

Holocaust, Hate Speech & Were the Germans so Stupid?

By Anthony Lawson

Although it has innumerable advantages, one of the great disadvantages of being able to communicate using a spoken and written language, is that it allows us to tell lies.

Normally, when one thinks about telling lies one immediately thinks of doing something that is wrong. But what if telling a lie could save your wife and children from certain death—would you be doing wrong to tell that lie?

It is now thought by many historians that Rudolf Höss, who was the commander of Auschwitz from 1940 to 1943, did just that.

Having also been tortured, he signed a confession about his part in the alleged murder-by-gassing of millions of Jews and others in the so-called death camp whose name became inextricably linked to what is known as the Jewish Holocaust.

Even if torture and duress cannot be proven, the overwhelming reason for recognizing the utter falsity of the Höss confession is that the gassing method he described is not scientifically plausible.

Yet it has stood as a testament to German cruelties since Rudolf Höss testified at the Nuremberg trials. He was subsequently tried, in Poland, and hanged on April the 16th, 1947.

Although specific evidence of Höss's torture did not surface until long after he was executed, in February 1948, shortly after the Nuremberg trials were over, the thoughts of one of the American judges, Charles F. Wennerstrum, were published in the "Chicago Daily Tribune":

"The initial war crimes trial was judged and prosecuted by Americans, Russians, British and French with much of the time, effort and expenses devoted to whitewashing the Allies and placing the sole blame for World War II upon Germany.

What I have said of the nationalist character of the tribunals, applies to the prosecution. The high ideals announced as the motives for creating these tribunals has not been evident.

The prosecution has failed to maintain objectivity aloof from vindictiveness, aloof from personal ambitions for convictions. It has failed to strive to lay down precedents which might help the world to avoid future wars.

The entire atmosphere here is unwholesome. Linguists were needed. The Americans are notably poor linguists.

Lawyers, clerks, interpreters and researchers were employed who became Americans only in recent years, whose backgrounds were embedded in Europe's hatreds and prejudices..."

Of course, any number of refutations can be found for this and other statements which are highly critical of the way in which the Nuremberg trials were conducted,

but Wennerstrum's words stand as testament that dissenting voices were already being heard less than a year after the War Crimes Tribunals were over.

But many individuals and groups, particularly Jewish and Zionist organizations, would prefer that the world remains ignorant of these dissenting voices, and have coined the terms "Holocaust Denial" and "Revisionism" in an attempt to silence them.

They have managed to persuade the governments of many otherwise civilized countries to criminalize any adverse discussions about the details of the Holocaust on pain of imprisonment or a heavy fine on the basis that to question any facet of the official Holocaust story somehow constitutes an incitement to racial hatred or something equally nonsensical.

I find it offensive beyond belief that a combination of Jews and Zionists has been able to persuade so many governments that the Holocaust is the single event in history on which open discussion will not be permitted, which is a gross infringement of Article 19 in The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

(Article 19 of The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights)

But there are those who claim that Article 20 of The United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights can be used to take this basic right of freedom of expression away from us:

Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.

(Article 20 of The United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)

This is not unreasonable, as long as the wording is correctly interpreted. The keyword is "Advocacy" which, according to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, means:

"The function of an advocate; pleading for or supporting."

So, as to make this absolutely clear, one may substitute the appropriate, expanded meaning of the word "Advocacy" into Article 20, as follows:

"Any pleading for or supporting of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law."

We should also look at the definition of incitement. The root word is the verb "incite":

"To urge or spur on; to stir up, instigate, stimulate."

Thus, incitement clearly means an intention to cause others to take some kind of action. It does not mean providing information which may cause someone to do something illegal.

If I told a friend that I had seen pornographic material on display in a shop where his daughter buys her teen magazines, and he smashed the shop's window and rubbished the offensive material,

I could not be held responsible for his actions, because merely imparting information is not inciting another person to take action.

Revealing and disseminating material contained in historical documents with a conviction that the information is plausible is not urging or spurring on others to take adverse action against any national, racial or religious group.

To suggest that it is INCITEMENT is a gross distortion of language, known as DOUBLESPEAK.

The word "incitement" has been deliberately misinterpreted in the past, and this must not be allowed to continue, because such doublespeak demonstrates a level of dishonesty that should never have been allowed to insinuate itself into the legislation of any nation which claims to uphold the accurate meaning and spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights.

It cannot possibly be incitement to racial or religious hatred to point out that something that is said to have happened over sixty years ago may not have happened in exactly the way it was reported to have happened, at that time.

The world had not even begun to recover from the unbelievable suffering of hundreds of millions of people, not only Jews, and the death of about 60 millions human beings for reasons and causes which may never be fully understood.

Just as there is no disputing that atomic bombs were dropped on Japanese civilians, the Jewish concept of a Holocaust cannot be denied.

But why should it be the only episode in history that is off limits to fair comment and freedom of expression?

Whatever the reason, such a ban is certainly not in line with the Declaration of Human Rights, conferring, as it does, a special privilege on one particular group of people over all others.

Making certain details of the Holocaust sacrosanct stirs deep suspicions in my mind, because it could mean that there are those who wish to conceal certain facts which may not reflect well on themselves or on those who played an active part in the death and suffering of Jews and Gentiles alike, before, during and immediately after that terrible war.

I cannot think of any other reason why genuine historical research should be characterized as being offensive to the memories of those who died, or as an incitement to racial or religious hatred.

And I often wonder why so many of the people who seem to claim a special privilege of remembrance for their own suffering, or for that of their forbears and co-religionists, are now persecuting and killing others in a land that Zionism has been insisting that they were predestined to settle in, since before the beginning of the twentieth century;

a land already occupied by Palestinians, none of whose forbearers were responsible for the death of a single Jew in Europe during the period when the Holocaust took place.

It is the utter single-mindedness of those who hunt down and persecute so-called "Holocaust Deniers" and "Revisionists" that I object to.

Millions of people, not only Jews, suffered and died horrible deaths on battlefields, on the high seas, and in fire-bombed cities

during a conflict that may never have happened, had International Jewry not declared economic war on Germany.

The front page of the London "Daily Express" of March 24, 1933 says it all:

*"Judea Declares War on Germany! Jews of all the World Unite!
Boycott of German Goods!
Mass Demonstrations!"*

One of the leaders of the movement, Samuel Untermyer, ignored pleas from Jews living in Germany, not to go ahead with the boycott, for obvious reasons, but on August the 6, 1933, he said this on WABC, New York:

*"Each of you, Jew and Gentile alike, who has not already enlisted in this sacred war should do so now and here.
It is not sufficient that you should buy no goods made in Germany. You must refuse to deal with any merchant or shopkeeper who sells any German-made goods or who patronizes German ships of shipping. We will undermine the Hitler regime and bring the German people to their senses by destroying their export trade on which their very existence depends."*

(Samuel Untermyer, on WABC, New York, August 6, 1933)

Bernard Baruch joined Samuel Untermyer in calling for an economic boycott, and at the same time was promoting preparations for a shooting war:

"I emphasize that the defeat of Germany and Japan and their elimination from world trade would give Britain a tremendous opportunity to swell her foreign commerce in both volume and profit."

And Bernard Baruch was no stranger to the profits of war. After Woodrow Wilson brought the United States into what became to be known as The Great War,

he appointed Baruch Chairman of the War Industries Board, where he had control of all domestic contracts for Allied war materials.

A service to his country, of course, which, it is estimated, benefitted him personally to the tune of \$200,000,000,

over \$35,000,000,000 in today's terms.

Oh yes, wars mean profits, but only for those who don't have to risk their own lives fighting them.

Bernard Baruch died in New York City in 1965, 20 years and almost 60 million deaths after the end of the war he'd advocated.

When looking at historical events and their far-reaching consequences, it is essential to try and understand the context in which they took place.

At the time of the Jewish Declaration of Economic War, the political picture in Germany was extremely volatile.

In certain circles, it has been largely forgotten, perhaps conveniently, that Jews formed a substantial proportion of the Bolshevik elite at the birth of the Soviet Union, little more than a decade earlier, and that many German Jews supported communism, during Hitler's rise to power.

Those who remember or who have learned about the McCarthy era in the United States, should be able to understand the fears of Germans in the early 1930s to what many of them saw as the real threat of a Jewish-led communist takeover.

Add to that International Jewry's openly promoted aim to destroy its economy, how can it not be understood that a rise of anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany was inevitable, and far more rational than it is characterized today?

"This is not a Jewish meeting. This is the conscience of America making itself felt."

In that speech, Rabbi Steven Wise, claiming to speak for all Americans, turned the Jews of Germany into The Enemy Inside the Gates.

Make no mistake: This declaration of war was a Jewish initiative and the reason why the Jews of Europe were later herded into concentration camps.

Today, with no mention of the context, the not unreasonable fears of the Germans are denigrated as being Anti-Semitic, pure and simple.

A later circumstance with similar overtones was the fear generated in the United States by the attack on Pearl Harbor, which led to the rounding up and internment of all people of Japanese descent.

As a result of their confinement, for the duration, many of them lost their homes, jobs, businesses, friends and savings, and many of them died in those prison camps.

But for the imprisoned Japanese, there was nothing similar to the Zionist pact with Hitler known as "The Transfer Agreement," which allowed German Jews to head for the safe haven of Palestine.

This was only made possible because of the infamous Balfour Declaration of 1917, converted to The Palestine Mandate by the Council of the League of Nations on July 24, 1922, a section of which reads as follows:

"... adopted by the said Powers, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine..."

And, as we all know, the nations involved have done next to nothing over the years to pay even lip service to the rights of the non-Jewish communities that had been well established on that land for hundreds of years. It was nothing less than blatant land theft, arranged between the British and the 2nd Baron Rothschild, who agreed to bring his influence to bear to bring America into what became known as The Great War to help defeat Germany.

To explain the full implications of the Transfer Agreement would need a feature-length video, so I will just recommend that those who are interested in finding out more follow the links in the notes to this video. However, what can be fairly stated is that this agreement was, without doubt, essential to Theodor Herzl's stated objective, as recorded in his diary following the First Zionist Congress in 1897:

"At Basle I founded the Jewish State. If I said this out loud today, I would be greeted by universal laughter. In five years perhaps, and certainly in fifty years, everyone will perceive it."

51 years later, the State of Israel was established. So, it is quite clear that The Holocaust was not the reason why the State of Israel came into being, but it can be truthfully said that without the Holocaust, making Israel happen would have been a much more difficult undertaking.

(Unwilling Martyrs)

There are many articles on the Internet which refer to offers, made by the Nazis to the Zionists, which indicate that many Jews who died in the concentration camps could have been saved.

In his book "From the Depths" published after his death in 1960, Rabbi Dov-Ber Weissmandel, a Jewish rescue negotiator, described how he was told by the Nazis in 1943 that he could have all the Jews in Western Europe and the Balkans for 2 million American dollars.

The offer was referred to the Zionists, in Switzerland, who turned it down. But with the refusal came another letter, written in Hebrew, which included the following:

"About the cries coming from your country, we should know that all the Allied nations are spilling much of their blood, and if we do not sacrifice any blood, by what right shall we merit coming before the bargaining table when they divide nations and lands at the war's end?"

Among the thousands of Holocaust books which cast the Germans as the sole and ultimate villains in this tragic story of human suffering, there appears to be no English translation of Weissmandel's book.

What a surprise.

But then, the pages of history are punctuated by the portraits of people who thought nothing of sacrificing thousands, even millions of lives —the lives of their enemies and of their own citizens— to follow their dreams of world domination or a better social structure.

The well-protected elite of powerful nations, whether inclined toward imperialistic or socialistic ideologies, show little concern for the Lesser People they are prepared to sacrifice for some twisted concept of The Greater Good.

Selling the idea of fighting and dying for one's country or for some esoteric concept of World Unity is as natural to them, as the act of filling their own pockets with the profits from armaments contracts is for their advisors.

So, would it be such a great surprise to learn that some Lesser People had been sacrificed for the Greater Good of establishing a new nation based on the ideology of Zionism?

For anyone with an interest in these matters, not to even consider such a possibility would suggest a stunning degree of naiveté.

Or is it that so many otherwise intelligent people have been cowed into silence by the ADL and other anti-free speech organizations?

The Transfer Agreement caused much consternation in 1984, the author's mother saying:

"I told him he's not my son anymore."

and his father:

"I told him I don't like it, because as being a Jew I didn't want something to uncover on my own people."

So, what is it about the Holocaust story that needs so much protection?

"Germans planned and perpetrated the Holocaust. We must confront this fact and accept our own guilt and the responsibility that results from it."

Hang on! Some Germans may have done what you say, but not the wonderful German girl that I met in London in 1958. She would have been eight years old when the war ended.

This apparently self-hating German justice minister is claiming that children must bear the guilt for the sins of their fathers. That is a monstrous concept from the Book of Exodus, and in my book, far closer to hate speech than many of the criticisms one reads about the Zionist's excesses in Gaza, for example.

Her contribution to a podcast series called Voices of Antisemitism ended with this incitement to disregard Article 19 of The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights:

"It remains important that we do not leave any room for Holocaust Deniers."

How many times does it need to be said?

Questioning certain details about The Holocaust is not denying it happened.

But in the interest of balance, it is just as important that we do not leave room for Holocaust Liars.

The grotesque power-without-responsibility of the Anti-Defamation League under Abe Foxman —whose accusations of Holocaust Denial, Anti-Semitism, Hatred, Prejudice, Bigotry and Discrimination echo around the so-called free world, resulting in loss of jobs, fines and prison sentences—allows the lies told about certain details of the Holocaust to remain on countless internet websites with impunity.

Here is a blatant, yet often-repeated example. Scroll down and you will find this sentence:

"In Auschwitz II-Birkenau, more than 20,000 people could be gassed and cremated each day."

Yet 23 years ago [1988], the manager of a large crematory testified under oath at a trial in Canada that this allegation was simply...

"Preposterous and beyond realm of reality."

On this website there is a Teacher's Guide to The Holocaust, which includes these chilling statements:

"1. An entire state bureaucracy was mobilized solely for the purpose of annihilating Jews.

2. German technological expertise was harnessed to make the mass murder as efficient and low-cost as possible."

I have been unable to unearth any specifics about the alleged "entire state bureaucracy"; official documents, directives, blueprints and other records,

which the Germans were known to be meticulous about, and the second statement appears to be at odds with what actually happened.

Now, there is no denying that German science and engineering was second to none at the beginning of World War II.

Planes, tanks, the V1 and V2, and other weaponry were quickly developed, and their rocket scientists were snatched up by the U.S. and the Soviets for their space programs at the end of the war.

So, the question is: Given the technological expertise that was available, were the Germans so stupid that they would leave it to prison-camp commanders to devise their own methods for carrying out the greatest mass murder in history?

Here are some excerpts from Höss's Nuremberg testimony:

"I had the order to produce extermination facilities in Auschwitz in June 1942... The camp commander of Treblinka... used monoxide gas, and according to his opinion, his methods were not very effective.

When I built the annihilation building in Auschwitz, I therefore used Zyklon B, a crystallized hydrocyanic acid, which we threw into the death chamber through a small opening.

It took 3 to 15 minutes, depending on the climatic conditions, in order to kill the people in the death chamber."

Zyklon B is in pellet form. The absorbed hydrocyanic acid vaporizes at 25.7°C, although some vapor is given off when the pellets are exposed to air.

Despite the mention of climatic conditions, unless the air and the concrete floor of the gas chamber were approaching a temperature of 25.7°C, a killing period far in excess of 3 to 15 minutes would have been required.

The average yearly temperature at Auschwitz is 8°C. So, was Höss so stupid that he devised a system of mass murder that would only have worked, with any degree of efficiency, during the summer months? It is of no consequence that claims have been made that in the cold months hot air was blown into the alleged gas chamber, because it would have been an absurdly inefficient method of liberating gas from pellets that were already lying on a cold concrete floor.

And Höss's confession continued:

"We waited usually a half hour before we opened the doors and removed the bodies."

Please note that Höss does not mention any ventilation procedure, which would have been essential for removing the remains of a deadly gas that had just killed upwards of 2,000 people, nor has any evidence of a chimney or the necessary machinery ever come to light.

Earlier, in a confession which was obtained under extreme mental and physical duress, this paragraph appears:

"I commanded Auschwitz up to December 1, 1943, and estimate that at least 2,500,000 victims were put to death and exterminated there through gassing and burning; at least a further half million died through hunger and sickness, which amounts to a total number of approximately 3,000,000 dead."

However, it has since been discovered that this number was wildly inflated, and was officially reduced to just over one million in July 1990 by the Auschwitz State Museum.

And there are those who are convinced that this estimate is still too high.

But no matter how many died, each and every one of these deaths was a tragedy, as were the deaths of millions of others during this terrible conflict, but this does not mean we should be prevented from finding out how and why they died.

(Additional Information)

After the original upload of this video, some comments were made about the preceding section to the effect that it is rather simplistic and does not take into account dissenting opinions about how effective Zyklon B may have been.

Dr. Richard Green, for example, has stated that enough gas could be released from liquid hydrogen cyanide to be effective as a means of killing humans at temperatures below 0°C.

"Deniers... have argued that hydrogen cyanide cannot kill at temperatures below its boiling point. They have not understood that liquids have vapor pressure."

"There is an equilibrium between gas and liquid at a given temperature. This fact can be illustrated by considering humidity. It is not necessary for the temperature to be 100°C in order for there to be a significant amount of water vapor in the air..."

"Hydrogen cyanide is a liquid at room temperature with an exceedingly high vapor pressure."

But, as is often the case with the Holocaust literature, Dr. Green's statement is misleading, because his findings only relate to liquid hydrogen cyanide, while my research indicates that only Zyklon B was alleged to have been used in the human gas chambers. I can find no mention of liquid hydrogen cyanide being used to kill people.

Zyklon A was a liquid form of hydrogen cyanide containing an odorous marker to prevent poisoning.

Zyklon B was a combination of Zyklon A and a carrier in the form of absorbent pellets made from gypsum, wood pulp or the substance that is used in cat litter.

And two chemists, Dr. Wolfgang Lambrecht and Carlo Mattogno, have found sources from 1943 and 1945 which show that:

"in dry air and at 15°C, it took roughly two hours for 90% of the hydrogen cyanide to evaporate from the carrier,

and much longer if the air was already saturated with water vapor."

While Dr. Green and others go to great length to point out that only a very low gas concentration is required to kill an individual, they do not explain how those critical

death-dealing part-per-million could have been dispersed within a sealed space crowded with up to 800 individuals.

Anyone who has been in a crowded, low-ceilinged, enclosed space when the air conditioning has been suddenly cut off will realize how critical air movement would have been in a room designed for gassing a lot of people who were already breathing out air saturated with water vapor, which would have inhibited the release of gas from the pellets.

circulate – distribute – disperse – diffuse – air movement – air flow

are words that would be used with regard to how quickly a lethal gas could kill a lot of people, but none of them or any derivatives appear in the section of Dr. Green's article that relates to the behavior of hydrogen cyanide gas within a sealed enclosure.

And I suggest that any scientist who was seeking the truth would not have overlooked this issue.

Höss confessed to using:

"...Zyklon B... which we threw into the death chamber through a small opening."

A small opening, please note. Not "four small chimneys" as quoted in Dr. Green's article.

Höss made no mention of wire baskets being used to contain the Zyklon B pellets, although drawings of such items have been made from descriptions allegedly given by eyewitnesses. But the use of these would not have meant that a method of rapidly circulating the air in order to distribute the gas would not have been required.

One obvious and virtually costless solution would have been to circulate hot air derived from the crematory ovens, but no equipment for this purpose, nor any for ventilating the chamber after each gassing cycle, has ever been discovered.

Would the Russians, who liberated the Auschwitz complex on the 27th of January 1945 have immediately destroyed such incriminating evidence, used by their arch enemies to allegedly kill millions of people?

Unlikely, because it was the Russians who adapted the building to make it appear to be a gas chamber. They also added the chimney and the Zyklon B input holes.

Together with Höss's implausible gassing method, which could be looked upon as his way of defeating his torturers from beyond the grave—waiting only for some unbiased researchers to point out its obvious absurdities—the following should be taken into account:

Steven F. Pinter, who served as a lawyer for the United States War Department in the occupation forces in Germany and Austria for six years after the war, made the following statement:

"I was in Dachau for 17 months after the war as a U.S. Department Attorney, and can state that there was no gas chamber at Dachau."

What was shown to visitors and sightseers there and erroneously described as a gas chamber was a crematory. Nor was there gas chamber at any of the other concentration camps in Germany."

(Statement by Stephen F. Pinter, Catholic magazine "Our Sunday Visitor," June 14, 1959)

Dr. Charles Larson, a highly-regarded American pathologist, was appointed by the Judge Advocate General's Department to investigate the conditions and the causes of so many deaths in the camps.

After overseeing thousands of autopsies, he concluded:

"Not one case of death by poison gas was found."

As Dr. Larson and other Allied medical men discovered, the chief cause of death was disease. Above all: typhus.

It is well-known that hydrogen cyanide was used at the camps for the delousing of prisoners' clothes and other materials,

for the very purpose of keeping them alive and, in the labor camps, productive.

As would be expected, the efficient Germans installed purpose-built machinery to heat the Zyklon B pellets; to retain them for recycling and to ventilate the rooms following each delousing cycle.

And again, it must be asked:

Were the Germans so stupid that they would have left it to the various camp commanders to deal with the far more daunting tasks of murdering millions of human beings?

Historian Robert Faurisson, who has been persecuted, prosecuted, beaten up, fined and fired from his job for daring to exercise his right to free speech, provides a clue:

"For more than half a century, Germany's accusers have in the end revealed their inability to let us see a single specimen of the alleged weapons of mass destruction that the

Nazis are said to have designed, built and used for The Destruction of the European Jews."

(Posted: April 3, 2009)

If you recall the concern that Charles F. Wennerstrum had during the Nuremberg trials, this should be of equal concern.

A former U.S. Senator, Thomas Dodd, who became second in command of the American prosecution team, wrote the following on September 25th, 1945, two months before the trials had even begun:

"You know I have despised anti-Semitism. You know how strongly I feel toward those who preach intolerance of any kind. With that knowledge, you will understand when I tell you that this staff is about seventy-five percent Jewish.

Now, my point is that the Jews should stay away from this trial—for their own sake. For— mark this well—the charge of a war for the Jews is still being made, and in the post-war years it will be made again and again.

The too large percentage of Jewish men and women here will be cited as proof of this charge. Sometimes it seems that the Jews will never learn about these things. They seem intent on bringing new difficulties down on their own heads.

I do not like to write about this matter—it is distasteful to me—but I am disturbed about it. They are pushing and crowding and competing with each other and with everyone else."

The undeniable fact that at least two of the judges expressed grave concerns about the conduct of the trials cannot be lightly dismissed. So, the following questions have great relevance:

Was the evidence given by Stephen F. Pinter that there were no human gas chambers in any of the German camps overlooked or deliberately suppressed?

Was the evidence given by pathologist Dr. Charles Larson that not one case of death by poison gas was found overlooked or deliberately suppressed?

How could the obviously absurd figure of 20,000 people being gassed and cremated at one camp in a single day have been accepted by the prosecution and defense lawyers as well as the judges without question?

How could it be that no scientists were questioned about the plausibility of Rudolf Höss's confession as to the method he stated was used to gas thousands of people, at one time, in one unheated, unventilated room at Auschwitz using unheated Zyklon B?

No nation, organization, association; no religious sect; no open, closed or secret society, nor any individual has the right to prevent me from seeking the answers to these and other questions, should I choose to ask them privately or publicly.

It is my right, under the protection of Article 19 of The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

It is also yours.