

Notes for BHPSC Meeting with me 19th April 2011

Quote from Tony 18.4.11 with comments in red:

What remains undisputed is that an overt holocaust denier has not been removed and I have been removed. And if I had not raised the matter and persisted he would still be spewing forth his hatred, because to say that millions of people somehow disappeared and that thousands of survivors were all lying, is hatred and even worse, a justification of genocide. **I have never said that large numbers of Jews did not die. This is a typical interpretation by Tony, and indeed by many Jews. If anyone questions aspects of the 'Holocaust' narrative they are said to be denying that anything unpleasant happened to Jews.**

On a practical level you can hardly challenge the Zionist abuse of the holocaust if you deny it even happened. The fact that Francis knows nothing about the views he expresses and that he doesn't even know that poison gas was used to murder 100,000+ Germans who were handicapped, **before** the Final Solution, **On what basis does Tony say that I know nothing about these things? Is he claiming absolute knowledge?** demonstrates to me that his reason for adopting these views lies not in having been superficially convinced by the revisionists but because of a wider sympathy with their wider political project. **Revisionists are certainly not of one political persuasion. A conviction that Germany is being unjustly blamed for things it didn't do is about the only common feature. Germar Rudolf, for example, is a socialist, Marc Weber, as I understand it, is a more conventional nationalist.**

I can only suggest he reads the sermon of Bishop Galen of Munster on the topic of 'euthanasia' and then tell us with a straight face that the Nazis did not exterminate anyone intentionally. **Again, I never said that the Germans didn't exterminate anyone. The murder of the mentally ill is nothing compared with the atrocities committed by the Einsatzgruppen in the Soviet Union. It's puzzling that Tony concentrates on euthanasia. It is as if he were so unsure of himself that he is clutching at straws.**

Tony wrote among other things, to Zoe, copied to Ben Soffa, on 14.4.2011:

I could have been forgiven if I had told Francis that he is an upper class fascist twit, since his 'no holocaust' views mean that it's not true that much of my family died in the holocaust. **I'm not upper-class, I'm not a fascist, and I'm only a twit in so far as I live in a twitten! If it is the case that much of Tony's family died in Germany or under German occupation, something I don't recall him saying before, then I'm very sorry about that. I'm quite willing to believe it. Certainly large numbers of people died in those times. The question is simply whether they died because of a systematic plan, and that gas chambers were used for much of the killing. I have doubts, also, about the 6 million figure, in part because there are too many Jews alive today for it to have been possible.**

Tony wrote to Ben Soffa, among other things, on 12.4.2011:

I assume that you are aware of the ploys used by those who deny the holocaust, who very much like Nakba deniers, deny that there was an intention to exterminate but don't deny that many died, from neglect, starvation, typhus etc. **This isn't a ploy, it's an opinion.**

Here is what Germar Rudolf wrote to me yesterday in reply to my request to be allowed to mention our friendship and discussions:

Every creature sporting a brain can think, but only humans are creatures capable of doubting their senses, of critical, systematic thinking and of a critical, systematic exchange of thoughts. Prohibiting or ostracizing this activity, no matter about which topic, means to deny us our most human activity, to rob us of our humanity, of our human dignity. So it is every human being's holy duty to resist any move by governments or by a society at large to declare any topic taboo to critical scrutiny and debate.

Any speech not promoting or justifying the infringement of the civil rights of others (henceforth referred to as "peaceful speech") must be free, or else there is no freedom at all. In this sense, promoting a Holocaust or justifying a Holocaust would be off limits -- but no revisionist does that -- yet critically discussing claims about a Holocaust and even refuting aspects of it cannot legitimately be off limit.

Any claimed crime must be open to critical scrutiny. Denying this means to deny an accused person or group of persons their civil right to a defence. This would terminate the rule of law.

Only offensive speech needs protection. Conformist views are never threatened. Hence, free speech means foremost the right to offend with one's peaceful speech.

Defending peaceful speech, that is: defending peaceful humanity, is most important where it is most threatened. Hence, defending peaceful Holocaust Revisionism's right to free speech is the most important defence of humanity as such.