Thursday, December 31, 2015
The revisionists' total victory on the historical and scientific level

In France and in the rest of the world historians and specialists of “the Holocaust” no longer know what to answer to the revisionists’ arguments. And to speak only of my own case, which has been going on since 1978 (that is, for some thirty-seven years), never has my country’s justice system, despite the countless requests by self-righteous associations to rule against me on the substance of my writings or statements, been able to note therein the least trace of any rashness, negligence, deliberate ignorance, falsehood, falsification or lying. My adversaries, rich and powerful though they may be, have never succeeded in getting our judges to convict me on the merits of the conclusions reached through my research work which, for over half a century, has focused on what is commonly called “the genocide of the Jews”, “the Nazi gas chambers” and “the six million (or nearly)” Jewish victims of the Third Reich. At most, at the end countless cases I have lost suits (whether as plaintiff or defendant) or been found guilty mainly 1) for a malevolence, supposed but not demonstrated, towards the Jews, 2) for breaking the gayssotine (the Fabius-Gayssot or Faurisson Act, legislation of convenience specifically targeting the findings of my research) or 3) by virtue of the “good faith” (sic) of individuals like Léon Poliakov or Robert Badinter, even though found to be at fault by the judges themselves.

For years Poliakov had well and truly manipulated the writings of SS officer Kurt Gerstein (who, having “repented” (?), then committed suicide (?)), when not fabricating outright fragments of text to attribute to him. But the judges granted the presumption of good faith to Poliakov. He had been, we were told, “animated by the passionate and legitimate desire to inform the public about a period and about facts of contemporary history that were particularly tragic”. It was therefore appropriate for him to have “perhaps, on minor points [sic!], broken scientific standards of rigour without, however, it being permissible to state that he is a manipulator or fabricator of texts”. As for Badinter, in 2006 he claimed that in 1981, when he was still barrister for the LICRA and just before becoming Minister of Justice, he had got a court to rule against me “for being a falsifier of history”. A decision of 2007 restored the truth and held that Badinter had “failed in his evidence” to demonstrate my alleged dishonesty; but, the court hastened to add, he had been in good faith. For want of both money and a lawyer (Eric Delcroix having retired – not without being refused honorary membership of the bar), I did not appeal and was forced to pay the Socialist millionaire the sum of £5,000. But at least since then I have had the satisfaction of being able to speak of “Robert Badinter, my liar, my slanderer... in good faith .”

An astute observer will have noted that the more our opponents sense the game is getting away from them on the historical or scientific level, the more they feel the need to increase their propagandistic drum beating, and the repression as well. In France, at this very moment, they are putting all their hopes in having Parliament pass a supergayssotine.

Good for them! A few weeks short of my 87th birthday, I have six cases pending, four against me and two others that I have had to instigate, albeit quite unwillingly. Will my judges finally decide, in 2016, to leave us, my wife and me, desistute? Or are they getting ready simply to throw me into a prison of the République? It is understood beforehand, is it not?, that if they are not able to speak of “Léon Poliakov, my enemy, my persecutor... in good faith”.

Let’s consider our current Prime Minister. One day, Manuel Valls, in full pomposity, his mouth, heart and left hand clenched, let fly: “I am, by my wife, eternally linked to the Jewish community and Israel”. He saw himself as “eternal”: a vast programme! But fervour was leading him astray. He ought to come back down to earth, reconnect with the ground, get treatment and stop deluding himself: the revisionists have, already as of now, won the match. As early as in 1983-1985, Raul Hilberg, surrendering to the arguments of “Faurisson and others...” had to drop the pretention of explaining, on the basis of valid arguments and documents of his own, that the Third Reich had, with proper Germanic efficiency, designed, prepared, developed, organised and financed the killing of millions of European Jews. The eminent Jewish American historian ended up finding himself reduced to trying to have us inform the public about a period and about facts of contemporary history that were particularly tragic.

..."an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus-minded reading within a large bureaucracy" that had, on its own, spontaneously decided, it seemed, gradually to abandon written communication in favour of verbal or indeed telepathic exchange to such an extent that no written or material evidence bespoke the six million Jews” (or, in Hilberg’s case, a bit fewer) having been systematically killed either on the Eastern Front or in the gas chambers, mainly at Auschwitz. A number of historians or researchers, such as Arno Mayer, Jean-Claude Pressac and Robert Jan van Pelt, have also capitulated, in a more frank and direct manner. The first has had to admit, among other bitter observations, that “Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable”. The second, a protégé of the Krasfeld couple, came to understand that the dossier of the official story of the Jews’ extermination, “rotten” with too many lies, was bound for “the rubbish bins of history”. The third has concluded that “Ninety-nine per cent of what we know [about Auschwitz] we do not
Manuel Valls, our Prime Minister, and François Hollande, President of our Republic, devote themselves to launching, in several foreign countries, warlike crusades of the kind that have backfired horribly for us French this year. On top of their foreign wars, conducted in the most cowardly as well as the most comfortable conditions, they instil an atmosphere of internecine war at home. They call “cowards” certain enemies who, after all, are inspired on a grand scale by the practices of our glorious Résistants: “Hey, killers with the bullet and the knife, kill quickly!” If François Hollande has the stature of a pedalo admiral, Mr Valls resembles Pichroche, that character in Rabelais whose Greek name means “bitter bile” and who regularly gets all excited at the prospect of going off to war. Mr Valls began with a crusade against the Sanctions of today and against the real or supposed enemies of Israel, but he is also on a campaign against the revisionists, against “Dieudonné in peace”, against Marine Le Pen – even though she has pushed her own father down the stairs – and even against his friends of the Socialist clan. A good suggestion for him would be to calm down, take care of himself, try to laugh with Dieudonné, reflect for a moment with the revisionists, allow historians or researchers to work as they wish and, at long last, spare us the flag-waving frenzy, the bugle-blowing, the verse and chorus of the Marseillaise on the “day of glory”, the “impure blood” and the “ferocious soldiers”. As we know, it is, unhappily, all too easy to take the French in with that sort of thing.

Such, today, are the modest New Year wishes for 2016 that I allow myself to make for that person, for his victims, for the French and for the rest of the world. But is it perhaps already asking too much?

For their part, the revisionists know what awaits them: the confirmation in the mainstream media, sooner or later, that they have already won a total victory on the historical and scientific level. The political and media powers will indeed have to resign themselves to the fact: persistence in gassing policies abroad and in those of gagging and censorship at home will only dishonour them a bit more. For nothing.

The rising flood, particularly on the Internet, that is bringing to the world’s knowledge the spectacular achievements of historical revisionism is not suddenly going to halt its advance or return towards its source.

The lies of “the Holocaust” are modelled on those of the First World War. All those “Nazi death-works”, like the ones at Auschwitz, are but a reprise of the myth of German “corpse factories” of 1914-1918. They were merely modernised by the adding of gas (Jewish-American version of November 1944) and sometimes of electricity (Jewish-Soviet version of February 1945). The good people, already generally not well disposed towards the practice of cremating the dead, were led to believe that Germany, a nation considered modern and known for having an abundance of engineers and chemists, had built structures containing, in addition to a cremation space, others called “gas chambers” (in reality, the “depositories”, Leichenhalle or Leichenkeller, technically designed to hold bodies awaiting cremation).

Thus a certain propaganda has managed to persuade us that those Germans devils were dumb enough to house under the same roof, on one side, spaces full of a highly inflammable and explosive gas (the hydrocyanic acid or hydrogen cyanide contained in the pesticide Zyklon B, created in the 1920s) and, on the other side, crematory ovens that had to be laboriously brought to a temperature of 900°C.

In 1943 some of the men in charge of British war propaganda deplored “this gas chambers story”. For his part, the revisionist Germar Rudolf sums up the subject rather well in his Lectures on the Holocaust (Chicago, Theses & Dissertations Press, 2005, 566 p., p. 82-85). Even Victor Cavendish-Bentinck, a senior official of the Intelligence Service in London ready to believe just about any nonsense said against the Germans, was to write: “I feel certain that we are making a mistake in publicly giving credence to this gas chambers story” (p. 83). The trouble was that the British, undisputed champions of lying propaganda during the two world wars, needed those fables. On February 29, 1944 their Ministry of Information sent the BBC and the Church of England a circular letter of the greatest cynicism, requesting their respective cooperation for the spreading of propaganda on the basis of atrocity stories either already in circulation or currently being concocted. It was a matter of forestalling the disastrous effect that the Red Army, an ally, was inevitably to bring about in Central Europe by real atrocities (p. 84)! On these inventions, these fabrications and the wide-scale dissemination of enormous tall tales, two books remain of great interest: Edward J. Rozeck’s Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland, New York, Wiley, 1958 and, especially, by Wahleruber (a Jew born in Breslau in 1921): The Terrible Secret, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980, 262 p., wherein we see Cavendish-Bentinck, him again, “Chairman of the British Intelligence Committee”, writing in July 1943 that “The Poles and, to a far greater extent the Jews, tend to exaggerate German atrocities in order to stroke us up” (p. 83).

Fifteen months ago, referring to the crisis that the historians of “the Holocaust” were experiencing, I wrote that there was “more and more water in their gas, and slack in their knotted rope”. Since January 2015 and the anniversary of the “liberation” of Auschwitz I have noted a sudden acceleration of the phenomenon. I have a whole file and a whole demonstration on the subject but the continuing judicial repression has not yet left me time to publish this information. In any case, for the historian, it has become captivating to observe the never-ending agony of the “magical gas chamber” (Céline in 1950). This agony is accompanied, as we have seen, by a redoubling of the repression of revisionism and a turning up of the volume of holocaustic propaganda. May our Pichroche refrain, then, from...
going on the stage and into a trance! He would have a stroke. He might even be cruelly
snatched away from us. Who knows? He could preceed in death a man who will be 87
years of age on January 25, 2016 and whom some have, thus far in vain, so often sought to
kill, not for his ideas (he has hardly any) but for having wanted to publish the result of his
research, which is summed up in a phrase of about sixty words. I repeat it here for memory,
and to have done with it:

The alleged Hitlerite gas chambers and the alleged genocide of the Jews form one and the same
historical lie, which has permitted a gigantic political and financial swindle whose main
beneficiaries are the state of Israel and international Zionism and whose main victims are the
German people – but not their leaders – and the Palestinian people in their entirety.

Note: For sources or references especially regarding certain points of this text one may
consult the indices of the seven volumes of my *Ecrits révisionnistes* thus far published.
On the Internet, for “The Victories of Revisionism” (11 December 2006), see
robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2006/12/victories-of-revisionism.html and for “The Victories of
Revisionism (continued)” (September 11, 2011), see

Afilesados of court rulings by imbéciles are invited to refer to pages 152-155 of the first
volume, where there are some titbits from a decision handed down in 1979 by Dame
Baluze-Frachet, judge of a Lyon police court. The good lady decreed back then that simply
asking the question of the existence of the gas chambers was an affront not only to “good
morals” but also to “the moral order”. The amusing bit of it is that by invoking “the moral
order” she was advocating – although probably unawares – a value dear to count
MacMahon, Marshal of France, President of the French Republic and perennial model of
reactionary conservatism. “The moral order” was to return seventy years later on with...

Marshal Pétain. As for the aficionados of behavioural curiosities, there is fare for them in the
following two videos featuring the current head of the French government: “The left hand of
Manuel Valls” and “Rally of March 19, 2014 – speech by Manuel Valls, Minister of the
Interior”.

*In preparation: 1) an article about an embarrassing secret of Serge Klarsfeld; 2) a study of
the highly inflammable and explosive nature of hydrogen cyanide.*
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Websites of Interest

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
Bradley Smith's Blog
L’Association des Anciens Amateurs de Récits de Guerres et d’Holocaustes
Adelaide Institute
One Third Of the Holocaust
Michèle Renouf
Ernst Zündel
Comite de soutien à Vincent Reynouard
Dernières nouvelles de la scène révisionniste