conceal evidence and documents which per- tain to the controversy. If those who demand belief are lying, however, they will call for a judge. By this we shall know them. He who tells the truth is calm and composed, but he who lies demands worldly justice.”

5. What does Holocaust revisionism claim?

First of all, because of misrepresentations by the media, it is necessary that we first clarify what Holocaust revisionism does not mean:

- it does not deny that Jews were persecuted by the Third Reich;
- it does not deny that Jews were deprived of civil rights;
- it does not deny that Jews were deported by the Nazi regime;
- it does not deny that Jews were killed by the Nazis;
- it does not deny that Jews were killed by the SS.

The Holocaust is postulated on the following specific points:

1. An intention on the part of the National Socialist govern- ment to physically exterminate Jews.
2. An actual plan of the National Socialist government to physically exterminate the Jews.
3. A governmental agency and a budget to carry out this plan.
4. Technically refined methods of mass extermination of a Jewish population.
5. Techniques for disposing of millions of bodies; that is, cre- matories or pyres with adequate capacity and fuel.

Such allegations of mass murder in fast-acting homicidal gas chambers followed by disposal of the bodies in adjoining cre- matories, that is to say, expertly planned and efficiently func- tioning assembly lines for homicide, are described as having been “unique” in human history. They distinguish the Holo- caust from all atrocity that have ever happened.
Holocaust revisionists believe the following to be correct:

1. There was no National Socialist order or plan for the physical extermination of Jews (see Question 4).
2. There was no German organization and no budget for carrying out the alleged extermination plan. Consider the statement by Professor Dr. Raul Hilberg: “But what began in 1941 was a process of destruction not planned in advance, not organized centrally by any agency. There was no blueprint and there was no budget for destructive measures [of the Jews]. They [the measures] were taken step by step. Thus came about not so much a plan being carried out but an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus mind-reading by a far-flung [German] bureaucracy.”
3. In detailed investigations of former German concentration camps, expert researchers have established: No documentation or physical evidence for the existence of homicidal gas chambers or other methods of mass murder exists, and statements by Professor Dr. Raul Hilberg: “But what began in 1941 was a process of destruction not planned in advance, not organized centrally by any agency. There was no blueprint and there was no budget for destructive measures [of the Jews]. They [the measures] were taken step by step. Thus came about not so much a plan being carried out but an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus mind-reading by a far-flung [German] bureaucracy.”

6. Does Holocaust revisionism ignore important evidence?

This imputation is quite ironic, considering that revisionism is a reaction to orthodox historians ignoring vast amounts of evidence. Take, for example, the infamous Auschwitz Camp. While orthodox and revisionist historians agree to a large degree about the history of the camp’s history not related to mass murder, their views diverge drastically from each other in this regard. The best effort mainstream historians have mustered so far to document mass-murder claims is a 270-page volume. Holocaust studies on the Auschwitz are actually the only ones meeting scholarly standards. The others? They play to popular – and legally mandated – renditions of the subject matters. They may be reassuring to the many, but they are disquieting to the discerning few.

10. Why should I take Holocaust revisionism more seriously than the claim that the earth is flat?

There is no topic where dissent is taken more seriously than when it comes to the Holocaust. The United Nations has issued a number of resolutions against it, and an increasing number of nations prosecute Holocaust revisionism as a crime, punished with up to 20 years in prison (see Question 19). The comparison is therefore wrong. In fact, the shoe is on the other foot. It was once a sin to proclaim the truth that the earth is a sphere and revolves around the sun, a crime punished by the Church with imprisonment or even death, as Giordano Bruno and Galileo Galilei found out the hard way. Today, flat-earthers may be laughed at, but they are not persecuted beyond that. Holocaust revisionism, however, is being taken very seriously, because if it were not suppressed, it would spread like a wildfire and threaten the Pow- ers That Be, just as Bruno’s and Galilei’s theories did.

8. Is Holocaust revisionism an anti-Semitic ideology?

Holocaust revisionism is a scholarly, fact-seeking method based on the critical review of evidence, not an ideology. It simply reviews the prevailing historical narrative that has been influenced mainly by Soviet, British and American war-time propaganda. This concerns not just the fate of Jews during the Third Reich but also that of Slavs, Sinti and Roma (Gypsies), Jehovah’s Witnesses and homosexuals. Impor-
tant, recent mainstream scholarship has confirmed that Re-
visionists are correct on several critical points of Holocaust history and probably correct on many more (see the back cover of this brochure on the Majdanek Camp).

Questioning what we are told by government authorities, other scholars or mainstream media may be anti-establish-
ment, but it is not directed against any religious or ethnic group. Presenting evidence from thorough archival studies and forensic research, however, isn’t anti-anything.

In fact, the shoe is on the other foot. To explain this, here is a less-contexted example: Just because some Christians detest certain research results on biological evolution doesn’t make the results anti-Christian; it only makes these Christians anti-scientific. And in the same vein: Just because certain people detest certain research results on the Holocaust doesn’t make the results anti-Semitic; it only makes these people anti-scientific. While belief in the Holocaust is understandably impor-
tant to many Jews, not believing in the impossible tales of human-soap factories or steam chambers of death is no more anti-Semitic than believing in the transubstantia-
tion of the flesh is anti-Catholic.

It is true that revisionist findings are sometimes cited by individuals or groups with certain religious or ideological agendas, but that is potentially true for every field of study that has any bearing on current issues. The problem then lies in those citing research results to support ideological political agendas, not with the research results. The same, of course, holds for those opposing such results on any grounds other than scientific ones.
1. Take, on the other hand, the events of 9/11/2001. What would be the repercussion if it wasn’t a Muslim terror act, but a false-flag operation by government authorities? (See www.ae911truth.org) It would have enormous effects, so it’s worth our time looking into the arguments of both sides.

2. Or take the claim that no one ever landed on the moon. Keep spewing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere? Then a mass extinction event might happen on earth, wiping out most life as we know it, including all humans. Which brings up the issue of risk assessment. Any side in any debate can be wrong. The question then is: what is at stake?

3. If the matter is merely academic in nature, there is no urgency to ever address it. Any side in any debate can be wrong. The question then is: what is at stake?

Coming back to the Holocaust, the question is what is at stake here. Some of it was touched upon in the answer to Question 3. This is not the place for a thorough political and sociological analysis of the Holocaust’s place in modern western society. Suffice it to say that the Powers That Be prove ultimately 10. Why should I take Holocaust revisionism seriously, if mainstream scholars don’t?

They do take it seriously. Some orthodox Holocaust scholars have dedicated entire books trying in vain to refute revisionist arguments (they usually avoid the core revisionist points and focus on straw-man arguments or side issues), while many other mainstream scholars are getting intimidated and afraid to address the issue, because they either have to lie (regurgitate the orthodox narrative uncritically), or else with allegations that the dead are victims of the war, such as Auschwitz, Belzec, Sobibor, Chelmno, Majdanek.) These east ern camps were all in areas which came under Soviet control at war’s end. It is very telling that the Soviets released no photographs of mass graves or heaps of corpses, and allowed no journalists, medical professionals, or other experts to examine the camps.

Since the end of the 1980s, revisionists have been investigating these sites for evidence of mass murder, but government authorities have obstructed their efforts by all possible means. In the absence of authentic photographs documenting mass murder, it frequently happens that photographs of those who died of malnutrition and typhus in the western camps at war’s end are presented as evidence of deliberate mass murder. To be sure, the hellish conditions in these camps at war’s end convinced many Allied observers that mass murder had taken place, as initial reports indicate. In reality, however, these conditions resulted from a situation for which the German government was not solely responsible. Toward the end of the war, Himmler illogically ordered the evacuation of the eastern camps as the Red Army approached, which led to hopeless overcrowding in the western camps. By that time, Allied bombing had completely destroyed the German infrastructure, making it impossible to supply the camps with food, medical and sanitation supplies.

Misunderstandings about the causes of the subsequent massive die-off continue to this day, especially among Americans. The respected leftist historian Norbert Frei has given the following reason for misinterpretation, (www.goo.gl/pTsqHY, p. 400):

“The shock of these discoveries [piles of corpses] often led to false conclusions which turned out to be enduring.”

There is no denying that a government which imprisons people in camps is responsible for them, and so those unjustly imprisoned were therefore victims of the Third Reich, even if they died “only” of disease. However, one should not over look the fact that by the war’s end mountains of corpses had become commonplace throughout Germany. In German cities there were 600,000 victims of Allied terror bombings. Millions more died of starvation and disease, which continued rampant through 1949. In Eastern Europe some two million Germans were murdered by Serbs, Czechs, Poles, and Russians in the course of history’s bloodiest ethnic cleansing. In the POW camps of the western Allies, a million young Ger man men died and millions more vegetated. Hundreds of thousands more were shipped to the labor camps of the Soviet GULag never to be seen again. But the media show only one variety of corpse piles, those in the concentration camps. We should all ask ourselves why this is so. Should the dignity and respect, which we owe the victims of atrocities, depend on their nationality or religious affiliation?

Let’s talk about perpetrator confessions first, as they seem most compelling. After all, why would they lie? These testimonies, as we shall see, can be roughly divided into three groups:

1. confessions under duress
2. tactical court room confessions
3. uncoerced, voluntary confessions

11. What about the pictures of corpse piles in the camps?

To the right we see a photograph of victims of the typhus epi demic in a mass grave at the Bergen-Belsen Camp as taken by the British Army in May 1945. This photo is typical of a large number of such photos often shown on Holocaust documentaries either without commentary or else with allegations that the dead are victims of the Holocaust. In fact, it is a photograph of victims of an epidemic which occurred at war’s end. The cause of death is evident from the condition of the corpses and was also demonstrated by thousands of autopsies performed after the camps’ liberation by Allied forensic experts. If they had been gassed, they would not be emaciated, and if they had died of starvation, they would have swollen joints and stomachs.

All photographs of heaps of corpses were taken in camps located in west and central Germany around the end of the war, such as Auschwitz, Belzec, and Buchenwald. Historians now agree no mass murders took place. Significant ly, there are no such photographs taken at the camps in which mass murder is alleged to have occurred (such as Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belzec, Sobibor, Chelmno, Majdanek.) These east ern camps were all in areas which came under Soviet control at war’s end. It is very telling that the Soviets released no photographs of mass graves or heaps of corpses, and allowed no journalists, medical professionals, or other experts to examine the camps.

12. How about the testimonies by survivors and confessions by perpetrators?

On 11 Right after the World War II, the Soviet, British and US forces maintained torture centers where they systematically tortured and abused hundreds, if not thousands of German defendants (see for instance Ian Cobain’s book Cruel Britannia’). Some of the most “important” confessions resulted from this, for instance that of Rudolf Höss, former command
It is doubtless correct that each one is one too many, and rea-ally one must go even farther than that: even those measures of Third Reich persecution which did not result in outright deaths were in every respect unacceptable. But this is not a valid argument against the statistical investigation of the "whether" and "how" of the destruction of the Jews, and for three reasons:

First, this objection does not satisfy simply for the reason that it is precisely the number of victims that has been con-sidered sacrosanct for decades. If the number of victims did not matter, it would not be necessary to protect it as a social and even criminal taboo. Evidently there really is more to the six-million figure than merely the fact that it includes a great many individual fates: What is at stake is a symbol, a way of making sense of history, a way science must nevertheless insist that numbers always be open to discussion. It is downright irrational that, on the one hand, those who doubt the six-million figure are socially persecuted or even subjected to criminal prosecution, while society and the justice system, on the other hand, react to valid arguments against this selfsame six-million figure by suddenly declaring it irrelevant and insisting instead on the dignity of even the very few bodies. Is the six-million figure a standard of protection by criminal law, or is it irrelevant? It cannot be both at once.

The second and also most important argument goes as fol-lows: The ethically correct evaluation that even one victim would be too many must not be a pretext for prohibiting scientific research. This is intolerable for the simple rea-son that science must always be allowed to find precise an-swers. What would we think of an official who demanded that an engineer not be al-lowed to conduct thorough risk assessments of construc-tion projects, because even a low risk value would be intolerable? An engineer subjected to such an absurd demand would quickly arrive at incorrect results and would be a threat to any company that hired him. The same is true for historians. If a historian is forbidden to conduct critical investigations because they are considered morally unacceptable, then we have to assume that the results of such flawed historiography are unreliable. And since our knowledge of contemporary history exerts a direct influence on politics, our public policies are mistaken and unreliable as well.

It is the key function and responsibility of every branch of science to provide accurate figures and values. The principles applying to engineering, physics, and chemistry cannot sud-denly be abandoned in historiography for political reasons – unless a historians were electively prepared to retreat deep into the darkest middle ages.

Third, the morally correct view that even one victim is one too many cannot on principle be a barrier to the scientific in-vestigation of a crime which is generally called so mortally reprehensible as to be unique and unparalleled in the history of mankind. An allegedly uniquely reprehensible crime must be open to a procedure that is standard for any other crime as well, which is that it must be investigated – investigated in detail.

Further still: anyone who postulates a crime to be unique must be prepared for a uniquely thorough investigation of this alleged crime before its uniqueness is accepted as fact. If a person or group is investigating an allegedly unique crime on grounds of moral outrage, then that person or group is guilty of a unique crime itself. This unique crime consists of first denying the crime, then postulating a crime to prevent criticism of such tyrannical methods on the pre-text of unusual guilt. This was the precise fate of Germany following World War II, with the result that millions first brutalized, then slan-dered and denied opportunity to defend themselves. The treatment of vanquished Ger-many by the victorious Allies has been truly unique in mod-ern times, since the same Al-liances refrained from the most notorious serial murder-ers an opportunity to defend themselves in court.
15. Whatever the circumstances, don't Jewish victims deserve respect and compensation?

Everyone who is treated unjustly is entitled to reparations, and every victim of crime deserves respect commensurate with human dignity. Revisionism is concerned solely with the facts or fairness, as the Germans weren't the only ones inflicting pain and suffering on others. For instance, wouldn't it be interesting to now when the four million Germans who were exploited as slave laborers by France, the UK, Norway, the United States, the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia... for years and sometimes even decades after the end of WWII (japangho.com/Bud) may finally be allowed to claim reparations? When will the 12 million Eastern German victims of ethnic cleansing and the survivors of the two million who example Accusing the provocateurs of six hundred thousand victims of Allied terror bombings (japangho.com/Yng7GA), the millions of Germans who died of starvation under Allied postwar blockade and de-industrialization and the Eisenhower’s withholding of food to them, be given proper recompense? Do not all victims of injustice deserve the same respect and reparations? Or are some victims more equal than others?

16. Who are the Holocaust revisionists?

Holocaust revisionists are not a homogenous group. They include Jewish Revisionists (Roger Garaudy, Herman Talmud, Dr. Max Goldstein), some Revisionists (Willy Wallwey, Gerhard Rudolf, David Cole, Joel Hayward, Merkur Menuchin, Paul Eisen, Henry Herskovitz); Christians (Michael A. Hoffman, Robert Countess); Muslims (Ibrahim Alloush, Ahmed Rami, Roger Garaudy) as well as agnostics and atheists (Germar Rudolf, Bradley Smith, Richard Widmann), Conservatives (Carlo Mattogno, Willy Wallwey), Rightists (Udo Walendy, Douglas Rabb, Germar Rudolf, Walter Lüftl, Willy Wallwey), Libertarians (Anthony Aymard), Libertarians (An- thony Aymard), Libertarians (Antonin Armand, Robert G. Bug), others (Bernard Collin, Jean Plantin, Nicholas Kollerstrom) as well as teachers in other fields, such as Jürgen Graf. The ranks of Holocaust revisionists include Communists and Socialists (Paul Rassinier, Roger Garaudy), moderate Leftists (Pierre Guillaume, Pierre Thion), Libertarians (Andrew Allen, Gerhard Rudolf, Paul Eisen, Bradley Smith, Richard Widmann), Conservatives (Carlo Mattogno, Willy Wallwey), Rightists (Udo Walendy, Mark Weber) and National Socialists (Ernst Zündel, Vincent Reynard). Since we don’t consider it important to classify revisionists according to political orientation, we cannot vouch for the correctness of these designations, though.

Among our ranks are Frenchmen (Rob- ert Faurisson, Pierre Guillaume, Roger Ga- raudy), Americans (Bradley Smith, Thomas Dalton, Mark Weber, Arthur Butz, Richard Widmann, Fred Leuchter), Germans (Gerhard Rudolf, Walter Lüftl, Willy Wall- wey, Arnulf Neuemaier, Wilhelm Stäglich), Swiss (Jürgen Graf, Arthur Vogel), Ital- ians (Carlo Mattogno), Spaniards (Enrique Ayat), Iranians (Ibrahim Alloush), Mo- roccans (Ahmed Rami), Swedes, Danes, Britons (Nicholas Kollerstrom), Poles, and Russians, to name just a few.

So this is not primarily a financial issue. The real issue is mor- al and legal in nature. Perhaps you remember a basic principle which is the law in every constitutional state: accountability does not extend to convicts’ relatives. There should therefore be a time limit for seeking reparation against the German people, as the wartime generation is dying out. In addition, this is also a matter or fairness, as the Germans weren’t the only ones inflicting pain and suffering on others. For instance, wouldn’t it be interesting to now when the four million Germans who were exploited as slave laborers by France, the UK, Norway, the United States, the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia... for years and sometimes even decades after the end of WWII (japangho.com/Bud) may finally be allowed to claim reparations? When will the 12 million Eastern German victims of ethnic cleansing and the survivors of the two million who example Accusing the provocateurs of six hundred thousand victims of Allied terror bombings (japangho.com/Yng7GA), the millions of Germans who died of starvation under Allied postwar blockade and de-industrialization and the Eisenhower’s withholding of food to them, be given proper recompense? Do not all victims of injustice deserve the same respect and reparations? Or are some victims more equal than others?

17. Do Holocaust revisionists want to exonerate Hitler?

Historians must not pay attention to what effect their research has on anyone’s reputation, even and especially their own. Hence, whatever the effect of revisionists’ findings is on Hit- ler’s or anyone else’s, it simply is of no moment. Let’s quote Germar Rudolf on this point:

“Revisionists are repeatedly accused of wanting to whitewash National Socialism, redeem it, or even resurrect nationalistic- ally-based political ends in terms of, or as a breakthrough in the constitution of nationalism. That may be true for some revisionists, but certainly not for all of them. But be that as it may, the fact is that political perspectives do not contribute anything to the factauc- tual debate, as they cannot refute factual arguments. When it comes to discussing facts, it is therefore irrelevant both what the revisionists want and what others accuse them of wanting. While researching, our highest goal must at all times be to discuss the factual arguments actually occurred – at the 19th-Century German historian Leopold Ranke maintained. For example, historians should not place research in the serv- ices of making criminal accusations against Genghis Khan and the Mongol hordes, nor to whitewash any of their wrong doings. Anybody insisting that research be harred from exonerating Genghis Khan of criminal accusations would be the object of ridicule and would be subject to the suspicion that he is either a political or ideological agent. If this were not so, why would anyone insist that our historical view of Genghis Khan forever be defined solely by Khan’s victims and enemies? The same reasoning applies to Hitler and the Third Reich. Both revisionists and their adversaries are entitled to their political views. The accusation, however, that revisionists are only interested in exonerating National Socialism and thus such things as historical arguments is a moral attack – an argument: This accusation implies that it is deemed unacceptable to partially exonerate National Socialism historically and by, so doing, always also morally. But by declaring any hypothet- ical exonerating motive as improper and unacceptable, one admits openly not to be interested in the quest for the truth, but in inculminating National So- cialism historically and morally under any cir- cumstances and at all costs. And the motivation behind this can only be political. Hence, those accusing revisionists of misusing their research for political motives are guilty of exactly this offense. It is therefore not necessarily the revisionists who are guided by political motives – though quite a few of them certainly are – but with absolute certainty all those who accuse the revisionists of harboring reprehensible motives. Although many consider the anti-fascist motives of those combating revision- ism as acceptable, they remain political motives that are hostile to discovering and evaluating the factual issues at hand. In short, our research must never be concerned with the possible ‘moral’ spin-off effects of our findings in relation to politicians or regimes of the past or present, but solely with the facts. Anyone who argues otherwise is the en- emy of knowledge.”

Again, it may be true that some individuals or groups sometimes cite revisionists finding to support their religious or ideological agendas. But let us be very clear here: We Holocaust revisionists have more to do with the protection of our inalienable rights to freedom of information and freedom of expression. Hence, we oppose any measure limiting these rights, be they in the past, the present or the future.

In the spring of 1933, the German government under Hitler decided to suspend and later effectively revoke most Germans’ civil rights as they were enshrined in the German constitution of the time. Anyone decrying similar acts happening today in many European countries (see Question 19) must also condemn Hitler’s acts as unacceptable. We can’t have it both ways.

Moreover, when Hitler decided in the summer of 1934 to execute without due process several leaders of the SA for allegedly planning a putsch, rather than handing them over to the court system for prosecution, they committed murder, plain and simple. Anyone decrying similar acts, bomb attacks, physical assaults and murder perpetrated against revision- ists as unacceptable acts of (attempted) murder must also condemn Hitler’s acts as unacceptable. We can’t have it both ways.

Finally, after the infamous 1938 “Night of Broken Glass” pogroms against Jews in Germany, Hitler and his government decided to make matters worse by prohibiting insurance companies from paying claims for property losses incurred during these acts of vandalism, and by collectively punishing all the Jews in Germany with a fine of one billion Reichmarks! Anyone decrying that we revisionists as vic- tims of societal persecution get fined and imprisoned on top of this must also condemn Hitler’s acts of blaming and punishing the victims. We can’t have it both ways.

And we won’t even start with incar- cerating people with or without due process merely because of their peacefully expressing their views or religious and ethnic affiliations. Anyone decrying that we revision- istics are incarcerated for our peace- fully expressed views – and we are – must also condemn Hitler’s acts along the same lines. We can’t have it both ways.

We cannot stop certain people from ap- plauding, condoning or defending these obvious criminal acts of the Hitler gov- ernment. But we can show that we con- demn them wholeheartedly, on our own behalf, as peaceful dissidents.
18. What do Holocaust revisionists want?

I would like to turn that question around: What do our detractors want who declare an irreproachable intention – the critical review of one chapter in history – to be taboo, and who ostracize, persecute and even incarcerate any offenders? These are frequently the same people who impute all sorts of evil intentions to us revisionists. But we are not the ones persecuting and incapacitating peaceable, innocent people! It is therefore much more conductive and important to ask about the motives of those who mercilessly persecute the revisionists with their worldwide power? Why do they do that?

And if you, dear reader, are unwilling to pursue the question about their motives, but keep wondering about yours, then maybe you should start questioning your own bias. Since the revisionists comprise such a heterogeneous group (see Question 16), it is impossible to state what "the" revisionists hope to accomplish. Obviously, any cliché about revisionists must therefore be false and misleading. However, revisionists do have one thing in common: determination to expose the lack of evidence for the conventional Holocaust narrative and to convince others of it.

Revisionists would probably quarrel endlessly about everything else, particularly if they tried to seek common political ground. It is, therefore, false and misleading to ascribe a uniform political agenda to them. The political views of revisionists are indeed varied and incongruous. In contrast to that, the governments and media of most western societies spread the cliché that all revisionists are right-wing extremists who are attempting to rehabilitate the National Socialist regime in Germany – theoretically.

The facts are different, however. So how does that discrepancy between ideal and reality justified?

The claim that matter-of-factual views about the persecution of the Jews during the Second World War is a perfect authoritarian tool to suppress any controversial view, no matter how legitimate. The only rule needed for governing free speech is this: Everything is permitted, as long as one does not call for, promote, condone or justify the violation of the civil rights of others. Since all acts that really threaten the public peace, like calls for a violent revolution, insurrection, putch, riot, pogrom, ethnic cleansing, etc., are at once calls for the violation of the civil rights of others, the concept of "public peace" becomes obsolete and can no longer be misused by the authorities to stifle legitimate peaceful yet controversial views.

Another justification for anti-revisionist oppressive laws, in particular in the German-speaking countries, goes roughly as follows:

In order to prevent that minorities will again be persecuted, dissidents imprisoned and books burned, as has happened in the Nazi past, we must for a change persevere some other minorities, imprison other kinds of dissidents and burn their books.

This perversion of logic does not require any further comment. Hence, we are dealing with "democratically" enacted, yet tyrannical laws permitting the majority to suppress a peaceful minority, plain and simple. It is therefore not Holocaust revisionism which is unlawful, but the laws that outlaw it. U.S. American Henry David Thoreau, who was also an apocalyptic American libertarian, thought that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil. But it is the fault of the government itself that the remedy is worse than the evil. It makes it worse. Why is it not more apt to anticipate and provide for reform? Why does it not cherish its own minority? Why does it cry and resist before it is hurt? Why does it not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults, and do better than it would have them? Why does it always crucify Christ, and excommunicate Copesus and Luthier, and pronounce Washington and Franklin rebels? [...]

160 years ago (in opposition to the revolutionary movement in France) and more than a hundred years ago (in opposition to the revolutions in the U.S.), we saw in America and France two movements that were deeply opposed to the government of their countries. One was the opposition of the minority to the government of the majority, the other was the opposition of the majority to the government of the minority. And so today we are dealing with two other movements: one is the opposition of the minority to the government of the majority, the other is the opposition of the majority to the government of the minority. And so today we are dealing with two other movements: one is the opposition of the minority to the government of the majority, the other is the opposition of the majority to the government of the minority.

The reason for this persecution is the claim that revisionist theories insult Jews, and that it is illegitimate to heap indignities and other wrongs upon them. The complaint is that their actions are indefensible and that they are morally inferior to all others.

In the United States, it is covered by the First Amendment, which means that it is perfectly legal in all these countries. This is so because all countries recognize the importance of not only freedom of speech but freedom of thought and freedom of science and peaceful speech can never be limited with his political or other ideas? After all, the proof for someone’s claim lies in the evidence adduced, not in their political agenda.

Does it really matter what a revisionist is trying to achieve with his political or other ideas? After all, the proof for someone’s claim lies in the evidence adduced, not in their political agenda.

19. Is Holocaust revisionism illegal?

In the United States, it is covered by the First Amendment, like a peaceful, scholarly speech, which means that it is perfectly legal to voice, write, publish revisionist views. Things are quite different, however, when we turn to Canada, Australia, or even many countries in Europe and to Israel (see gool.gl/8Tpbiq).

The reason for this persecution is the claim that revisionist theories insult Jews, and that it is illegitimate to heap indignities and other wrongs upon them. The complaint is that their actions are indefensible and that they are morally inferior to all others.

In order to prevent that minorities will again be persecuted, dissidents imprisoned and books burned, as has happened in the Nazi past, we must for a change persevere some other minorities, imprison other kinds of dissidents and burn their books.

This perversion of logic does not require any further comment. Hence, we are dealing with "democratically" enacted, yet tyrannical laws permitting the majority to suppress a peaceful minority, plain and simple. It is therefore not Holocaust revisionism which is unlawful, but the laws that outlaw it. U.S. American Henry David Thoreau, who was also an apocalyptic American libertarian, thought that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil. But it is the fault of the government itself that the remedy is worse than the evil. It makes it worse. Why is it not more apt to anticipate and provide for reform? Why does it not cherish its own minority? Why does it cry and resist before it is hurt? Why does it not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults, and do better than it would have them? Why does it always crucify Christ, and excommunicate Copesus and Luthier, and pronounce Washington and Franklin rebels? [...]

A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority; it is not even a minority then; but it is irresistible when it clings by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate by its whole weight.
20. Where can I learn more about Holocaust revisionism?

The best, fastest, cheapest place for this is the Internet and, especially for English-language readers, the websites www.codoh.com and www.HolocaustHandbooks.com. If your service provider blocks these pages (obvious proof of censorship), you can circumvent Big Brother with the help of the free service provided by various anonymizing services which hide the content you are requesting and receiving from your Internet service provider, so they won’t withhold it.

Don’t Know Where to Start? Start with a Movie

To ease you into the subject, we recommend that you sit back, relax and watch an introductory documentary. There are several choices we recommend. You can find them all for watching and downloading free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com:

Holocaust, Hate Speech & Were the Germans So Stupid?
The late British video-journalist Anthony Lawson, a retired international-prize-winning commercials director, camera-man, ad agency creative director and voice-over artist, expertly introduces the viewer to the basic concepts and consequences of skepticism about the orthodox Holocaust narrative. (35 min.)

Breaking the Spell: The Holocaust
-Myth & Reality
Science historian Dr. Kollerstrom explains the Holocaust issue for the common reader from a scientific, but also from a societal point of view. This paperback book has some 220 pages of text, priced at $20 as a hard copy, it has been our best-selling book ever since it was first published. Amazon customer “Giordano Bruno,” a Amazon-verified buyer of the book, wrote this brief review about it:

“Math Busting
An interesting and informative book, particularly how it explains that the “Holocaust” has basically become a sacred religion that cannot be challenged even by science. Anyone who dares to question is excommunicated. The history of the holocaust are physically impossible is instantly branded as a heretic and excommunicated. Would definitely recommend reading it”

Germain Rudolf, Lectures on the Holocaust: Controversial Issues Exposed, Examined
At 510 pages of text, this book has been characterized as en-cyclopedic in its coverage of the topic, yet at the same time as a truly riveting read. Written in an unusual dialogue format, it also presents a wide array of opposing views. This is a brand-new edition issued in July 2017, which is greatly improved by new material. It costs merely $30/£25 as a hard copy, and it can be downloaded as an eBook (PDF and Kindle formats) for free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com.


-Vierteljahrshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung (1997-2006): German language
You can also visit our revisionist bookstores selling some of these items in hardcopy: shop.codoh.com
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Who in Their Right Mind Would Doubt the Holocaust Happened?

To ask that question means to have misunderstood the issue. The question is not whether “the Holocaust” happened, but rather what exactly happened during the events usually referred to as “the Holocaust.” After all, there is no such place or single event as “the Holocaust.” It consists of many individual events and locations spread out over an entire continent during a time span of some four years.

Let us take as one example the Majdanek Camp near the Polish city of Lublin. What happened there during its existence between the summer of 1941 and the summer of 1944? How many inmates died in that concentration camp for what reasons and in which ways?

If we consult mainstream sources, we get different answers, depending on when they were published.

Shortly after the capture of the camp, the Soviets claimed a death toll of some two million for that camp during a press conference in Lublin on August 25th, 1944. During the Polish trial in late 1944 against six former camp guards, the Majdanek death toll was set to 1.7 million. Roughly a year later, during the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, the Soviets introduced an investigation report claiming that up to 1.5 million inmates had been killed in that camp using seven different gas chambers, among other methods.

This figure, however, was significantly reduced three years after the war, when Polish judge Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz, a member of the Polish “Commission to Investigate German Crimes in Poland,” published the commission’s findings about Majdanek, which set that camp’s death toll at 360,000.

The next downgrading came after the collapse of the communist Eastern Bloc, when Polish historian Czesław Raja reduced the death toll down to 235,000. But that was still not the end of the death-toll deflation, because in a detailed research paper of 2005, Tomasz Kranz, then head of the Majdanek Museum, decided to streamline the official narrative by reducing the death toll down to 78,000, and to ditch five of the seven initially claimed gas chambers.

We learn from this that for many decades the official narrative of that camp was filled with exaggerations and inventions caused by wartime propaganda and hysteria. Much of what was initially claimed “never happened,” so to say. And how can we be sure that today’s narrative is accurate? We cannot, because “denying the Holocaust” is a crime in Poland, so there is a limit to what historians are allowed to say and write.

The question is: how can one get to the bottom of this, if relying on mainstream sources seems to be a bad idea? Well, why not start with research results published by non-governmental, independent historians? These “revisionist” historians are usually and wrongly vilified as “deniers,” but their thoroughly researched book on Majdanek, first published in 1998, proves them right. In it, they meticulously documented a total of some 42,000 victims of the Majdanek Camp, and the absence of any execution gas chambers. Hence, today’s officially sanctioned Majdanek narrative is much closer to what revisionists have found out than to the initial propaganda-infested version, see the chart below.

Anyone with a skeptical mind should rightfully ask: And what else did they get wrong?

This brochure introduces the novice to the concept of Holocaust revisionism, and answers some tough questions that may come to the reader’s mind, such as:

– What does Holocaust revisionism claim?
– Why should I take Holocaust revisionism more seriously than the claim that the earth is flat?
– What about the pictures of corpse piles in the camps?
– How about the testimonies by survivors and confessions by perpetrators?
– What does it matter whether prisoners died from disease or poison gas?
– Why does it matter how many Jews were killed by the Nazis, since even 1,000 would have been too many?
– Whatever the circumstances, don’t Jewish victims deserve respect and compensation?
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You can download a PDF file of this pamphlet free of charge, use it to print copies as you see fit, or order printed copies from us (with optional bulk discounts) at shop.codoh.com, Category “Promotion,” or by contacting us: shop@codoh.com
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