

Some Personal Reflections on Why I Became a Holocaust Doubter

by Francis Clark-Lowes

2nd April 2012

If I had to bet on it, I would put my money on crucial elements of the currently accepted history of the Nazi treatment of Jews being untrue.

Those elements are:

- (1) The existence of a government sponsored plan for the extermination of all, or most, Jews in the territory controlled by Nazi Germany.
- (2) The existence in the so-called 'death camps' of industrial scale gassing facilities for the purpose of carrying this policy into effect.
- (3) The six million figure for the number of Jewish victims of this system, whether or not this includes those who were killed by other means than gassing.

In other words, I am suggesting that there is a 'Holocaust mythology'. I am not, however, questioning:

- (1) that the Nazi regime aimed to remove Jews from the territory controlled by them,
- (2) that the mechanism for doing this, i.e. transporting Jews to concentration camps and employing them as slave labour, was brutal and cruel, and
- (3) that many died as a result of this mechanism.

So why do I disbelieve the story which is at present almost universally accepted in the West? My answer has four elements, summarised by the acronym EMM – that is Evidence, Motivation and Mechanism.

Evidence

The evidence that the orthodox narrative is questionable is largely negative, i.e. on close examination there turns out to be little hard evidence, i.e. evidence not based on personal testimony, that such a narrative is true.

The German records of the time, which detail the atrocities committed by the so-called *Einsatzgruppen*, have nothing to say about mass extermination in the 'death camps'. Moreover, when witnesses have been cross-examined, as in the Zündel trial in 1985 in Canada, their evidence falls apart and is shown to be full of contradictions. None of the eye-witnesses who appeared for the prosecution wanted to repeat the thrashing they received by showing up for the 1988 re-trial.

Chemical analyses of the asserted gas chambers and of the delousing chambers reveal negligible levels of cyanide (the poisonous element in Zykon B) in the first and high levels in

the second, consistent with the view that Zykon B gas was being used in the camps, as it had been before the war and as it continued to be after the war, for disinfection, not for extermination.

Further doubts about the mass extermination programme can be summarised as follows:

- (1) The ineffectiveness of Zykon B for this purpose.
- (2) The lack of effective sealing of the supposed gas chambers.
- (3) The logistical impossibility of cremating the supposed huge numbers of victims in the time available.
- (4) The number of Jewish survivors in relation to both the total number of Jews supposedly killed and the total population of Jews under Nazi rule immediately after the invasion of the Soviet Union.
- (5) The proved survival of many Jews who are listed as victims, and the duplication, often with slight spelling variations, of victim records.
- (6) The existence, pre-war, of two important elements of the 'Holocaust narrative' – i.e.
 - (a) the fear of gassing, going back at least to the Franco-Prussian war, caused by German disinfection methods and
 - (b) the 6 million figure which was evidently used well before the First World War.
- (7) The use from an early stage in the war of pre-existing fears in Germany by British Psychological Warfare and other allied propaganda organisations to stiffen resolve against the Nazi regime, particularly in the Polish resistance. Those entering Auschwitz may well have been persuaded already by allied leafleting that Auschwitz, and other camps, were exterminating Jews.
- (8) The rather too convenient fact that the so-called 'death camps' were all in territory occupied from 1945 to around 1990 by the Soviet Union, where the evidence could not be examined. Stories of extermination in the camps occupied by the Western allies were soon dropped (though many people still believe them, and are not discouraged from doing so).
- (9) Lastly, the very fact that the 'Holocaust narrative' is fenced around, in some countries by the law, in others by social pressure, makes one suspicious about its veracity. Even if the story was originally true in essentials, one can surmise that it would have been distorted by this tabooisation of the subject.

Motivation

But why would anyone *want* to distort the true events of those times?

Here is another list:

- (1) The Zionist movement aimed to swim against the tide of anti-colonialism sweeping the world at that time. It therefore needed a claim of exceptionality for a Jewish state, because the establishment of such would inevitably involve the removal of most of the native population from the territory decided upon.

(2) A story which simply asserted that the Nazis had committed atrocities against Jews would not have had that element of exceptionalism. Atrocities are, sadly, a commonplace in history. The assertion that there was a government plan to exterminate Jews, that the mechanism for this was an industrial-scale system of gassing, and that 6 million Jews were killed in this way is what gives 'the Holocaust' its capital H, that is its exceptionalism.

(3) The allies also had an interest in promoting an exaggerated account of what had happened, and for the following reasons:

(a) There was a widespread fear that Germany would again, with time, emerge as the most powerful state in Europe (as, of course, it has), and would therefore threaten other states. Ensuring that it occupied the moral low-ground was part of a strategy to ensure that if it ever stepped out of line its supposed past sins would be brought back into the foreground of international discourse, thereby delegitimizing the German state.

(b) The allies had bombed Germany in a way which even Winston Churchill condemned, and artillery bombardment of cities, particularly by the Americans, was almost equally atrocious. The treatment of real or supposed Nazis after the war also went far beyond acceptable norms in peacetime. The allies therefore needed a post-facto justifying narrative.

Mechanism

You might be taking the line that even if it is accepted that there are elements of the 'Holocaust' narrative which suggest some exaggeration, and even if one agrees that there were motives among Zionists and the allies for distorting the picture, surely another truer version of events could not have been suppressed this long.

It is a commonplace that history is written by the victors. The period we are talking about is no exception. The truth is that revisionists have been working away behind the scenes for decades, and have been asking extremely pertinent questions, and producing challenging evidence. On the whole, though, they have remained unheard for no better reason than the incompatibility of what they say with popular mythology.

If we want to get to the truth, we will need to swim against that powerful tide. The ever greater memorialisation of 'the Holocaust' and the glorification of Britain's (and other allies') role in the war are powerful emotional mechanisms for suppressing dissent.

But how was this narrative constructed? Here is how I believe it happened:

(1) You start with the stories about Nazi atrocities which are widely believed, even if not proved.

(2) You look for evidence, and in particular personal testimony, which supports those stories, and you dismiss, or even suppress, contrary evidence.

(3) You employ German Jews in the process of pacifying Germany. They speak German and are pretty well guaranteed to be anti-Nazi, and so, from the allies' point of view, they can be

relied upon. These German Jews are thereby excellently placed to write Germany's Nazi history in a way that furthers the cause which most of them support, that is Zionism.

(4) You ensure, through subtle and not so subtle means, that Jews know what they have to say about their experience of Nazi Germany. Written testimony is subjected to an informal kind of censorship, or authors are encouraged to embroider their accounts. I believe I have seen both of these processes at work in German Jewish texts I have translated and edited.

(5) Even anti-Zionist Jews stand to gain from the exaggerated demonization of the Nazis. They thereby create for themselves a victim status which protects them from criticism and facilitates considerable individual and collective power.

(6) You use all the resources provided by the high profile of Jews in the Western media and the film industry both to promote the orthodox story of 'the Holocaust' and to condemn as 'Holocaust deniers' and anti-Semites those who dare to question it. A culture is thereby created in which critically discussing Jews, Jewish culture, the power wielded collectively by Jews and above all 'the Holocaust' are taboo areas.

(7) Finally, in order to enable the tabooisation of the subjects mentioned above, you promote a concept of 'racism' which condemns not only hatred of, and discrimination against, real or supposed racial groups, but also vetoes any attempt to critically examine how particular groups function, and what general conclusions can be drawn about them.

* * * * *

I turn now to three questions which arise from my stated position.

Was what happened to the Jews genocide?

The vernacular understanding of the word 'genocide' is the killing of a whole race, or by extension a whole identifiable group, or at least the intention to do either of these. In this sense I do not believe that what the Nazis did was genocide. But there is another definition, used by the United Nations, which holds that the attempt to eradicate a people's culture is also genocide. In this sense what the Nazis did clearly was genocide.

But you can't have it only one way. If what happened to the Jews was genocide, then what the Israelis have been doing to the Palestinians since the foundation of their state has also been genocide. There is no question, whatever their protestations to the contrary, that the policy of successive Israeli governments, left and right, has been the elimination of Palestinian culture in its native land, starting with the expulsion of around a million men, women and children, and the destruction of more than 400 villages, in 1948 and 1967, and going through to the settler expropriations of today. The problem for the Israelis has been how to have the whole land of Palestine without the people.

Am I a 'Holocaust denier'?

This is one of those trick questions. The trap is set by establishing a very wide boundary to the area of discourse which will incur the accusation of 'Holocaust denier'. Since this

effectively prevents any questioning of the standard narrative, anyone who nevertheless wants to investigate the Nazi treatment of Jews will be described as a 'Holocaust denier'. It is useless to protest that one is a revisionist, because revisionism itself comes within the scope of 'Holocaust denial'. One way of dealing with this is simply to say: 'Alright, then. I'm a Holocaust denier,' in the hope that some people will notice the absurdity of such an accusation against people who are clearly reasonable in every other way. But you can only do this if you are not vulnerable, as for example you would be if you had a career which could be ruined. When I tried this strategy I was relatively invulnerable, though I confess I discounted the effect my position might have on members of my family.

But there is another literal interpretation of the expression 'Holocaust denier' which persuaded me to embrace it as a description of my position. The 'Holocaust' is clearly a construction which goes far beyond whatever may or may not have happened under the Nazis. That is why, with its capital H, it has become a kind of religion, with its dogma, its temples, its shrines and its high priests. This religion I deny with the conviction of the most hardened atheist.

What does it all matter?

But wouldn't it be better just to leave such a contentious issue alone and concentrate on less disturbing concerns? Why should I care what happens to the Palestinians? Aren't they just a rather backward lot of people who stubbornly refuse to recognise that they've been beaten? After all the Silesian, Pomeranian, East Prussian, Sudeten and Volga Germans have accepted their loss; why shouldn't the Palestinians? History is a zero-sum game. For one side to win, another must lose. Tough, but there you go.

This kind of argument dismisses justice for the Palestinians, but it nevertheless has a brutal *Realpolitik* logic. Faced with it, I find myself dropping moral arguments and retreating to considerations of my own, British and even global self interest. And here I find a number of reasons for not being complacent:

- (1) The first is that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine affects not only the Palestinians, but also the entire Muslim world. Jerusalem is one of the three holy cities of Islam, and its occupation by Jews, and the denial to most Muslims of access to the Haram Ash-Sharif is a provocation. If the Muslims were a small minority religion, this might not matter, but there are up to two billion Muslims, most of whom feel aggrieved to some extent by the occupation of Jerusalem.
- (2) Following from the above, Israel feels itself under threat from the Muslim world, and therefore has an interest in persuading Western opinion that Muslims are racist, anti-Semitic naturally violent, male chauvinist, homophobic and so on. Western support for Israel further infuriates Muslims, and a dangerous escalation of posturing is thereby initiated which cannot bode well for the future peace of the world.
- (3) The risk to world peace is further aggravated by Israel's position at the axis of the Arab world's Mashraq (eastern) and Maghreb (western) parts. It thereby divides the two parts in

two. At the moment the Arabs have been successfully manipulated by Israel and the West into a supine acceptance of their vassal status. It seems highly improbable, however, that this will continue forever, or even for very much longer, in view of recent events in that part of the world.

(4) If unchecked, I believe the likely outcome of Israeli policies will be ever greater encroachment into the surrounding countries, and while in the long run this is likely to overstretch the Jewish state, in the short term it will expose us all to ever greater unrest and likely 'terrorist' attacks at home.

(5) There is, lastly, a further consideration in which the Middle East plays only a small part. The domination of Western discourse by what I can only call Jewish thinking, brilliant or not, is a severe infringement of my freedom of thought and expression. In other words, by exploiting 'the Holocaust' as the ultimate and unchallengeable proof of Jewish victimhood, Jews collectively have become supremacists who victimise not on the Palestinians but also anyone who stands in the way of their ambitions.