IN THE DECADE before us, the methods of historiography will undergo a very considerable modification.

History depends primarily on written documents, from the clay tablets of ancient Sumeria and the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphs to the archives of modern states. In the absence of documents, the historian can only elicit tentative conclusions from artifacts disinterred by archaeologists or surmise what actual events gave rise to folk-tales and legends, such as the myths about Hercules or the story of Heimdall in the Rigsthula.

It is the function of the historian to submit all documents, whether purported originals or copies of lost originals, to the most rigorous critical analysis to determine their authenticity and their veracity. Wherever there is an apparent motive for forgery or mendacity, the document and its contents must be tested by every available criterion and technique, and only rarely are these sufficient to give results that have so high a degree of probability as to be virtually certain.

Inevitably of course, there are a few documents of great historical import about which doubt subsists. The famous letter of the younger Pliny, evidently written in A.D. 112, which is the earliest evidence for the existence of a sect with which modern Christians would admit an affinity, is now accepted as genuine by the majority of scholars, chiefly on the grounds that if it were a forgery concocted by the Christians and inserted in the corpus of Pliny's letters that came down to us in only one manuscript, now lost, it would presuppose in the forger a degree of learning, skill, and care much greater than is found in other Christian compositions. But we cannot be quite certain. The letter was quoted, with some odd variations, by Tertullian in the very Apologeticum, written astound 200, in which that Father of the Church and shyster lawyer cites one of the most audacious of Christian forgeries, a purported letter from Pontius Pilate to Tiberius: recent studies have disclosed two odd anomalies; and it is not impossible that Tertullian or an accomplice had the requisite skill and diligence: so doubt remains.

The famous Kensington Rune Stone, which purportedly attests the presence of Norse explorers in what is now Minnesota in 1362, has long been regarded as a forgery perpetrated by a local resident for the glory of Scandinavia, but a recent
linguistic analysis makes it seem unlikely that the supposed forger could have introduced subtle dialectical variations of Old Norse unrecorded in his time; so doubt remains.

These examples suffice to show the underlying assumption in all historical criticism: forgeries or impostures are always the work of an individual or a small group of individuals for profit, piety, or political ends. The most recent Christian gospels are good examples. When Joseph Smith found that swindling farmers with tales of buried treasure entailed legal hazards, he manufactured the Book of Mormon, possibly with one assistant author, and enlisted eleven perjurers to attest its authenticity. In 1879 and 1883, the Reverend Mr. William Dennis Mahan produced a whole sheaf of forgeries to prove the historical truth of a religion to which he had a deep emotional attachment, and it seems that only his wife was a party to his pious hoax, although other clergymen soon tried to muscle in on what had become a lucrative imposture by producing supplemental forgeries. Smith founded what became the staunchest, most stable, and most cohesive church in the United States, exciting the emotional faith of millions who never suspected that the "Newest Testament" was a fraud. Poor Mahan undertook a more difficult task, for which he had neither the education nor the financial resources, but he stimulated the glands of many thousands of yearning Christians, and many enterprising publishers since his time have found it highly profitable to reprint, ad maiorem gloriam Dei, what some of them call "the Archko Volume."

Forged letters

Some political hoaxes are comparable. The forged letters of Winston Churchill, which aroused considerable excitement in Italy in 1954, were plausible in content and deceived many well-educated Italians, for whom English was a foreign language and who had never noted the minute characteristics that distinguish the work of the various brands of typewriters. It is uncertain whether the forgers were interested only in collecting the large sums of money they obtained from Italian conservatives for the precious historical documents, or had been inspired by the Italian Premier, De Gaspari, who used the hoax to prosecute and discredit the conservatives who had earlier obtained possession of possibly genuine letters that he wrote while hiding out in the Vatican in 1940-43.

In the absence of documents, the historians' task is more difficult, and where there is no trustworthy evidence and the doctrine of "cui bono?" does not yield conclusive results, we naturally have one of the innumerable mysteries or ambiguities that season the pages of history. The facts concerning the death of the Austrian Crown Prince at Mayerling were so successfully covered up that, while we may have strong suspicions, we do not know whether or not Rudolph murdered his mistress and committed suicide. We shall probably never know why the Great
Fire of London in September 1666 "happened" to begin on the eve of the very day for which it had been scheduled by a conspiracy, directed by unidentified persons residing in Holland, some of whose agents were arrested, confessed, and were executed in the preceding April. Nor shall we know why so remarkable a "coincidence" excited no official investigation after the event.

**Evidence destroyed thoroughly**

When conspiracies have governmental powers, they can usually cover up their guilt at the time and they often destroy evidence so thoroughly that later generations are left with a puzzle they can solve only partially or tentatively. We now know only that the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was arranged by a conspiracy for the dual purpose of eliminating a political figure who was no longer useful and of exciting fresh animosity against the Southerners who had been conquered, and whose country had been destroyed, in the unconscionable war of aggression of which he had been the ostensible leader; but, aside from a few hirelings, the only person whom we can positively identify as a member of the conspiracy is Stanton, who was the Secretary of War in Lincoln's cabinet, arranged many of the practical details, and was able, after the event, to silence key witnesses, although we can only guess what it was they knew that made it necessary to have them judicially murdered. And Stanton seems to have been only a local manager for principals whose identity we can only surmise.

The second-class battleship *Maine*, significantly the least useful ship in the comparatively small American navy, was sent to Havana to overawe the legitimate government of Cuba, and was there destroyed, with great loss of life, by an internal explosion. The American government, however, was able to cover up that fact and to claim that a Spanish mine or torpedo was responsible, thus preparing the excitable American populace for the desired war of aggression against Spain. So far as I know, no one has thus far found evidence to fix the responsibility for what is likely to have been more than a happy "accident" at just the right time.

It frequently happens, of course, that all the evidence is not thoroughly destroyed. The work of Mr. Colin Simpson, published in 1972, amply documents the facts concerning the sinking of the British cruiser and munitions ship, *Lusitania*, which had been disguised as a passenger liner to attract a large number of American passengers in the hope that a German submarine would take the "livebait" dangled before it.

It is now clear that the atrocious gambit, which would certainly have offended the sensibilities of the English public in 1915, was contrived by Winston Churchill with only a few accomplices. After the event, there were in Britain a considerable number of persons who knew that the official tale was false and had solid grounds
for suspecting the truth, but gentlemen (e.g. Lord Mersey, who retired from the bench after his part in what he termed "a damned dirty business") were silenced by appeals to patriotism and the raison d'état, while lesser men were intimidated. In the United States, the great deception was assiduously promoted by the cynical gang that surrounded Woodrow Wilson, a muzzy-headed shyster whom the Jews had trained for the Presidency into which they boosted him by the simple expedient of playing on the vanity and gullibility of Theodore Roosevelt. Their efforts were, of course, abetted by the large corps of journalistic hirelings, who probably disseminated sensational lies with the efficiency and in the spirit with which they would have waited on tables or operated taxicabs.

Many millions of citizens of both Great Britain and the United States were successfully duped, while the facts were known to only comparatively few persons and, in all probability, the ultimate purpose of the operation was known to yet fewer.

**Mental logistics**

Experience has shown that the mass-armies of "democratic" states fight with greater zeal when they are animated by hatred and supported by a hate-crazed populace that fancies it is fighting a holy war. Lies have therefore become military equipment, a kind of mental logistics; but it is the essence of such propaganda that its spuriousness is known only to the persons who manufacture it. The model of such operations is the famous lie-factory managed by Lord Bryce during the First World War, in which a corps of expert technicians forged photographs, while expert liars, including Arnold Toynbee, concocted stories of "atrocities" to inspire the emotionally overwrought British with a fanatic's hatred of the incredibly bestial Germans and with a noble Christian ardour to kill them.

Lord Bryce's superiors in the Government undoubtedly knew what his merry knaves were doing, and a small number of educated and judicious men must at least have had suspicions which they concealed from fear or unwillingness to impair the "war effort", but the number of persons who knew or suspected the truth was very small in comparison with the vast majority that was successfully deceived during the war. And after the war, the secret could no longer be kept.

It is a truism, of course, that in "democratic" states the populace must be encouraged to imagine that it makes important decisions by voting, and must therefore be controlled by suitable propaganda, which implants ideas to which the voters respond automatically as trained animals respond to words of command in a circus, thus leaving to the masses only a factitious choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee on the basis of their preference for a certain kind of oratory, a hair-style, or a particular facial expression.
The production of such propaganda requires a very high degree of technical skill, as may be learned from the most complete treatise on the subject, Jacques Ellul's *Les Propagandes* (Paris, 1962), which is also available in an excellent English translation. The conditioning of the populace must be directed by a small corps of expert technicians in the employ of an oligarchy, with only a limited number of assistants who are fully aware of their task. When we consider the British and Americans (as distinct from resident aliens), we may be certain that most of the teachers who inject illusions into the minds of the young, many of the journalists who manufacture tripe for the press and radio, and even quite a few of the "social scientists" who concoct sophistries for the half-educated, are not conscious of what they are doing, being themselves deceived. And the individuals who suspect that they are deluding their victims probably soothe their consciences with assurances that they are engaged in noble work for "democracy" and their salaries.

Thus, although it is true that the manufacture of propaganda, like the manufacture of shoes or stoves, requires today a larger number of technicians and other employees than were needed even a few decades ago, the number concerned in its production is relatively small and the employers even fewer, so that historians still think in terms of a small group engaged in conscious and calculated deception of a great majority.

To take a specific example, *adhuc sub iudice*, a photograph with some collateral evidence has recently been published to show that the holy man who has been raising Hell in Persia is not the Khomeini who appeared in France as a refugee some years ago. We automatically assume that if the evidence is spurious, it was fabricated by a few men, no more, perhaps, than half a dozen. If it is genuine, then the impersonation was arranged by the secret service of some major nation or international state, requiring the complicity of no more than a dozen men, including the director who gave the orders. We should think it fantastic to suppose that there are as many as four hundred persons, now in Europe and able to tell the truth, who are party to the hoax, whichever it is.

Historians have never thought of calculated deception as the work of any large number of persons. It is true, of course, that some minority groups, religious or conspiratorial, have tried to disguise their beliefs. The Mandaeans are reputed to have lied about their faith to strangers, but if their religion is fairly represented by the scriptures that have been recently obtained and published (e.g., their Canonical Prayer Book, edited and translated by Professor E. S. Drower in 1939), one wonders why they took the trouble. In past centuries, Persian Shi'ites, when they made a pilgrimage to Mecca, understandably practised *takiyah*, concealing their heresy from the more orthodox Moslems among whom they had to travel at the risk of their lives.
In the United States, the American Republican Party, which limited its membership to American-born white men, excluding Jews and other unassimilable aliens, earned the sobriquet by which it is now commonly known by urging its members to avoid futile debate with their adversaries by saying, "I Know Nothing about it." But their aim was not to keep secret purposes which, indeed, were so well known that, despite the furious opposition of professional politicians, they might well have achieved control of the Federal government, had they not been disrupted and dispersed by agitation about slavery in the South. One could cite other instances of evasion to avoid inconvenience or harassment, but such expedients differ totally from the perpetuation of hoaxes and do not impugn the historians' premise that forgeries and impostures are secretly contrived by a few individuals.

Historians must now drastically revise that premise. No matter how timorous they may be, they cannot, if honest, close their eyes to proof that massive deceptions can be carried out by thousands, even millions, of individuals who act unanimously with a common purpose.

40 million too preposterous

The great Jewish hoax about millions of God's Chosen People whom the Germans supposedly exterminated seems to have been devised late in 1942, when it was claimed that in the autumn of that year the Germans had murdered two millions of the Holy Race in various ways. By 1943, the number had been increased to six million, and to keep up the progression, it was later increased to 40,000,000, which was seen to be so preposterous that it was reduced to 12,000,000, and at the end of the Crusade to Save the Soviet, the figure of six million was taken as the largest that could be imposed on the gullible goyim.

The obvious original motive, common to all war propaganda, was to pep up the cattle that were being stampeded against Germany, but there may have been a further purpose in a hope that after the war it would be possible to carry out the Jewish plan, formulated and published by Theodore Kaufman in 1941, to exterminate the entire population of Germany as an object lesson to lower races that might want to have a country of their own, not under the management of God's People.

Since that proved not to be feasible, the hoax was used as a pretext for the obscene murders perpetrated at Nuremberg by the American, Soviet, British, and French victors, for their repudiation of the conventions, called international law, that had been observed by all civilised nations, and for the innumerable and ghastly atrocities by which all the victors, guided by their Jewish supervisors, equally and forever forfeited their claim to be morally superior to Atilla's Huns or Hulagu's
Mongols. And the hoax is still being used to loot Germany and, indirectly, all the nations of the West to subsidise the Jewish seizure of Palestine and adjacent lands.

It is no longer possible to think of a deception of many by a few. The utter falsity of this hoax, which was made the more preposterous when the physically impossible gas chambers were invented to dress it up, was necessarily known to hundreds of thousands of Jews who remained on German territory during the insane war, many of whom – probably 250,000 – the Germans naturally interned as domestic enemies, although not with the thoroughness with which the Americans put resident Japanese in concentration camps during 1942-45. The Jews who remained in Germany, both those who were foolishly trusted and held governmental positions and those who were confined to the various camps, necessarily knew that there were no "gas chambers" and there was no "extermination" (although, of course, many individuals died from disease, old age, and Anglo-American bombing raids on the various camps, and, no doubt, some were slain by individual Germans when they foresaw the defeat and ruin of their country by the maddened hordes that the international race had mobilised against them – and by the Polish and Russian populations of occupied territories when the German armies failed to control their long-standing resentment of their parasites).

Furthermore, since the race has always been truly international, many hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Jews throughout the world and especially in the United States must have known or suspected the truth when their supposedly exterminated relatives flocked into the country or corresponded with them. In addition, there must have been a considerable numbers of Jews who, even if without sources of direct information, were intelligent enough to see that the hoax was inherently incredible, psychologically improbable and physically impossible.

But nevertheless, so far as I know, only one Jew, Josef Ginsburg, who resided in German or Rumanian territory throughout the war, has borne witness that there was no German policy to "exterminate" his race; and although he published his books under the pseudonym of J. G. Burg, he only accidentally escaped death at the hands of Jewish terrorists in Munich.

The great Jewish hoax, which is currently imposed by the Jewish Terror on the population of Western nations, must be distinguished from the tall tales now told in Soviet territory, where the yowling about fictitious Jewish victims was long ago replaced by an official claim that the Germans deliberately exterminated six millions of high-minded Slavs. How much of this propaganda, much of which is so phrased that it could include casualties in battle, is believed by intelligent Russians, it is impossible to say, and no one will wonder at the lack of public protest from persons who know better but live in Soviet territory, under a supervision more strict than any that has thus far been imposed on any Western
nation, although the Jews are naturally trying to approximate it for purposes of their own and have attained a very considerable success in Western Germany, where the corrupt government in Bonn has virtually made it illegal to disbelieve any Jewish imposture, and many books that the Jewish censorship has not approved for goyim can be circulated only clandestinely.

Although the hoax about the "six million" has always been inherently unbelievable in all of the various revisions that have been made from time to time, and although it has been definitively exposed and demolished by Professor Arthur A. Butz in his Hoax of the Twentieth Century (Historical Review Press, 1976), the entire race, numbering at least thirty millions throughout the world, is frantically insisting, with apparent unanimity, that the lower races must believe whatever they are told by God's Master Race, and what is most significant, Jewish professors ensconced in Western universities and necessarily knowing something of the methods of Western scholarship, automatically shrieked and spat at Professor Butz, although they had never seen his book and did not even know its correct title. One cannot avoid the conclusion that however well they had learned or simulated the methods of scholarship, all questions of fact were to be rigorously subordinated to the interests of their race.

Anne Frank's Diary

A second example is the astoundingly crude forgery called "Anne Frank's Diary", concocted so negligently and with such contempt for Aryan minds that its many internal contradictions proclaim its falsity. It can have imposed on no reader who had even a modicum of critical judgement and a memory sufficiently good to retain what he read on one page when he read a passage a few pages later. The blatant contradictions in the text of this fraud have now been listed by Swedish writer, Ditlieb Felderer, in Anne Frank's Diary: a Hoax (Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, California, 1980), but the mystery is why such a booklet was ever needed.

Many persons, it is true, read religious texts in an emotional trance that paralyses their reason, and one can only assume that sentimental persons who have been so prepared by preliminary propaganda that they blubber as they read the first page of the "Diary" can go on reading in a similar stupor. No critical reader can ever have been deceived, whatever his race. But here again, thirty to sixty million Jews, with apparent unanimity, are determined that the goyim shall believe, or profess to believe, that preposterous canard, if they are to escape punishment for being rational. And one hears that the courts in Western Germany have held that it is a criminal offence to express doubts about what no intelligent man can believe. One cannot predict when the same courts will hold that it is an "insult" to the "Jewish
nation" to deny that the earth is flat, as was specifically stated by the God who covenanted to deliver the whole earth to His People.

Even more significant is the Jews' progressive abandonment of their usual measures for herding the goyim: bribery, open or surreptitious financial pressures, and the manipulation of venal politicians. Mobs of Jewish hoodlums now openly assault French professors who dare to doubt the incredible, wield iron clubs to crack the skulls of a few French writers who have met privately to discuss the forbidden topic, and openly boast they have murdered with a time bomb a French professor who dared to stand for election to the Chambre des Députés. And there is comparable violence by Jewish thugs, with or without an admixture of zombies from the lower races, in West Germany, England, and the United States, while thirty to sixty million Jews, without significant exceptions, applaud the good work and protect the criminals through their control of virtually all the means of communication and their control or intimidation of police forces and courts.

The drastic import of these facts for historiography is obvious. An entire race (or sub-race, if you prefer that classification) can show effective solidarity in the perpetration of outrageous hoaxes, while many thousands or even millions who cannot but know the truth, knowingly participate in the fraud, whether from fear of reprisals by their fellows, hatred of their victims, or a confidence in their biological superiority, such as we show when we imprison or kill wild animals and make cows, horses, sheep, and dogs our domestic servants or our food. The implication for historians in their consideration of all information, ancient or modern, that has come to us from or through Jewish sources is emphatically clear and imposes an inescapable obligation. And it remains to be ascertained whether there may be, or have been, comparable phenomena in seemingly unanimous asseverations by other races.
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