

WHERE TRUTH  
IS NO DEFENCE,  
I WANT TO  
BREAK FREE

*Fredrick Töben*

PEACE BOOKS  
2001

## PEACE BOOKS

A division of the  
Adelaide Institute  
PO Box 3300  
Norwood SA 5067  
Australia

Töben, G.F. (Gerald Fredrick), 1944-  
Where truth is no defence, I want to break free.

Includes index.  
ISBN 0 9585466 1 4.

1. Töben, G.F. (Gerald Fredrick), 1944- - Trials,  
litigation, etc. 2. Holocaust denial. 3. Holocaust,  
Jewish (1939-1945) - Errors, inventions, etc.  
4. Freedom of speech - Germany. I. Title.

940.53/18

*Dedicated to TRUTH.*

*In gratitude  
to the men and women who morally, legally, socially  
and financially helped me to survive.*

*Dedicated to Werner Fischer who, throughout his  
lifetime in South Australia, has attempted to correct  
the perception that Germans are inherently evil on  
account of World War II historical analysis.*

What is the country's history worth when the archives are closed?

*Sir Walter Crocker*  
*Adelaide*  
*February 2001*

\* \* \*

Though infallibility in scientific matters seems to me irresistibly comical, I should be in a sad way if I could not retain a high respect for those who lay claim to it, for they comprise the greater part of the people who have any conversation at all. When I say they lay claim to it, I mean they assume the functions of it quite naturally and unconsciously. The full meaning of the adage *Humanum est errare*, they have never waked up to. In those sciences of measurement which are the least subject to error - metrology, geodesy, and metrical astronomy - no man of self-respect ever now states his result, without affixing to it its probable error; and if this practice is not followed in other sciences it is because in those the probable errors are too vast to be estimated.

*C.S. Peirce*

# Contents

List of Illustrations .....	vii
Forewords .....	xi
Preface .....	xxix
Chapter 1 The Journey Begins .....	1
Chapter 2 Poland .....	4
Chapter 3 Ukraine .....	8
Chapter 4 Kiev Express To Vienna And Nuremberg .....	16
Chapter 5 Things Are Hotting Up .....	27
Chapter 6 Revisiting Old Friends, Meeting New Ones .....	31
Chapter 7 The Mannheim Arrest .....	40
Chapter 8 Prison Night, And Day In Court .....	71
Chapter 9 A Real Prison - And Hope .....	79
Chapter 10 After One Month .....	109
Chapter 11 After Two Months .....	132
Chapter 12 After Three Months.....	150
Chapter 13 After Four Months.....	169
Chapter 14 After Five Months .....	205
Chapter 15 After Six Months.....	237
Chapter 16 After Seven Months - The Trial.....	267
Chapter 17 Freedom - 11 November 1999 .....	283
Chapter 18 Tehran Interlude .....	295
Chapter 19 Journey Home Via Berlin.....	297
Afterwords .....	319
Appendices .....	365
Index .....	502

It is not necessary to ask oneself how, technically, such a mass murder was possible. It was technically possible since it took place. Such is the point of departure required of any historical inquiry on this subject. This truth obliges us to state quite simply: there is not, there cannot be any debate on the existence of the gas chambers.

*Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Leon Poliakov et al.*

\* \* \*

... we must call to mind ... what endless detail work is performed in a murder trial these days – how out of small mosaic-like pieces the picture of the true occurrences at the moment of the murder is put together. There is available for the court's deliberations above all the corpse, the record of the post-mortem examination, the expert opinions of specialists to the causes of death and the day on which the deed must have occurred, and the manner in which the death occurred. There is the murder weapon ... All this was missing in this trial.... The possibilities of verifying the witness declarations were very limited.

*Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, 20.12.1963-20.8.1965*

\* \* \*

Why don't you protest when you know that Agron Street in Jerusalem and the Hilton Hotel in Tel Aviv are built on top of razed Muslim cemeteries?

*Les étudiants de l'Organisation socialiste israélienne: Matzpen (Students of The Israeli Socialist Organisation: Matzpen), Jerusalem*

# List of Illustrations

Freedom of speech – a global issue .....	xxxiv
Töben to challenge genocide stance .....	xxxv
BNP leader Mick Griffin in Wales .....	19
Final drink with Germar Rudolf before Prague .....	19
Briefing session with Jürgen Graf and Carlo Mattogno .....	20
Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf at Chelmno .....	20
A group for posterity .....	21
A teachers' strike in Warsaw .....	21
Archivists at the A.K. partisan office, Warsaw .....	22
My host family, Lviv .....	22
'My' office, Kiev .....	23
At the Ukraine State Archives .....	23
The Kiev archivist who visited Adelaide for a war crime trial.....	24
My tireless and generous guide, Kiev .....	24
Ukrainian graffiti .....	25
Boris Zindels and friends, Kiev .....	25
Four vodka drinkers .....	26
My train compartment companions .....	26
The courthouse where Ingrid Weckert was sentenced.....	63
Richard Wagner's great-grandson, Wolfgang Wagner .....	63
Dr Wilhelm Stäglich, Glücksburg .....	64
A good German patriot at Bielefeld Court .....	64
Visiting Jean-Claude Pressac .....	65
With Professor Robert Faurisson .....	65
My hotel 'office', Paris.....	66
Notre Dame, Paris .....	66
Chateley Opera, Paris .....	67
A run through Paris.....	67
Professor Serge Thion's study.....	68
With Martin Walser .....	68
A prized possession for some; the dream for some as well .....	69
The Bruchsal courthouse.....	69
Günter Deckert's prison home at Bruchsal.....	70
The site of Hans-Heiko Klein's office .....	70
Elvis Presley in Holland! .....	263
The facade of Gracelands in Holland .....	263
My cell .....	264
The interior of my cell .....	264

Eric Rössler and the author .....	265
Visiting Radio Regenbogen .....	265
Author Jürgen Grässlin who celebrated free speech in Germany .....	266
Günter Deckert on his weekend home from prison .....	266
The <i>Time</i> report on Töben's case .....	275
The Töben judgement in the name of the people .....	276
Mannheim Prison from the car park .....	277
Mannheim Prison church .....	277
In front of the Mannheim Prison gate .....	278
Eric Rössler addressing his party's faithful .....	278
Three of my visitors in prison .....	279
Klaus Huscher .....	279
Snow at Dachau .....	280
Tidua Rudolf and friend .....	280
Udo and Margarete Walendy .....	281
Andreas Röhler .....	281
Dr Elisabeth Walther-Bense .....	282
Gerd Wedemeyer .....	282
Tehran, a beautifully clean city with a wonderful vista .....	299
The Ayatollah Khomeini Institute .....	299
Students at the Ayatollah Khomeini Institute .....	300
Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting German department staff .....	300
Sharing morning tea with journalists .....	301
After addressing university students in Tehran .....	301
A gift to me .....	302
Visiting a spiritual leader in his home .....	302
The popular KaDeWe in Berlin .....	303
Brandenburg Tor .....	303
Relaxing with thinkers .....	304
Horst Mahler .....	304
Arriving at Adelaide .....	305
Upon my return to Adelaide .....	305
A welcome return to Adelaide .....	306
With Penny Debelle .....	307
Outside Mannheim Prison .....	307
My prisoners' representative pass .....	308
Cartoon .....	308
Ludwig Bock .....	309
My prison ID card .....	309
Laufzettel .....	309
Antrag .....	309
Mail envelope .....	310
Interna letterhead .....	310
Choirmaster Kratzert's birthday card .....	311
Support in French .....	312
Public notice of the trial .....	313
Proof of bail payment (front) .....	314



Proof of bail payment (back).....	315
The court order for Töben's release .....	316
Prison release document .....	317
Peering from Mannheim Prison .....	318
Adelaide Institute revisionist symposium, 1998 .....	318
At the railway track at Auschwitz-Birkenau.....	353
The gates to Auschwitz-Birkenau .....	353
Danish school students visiting Auschwitz.....	354
The swimming pool for inmates' use at Auschwitz .....	354
A hole in the roof of Krema I.....	355
A hole in roof of Krema II .....	355
Two crudely cut holes at Krema II .....	356
The Krema III crematorium site .....	356
The entrance to Auschwitz-Stammlager .....	357
The gallows, Auschwitz-Birkenau .....	357
The alleged entrance to the homicidal gas chamber .....	358
The door to the alleged gas chamber .....	358
Inside the alleged gas chamber.....	359
A door inside the alleged gas chamber Krema I .....	359
The caved-in roof of Krema II.....	360
Entering the 'gas chamber' through the concrete roof .....	360
Close to the ceiling.....	361
Non-porous pillars and ceiling of the alleged gas chambers .....	361
The inscription on the original 19 memorial plaques.....	362
The replacement memorial plaque erected in 1990 .....	362
The gas chamber model.....	363
Gas chamber doors - Baltimore, USA and Krema I.....	363
The gas chamber model, Auschwitz Museum.....	364
The gas chamber model, Holocaust Memorial Museum .....	364

Collective memory has seized upon the figure of four million – the very number which, based on a Soviet report, was inscribed until now on the monument erected at Auschwitz to the memory of the victims of Nazism – notwithstanding that in Jerusalem, the museum of Yad Vashem has indicated that this total is far from correct.

Nevertheless, from the war's end, scholarly memory set to work. Patient and minute investigations revealed that the figure of four million did not rest on a serious foundation and could not be retained.

The [Nuremberg] tribunal, after all, had relied on a claim by Eichmann, according to which extermination policy had caused the death of six million Jews, four million in the camps. Based on the most recent works and on the most reliable statistics – as in Raul Hilberg's *Destruction of the European Jews* – one arrives at about one million dead at Auschwitz. This is a total corroborated by all the experts, since today they agree on a number of victims that varies from a minimum of 950,000 and to a maximum of 1.2 million.

*'L'évaluation des victimes d'Auschwitz', Le Monde 23.7.1990*

\* \* \*

On 6 May 2001, Hans-Heiko Klein, 61, was awarded the Medal of Honour by the Mannheim Jewish community.

# Forewords



## The Greatest Dirty Open Secret

In the trials and tribulations of Fredrick Töben one can observe in operation the greatest dirty open secret of our day. In explaining that remark here, I will do my best to be objective, despite the fact that because of the conditions I am to discuss several of my friends have been imprisoned or fined for doing the sorts of things I also do.

In October 1997 I received a request from Töben, director of the Adelaide Institute and a Holocaust revisionist, to be a defence witness for him in his hearings before the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). The role would have involved writing a letter for him and perhaps testifying by telephone from my home near Chicago.

I resisted this request, pleading a shortage of time and the fact that he had told me, earlier that year in Chicago, that the Australian 'human rights' legislation has no teeth and that he did not have to pay any attention to such proceedings against him. Both pleas were true but I had another strong reason for my reticence, which was too complicated to state in these rapid-fire e-mail messages, but which can be explained here in due course.

In any case I relented after a few passionate e-mails from Töben. I wrote a two-page letter, intended to be submitted to the HREOC hearings. The letter, dated 5 November, declared:

Alas I must say that you are arguably guilty of some of the charges. I looked over Jeremy Jones' stuff and I infer that the 'Racial Discrimination Act' proscribes what might 'offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate another person or group of people.' Well, revisionism certainly does the first three! It does not however 'intimidate'; at least, I have never noticed such a case ... Heated controversy is a price of open debate, the foundation of a rational society.

Jeremy Jones was the representative of the Jewish organisation that had brought charges against Töben. I commented on Jones' letter by declaring Töben guilty. Some defence witness!

Far from acting betrayed by me, Töben submitted the letter to the HREOC. I believe that he was starting to see my real reason for my reluctance to get involved as a defence witness. Such matters as I had

expertise in were irrelevant to the proceedings, which related not to historical truth, but to offending, insulting etc. For the most part I could not understand the notion of culpability as used in the proceedings, but to the extent that I could understand, Töben was guilty. I am at least as guilty, as are many of my revisionist friends. The situation was structured such that nothing I could have said would have helped attain a favorable verdict, as became clear to Töben shortly later.

On 7 December Töben ended his participation in the hearings, complaining that he was unable to defend the position of the Adelaide Institute because the HREOC was not interested in historical truth. The breaking point seems to have come when the Commission rejected the witness statement of Dr Robert Faurisson as 'irrelevant'.<sup>1</sup> In a hearing conducted by telephone on 27 November, the Commission had told Töben that for the most part the witness statements he had submitted had to be disqualified either because (1) they 'make comments about the desirability, validity, constitutionality or sensibleness of this law' under which the hearings were being held or (2) they comment on 'the substance' of the historical problem, that is 'the truth of the Holocaust, the extent of the Holocaust, its existence [which] is not of much significance' for the hearings.<sup>2</sup>

Of course these two questions are, to our common sense (or as Töben puts it our sense of 'natural justice'), the only relevant questions. There is almost nothing left to be said if these two questions are excluded. I felt vindicated because even the accused had decided to submit no defence. I could not be accused of failing him. Faurisson had written one of his usual masterfully incisive analyses of the historical problems, formulated for the layman, and his statement was rejected. The implicit effect of what I wrote was to question the law itself, but I declared Töben guilty so my statement was accepted. We may make the basic observation that it was impossible to determine what Töben was being charged with, apart from saying things that annoyed some people. The Commission was not interested in the intentions behind Töben's public declarations or in their actual effect.

This observation raises the general question of the legal formulations under which Holocaust revisionists are persecuted in various countries. For purposes of such a discussion, we can take two: the Human Rights Act (such an Orwellian term!) in Canada and the 1990 Fabius-Gaysot law in France. These two legislations do contrast sharply but in practice they operate similarly, as I now explain.

In the Canadian case, the code excludes the relevance of three considerations:

1. The truth of the offending statements.
2. The intent behind the expression of the statements; for example, whether they were intended to cause people to hate Jews.

3. The actual effect of the statements; for example, whether they caused people to hate Jews, whatever the intent of the author.

We simple-minded people will scratch our heads and wonder what is left to try. It is this: whether the statements 'exposed' somebody to hatred or contempt.

It is impossible for me to clarify that standard because, to the extent I understand it, reference is being made to a condition into which all of us are born. Somebody may start hating us, and often does. Holocaust revisionists are hated more than most but exposure to hatred is basically part of the human condition. One can be argued to be innocent of such an offence only in that sense: that is, that the condition referred to is a condition we are all in, independently of what statements are made by anybody. If that plea is unacceptable, then of course we are all guilty. Anybody may be hated in the future for all sorts of reasons. Witness human history.

By contrast, the French Fabius-Gayssot law is very clear. It proscribes contesting the truth of any finding in the 'Crimes Against Humanity' section of the 1946 judgment in the main Nuremberg trial. It candidly expresses, without any tergiversation, what all legal moves against revisionists are trying to do: freeze received history in the state of the end of war hysteria of 1945-1946. This sort of law contrasts with the typical 'human rights' legislation, since here there is no doubt what offence an accused is being charged with.

The Australian statute resembles the Canadian, and the formulation of the French law is approximated in Germany, with its 'denial of established fact' clause. These are two starkly contrasting formulations and Töben may be unique in having been prosecuted under both, for as this book relates at length, in April 1999 he was jailed in Germany while travelling there.

That the two formulations have something important in common is suggested by what finally happened when Töben's trial came up in Germany in November 1999. Again, he decided to remain silent and offer no defence, and his lawyer did likewise. I commented on my website:

If I must conjecture the specific grounds for Töben's silence during the trial, I would guess that his protest is based on the impossibility of arguing the truth of any of the claims he has made, for which he is being prosecuted. I suppose in the court's eyes there is a certain amount of logic in that situation which, as so often happens, makes legal sense but not common sense. If e.g. there were a law outlawing the denial that Germany is on the planet Mars, and if I deny that Germany is on the planet Mars and am prosecuted for the claim, then the question of whether Germany is on the planet Mars is irrelevant to the question of whether I broke the law. Truth is no defense. In those circumstances I would adopt the strategy Töben adopted, silence, which for me would make both legal sense and common sense.<sup>5</sup>

Thus the two contrasting formulations confront the accused revisionist with the same practical situation: the impossibility of seeking to justify the offending statements in relation to the accusations. Before a 'human rights' tribunal, a Holocaust revisionist confronts unintelligible accusations. Under the French or German laws, the Holocaust revisionist is accused of being a Holocaust revisionist. If I had been a defence witness for Töben in Germany, I could not have helped him and indeed he could not think of anything to help himself. There was nothing for him to say, and nothing a defence witness could have effectively said in his support. Such court victories as revisionist defendants have won have been based on legal and constitutional technicalities.

Since Western society has, for many years, made freedom of expression one of its highest values, the reactions of the civil liberties groups to this offensive and scandalous situation are of great interest.

Their reactions are equally offensive and even more scandalous. The leading (in terms of general prestige) international civil rights group is Amnesty International, headquartered in London. Amnesty has a designation, 'prisoner of conscience', which it describes thus:

'Prisoners of conscience' is the original term given by the founders of Amnesty International to people who are imprisoned, detained or otherwise physically restricted anywhere because of their beliefs, colour, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion, provided they have not used or advocated violence.

The concept of a prisoner of conscience transcends class, creed, colour or geography and reflects the basic principle on which Amnesty International was founded: that all people have the right to express their convictions and the obligation to extend that freedom to others.

The imprisonment of individuals because of their beliefs or origins is a violation of fundamental human rights; rights which are not privileges 'bestowed' on individuals by states and which, therefore, cannot be withdrawn for political convenience.

Amnesty International seeks the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience.<sup>4</sup>

Early in Töben's German incarceration John Bennett, the Melbourne civil liberties lawyer, wrote to Amnesty to request them to formally adopt Töben as a 'prisoner of conscience' which, in ordinary meaning, is what he was. In a long letter Amnesty declined, declaring that

in 1995 the organisation decided at a meeting of its International Council - the highest decision making body of Amnesty International - that it would exclude from prisoner of conscience status not only people who have used or advocated violence, but also people who are imprisoned 'for having advocated national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence.'. The decision codified Amnesty International's intention to exclude from prisoner of conscience status those who advocate the denial of

the Holocaust and it confirmed what had in fact had been the de facto interpretation of the prisoner of conscience definition contained in Article 1 of Amnesty International's Statute.

That seems to say that 'those who advocate the denial of the Holocaust' are viewed by Amnesty as thereby advocating 'national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence.' That is rubbish, an obvious logical non sequitur, empirically contradicted by easy observation; I have never seen such advocacy in the Adelaide Institute newsletter. It is such obvious rubbish that it must be called a lie. Töben is not in the class of an Elie Wiesel, who has incited hatred of Germans, or of Zionists who have incited discrimination and violence against Arabs.

Amnesty has declined to support freedom of expression for Holocaust revisionists for political reasons. It is, therefore, not worthy of respect. The organisation's hypocrisy is highlighted by the case of Nelson Mandela who, during his sabotage trial in South Africa in 1964, admitted that he believed in violence to achieve his political objectives and for that purpose had been a leader of a campaign of sabotage. Mandela was a hot subject of debate at Amnesty's meeting in September 1964 because, while the overwhelming sentiment was to continue to support him, one of the rules pertaining to the prisoner of conscience category was that those who used or advocated violence were not eligible. Thus the meeting decided against adopting Mandela thus, but it also voted for supporting him anyway.<sup>5</sup> A mere label was withheld, not the support. Töben needed the support more than the label.

Thus we see in the Töben case hypocrisy at high levels of contemporary public life, but I opened by promising 'the greatest dirty open secret of our day', and I have yet to explain.

Like the study of taboos, the study of hypocritical exceptions to agreed norms is highly instructive on the real, as opposed to declared, values of a society. That free expression of ideas must be a fundamental value of the sort of society we purport to be has virtual unanimous support, at least in the abstract. True, the ideal of free expression must be qualified in various ways, for example by national security laws and restrictions against distribution of pornography in some circumstances. However, it is hard to make even a bad case for censorship of the history of the remote past unless that history impacts in some way on the present; in such event bad cases can be and are made.

The past and the present are linked, in the case of Holocaust revisionism, by Zionism. Many Israeli leaders agree that the Holocaust is 'what this country's all about'.<sup>6</sup> That statement is more true than the speaker intended, because apart from Zionism's obvious contemporary exploitation of the Holocaust legend, there is the lesser known role that Zionism played in establishing, during the years 1942-1948, the legend that was to become its lifeblood, as I have discussed at length elsewhere. However, even that is not the greatest dirty open secret of our day.

It is widely imagined that the various national-socialist movements that flourished in Europe more than 50 years ago are dead. But that is not true. Yes, gone are not only Hitler's Nazis and Mussolini's Fascists, but also the British Union of Fascists, the Croatian Ustashe, the Hungarian Arrow Cross, the Romanian Iron Guard, the Parti Populaire Français, and all such national-socialist movements except Zionism, a movement born and nurtured in Europe during the heyday of nationalism and socialism, and which is quite vigorous today. Its völkisch principle, that of the 'chosen people', is the oldest and best tested extant.

Despite occasional rhetoric by various governments and organisations like Amnesty International (for example, against the torture of prisoners), Israel and thus Zionism are essentially untouchable in international affairs. One cannot imagine, for example, Israel being treated harshly for defying the United Nations' resolutions, even with measures less severe than those used against Iraq during the past decade. Our institutions not only support Israel as a state; they also support Zionism in domestic policy by means tailored for each country. In Europe the critical examination of Zionism's sustaining legend is outlawed.

That is not the case in the USA, for constitutional reasons, but American institutions look kindly on this European repression nevertheless. There are occasional references in the American press to the European anti-revisionist laws, but I have never seen an editorial condemnation of them from these editors who so righteously scold China for its human rights violations. A frightening episode occurred in 1993 and 1994, when FBI Director Louis Freeh held talks with the German *Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz* (Federal Office for Protection of the Constitution), the euphemistically named agency that performs many of the functions once entrusted to the more honestly named *Geheime Staatspolizei* (Gestapo or Secret State Police). The talks sought to find ways the USA could stop the flow, from the USA to Germany, of literature banned by German law but lawful in the USA.<sup>7</sup> The talks seem to have come to nothing but the point was clearly made that the USA approves of such German repression of civil liberties. The role of the USA in supporting Israel diplomatically, financially and militarily is well known. The USA is also the mainstay of the operation of the related Holocaust restitution racket.

Thus the institutions of some major Western countries, flouting established legal and ethical norms, are as intellectually repressive as anybody's Gestapo, in enforcing service to the only surviving European national-socialist movement, and the others are tacitly or even openly supportive of that repression. That is the greatest dirty open secret of our day.

**Professor Arthur R. Butz**  
Evanston, Illinois, USA  
September 2000

\* \* \*



## Lessons from History

Sun Tzu, 2500 years ago, said all warfare is based on deception. Human progress is such that in this enlightened era, deception is as much constituent to politics as to war, and where war leaves off, politics continues the conquest.

What we know as World War II did not cease with the unconditional surrender of Germany to the noble Allies on 7 May 1945. It continues today by other means, the element of deceit central.

As war is not fought with bullets of truth and bombs of laughing gas, neither is the existing cold war between the Zionist-controlled consortium of plutocrats and corrupt politicians who control Israel, the U.S., Britain and Germany against the uncomprehending people of Germany (not to mention the equally pathetic numbskulls of the USA, Canada, Australia, Britain and Europe) fought with truth, open debate and academic freedom. In fact, those storybook concepts are anathema to the stability of the existing order.

Revisionist historians have documented the facts, shocking to most, that World War II was not started by a madman, Adolf Hitler; that he had no intention of conquering the world; that he unceasingly worked for peace with Britain from his earliest days against insanely vicious and evil forces in the West determined to create a devastating and disastrous war; and that he and other German leaders tried again and again to reach a negotiated peace beginning as early as May 1940, nine months after the British declaration of war, when Hitler, against the advice of his generals, personally saved the British Army from annihilation at Dunkirk.

Nor are establishment historians up to pointing out that Hitler's closest friend and his deputy, Rudolf Hess, flew to Britain on 11 May 1941 in a last-ditch effort to stop the needless war between the two countries and to enlist British support for Germany's planned attack on Stalinist Russia for the purpose of countering the impending Soviet attack on Germany and the subjugation of all Europe. Instead of the reception this tragic hero deserved, he was silenced by solitary confinement for 55 years, declared a 'war criminal' at Nuremberg and finally murdered by strangulation by a paid British assassin in his cell at Spandau Prison on 17 August 1987 at the age of 93.

Nor does the Western public yet know - 55 years after the end of this 'forced war', as it has been described by revisionist scholar, David Hoggan, that Germany is still an occupied nation without a peace treaty and without sovereignty and that its politicians may charitably be described as trained fleas who cheerfully jump to orders from their superiors. In return for their treason, they receive journalistic and monetary plaudits as befits the corrupt system they serve.

In apparently long-forgotten terms of international law, the German government has been and is unmistakably *de facto* but not *de jure*; indeed, Germany serves as the classic model for this contrast since 23 May 1945 when the Allies dismissed Admiral Karl Dönitz, the last legal head of Germany.

The most effective tool used against Germany to keep hot the flame of hate is the Holocaust propaganda, a holdover from the hot war which, however, grows in intensity with each passing day even as Holocaust revisionists, such as the author of this volume, uncover more facts to prove that it is the most massive deception of the past 2000 years.

As I have tried to make clear in my essay, 'Why is 'The Holocaust' Important?' the consequences of this deception have been incalculable in spite of its almost infinite internal contradictions, its shifting numbers and facts and the dismal repute of its high priests, such as Simon Wiesenthal, Elie Wiesel, Deborah Lipstadt and Christopher Browning, to name a few.

But of course, mere truth and facts have no place of importance to Establishment journalists and historians. What is important is that the 'The Holocaust' deception be kept vital. It is fully as important to the subjection of German freedom today as was the Aztec myth that Cortes was a god important to the Spanish conquest of Mexico. The Aztecs invented their myth whereas the Germans had theirs forced upon them and they accepted it because of the traditional feeling of guilt which is always close to the surface in Christians. That Cortes was an irresistible god was a myth that destroyed the Aztecs. That their fathers gassed 6 000 000 defenceless Jews is killing gullible Germans and tearing down self-respect among all Europeans, including white Americans. No wonder the West is deeply sunk in a cesspool of moral slime.

Thankfully, not all of our contemporaries are cowed in the face of the myth of the Holocaust. One man who has taken a position of leadership for truth is Dr Fredrick Töben, the author of this volume. He has personally confronted today's dragon of deceit and in this book relates the facts as he knows them.

Fighting for the truth is dangerous today in this 'enlightened' age of deceit, this imperium of lies. Today, some hundreds of prisoners are held in German jails for daring to speak the truth. Apparently, this is what Americans, Britons and Senegalese bled and died for - to bring democracy to Germany and liberate them from a wicked tyrant who, it is said, burned books as well as Jews. Shamefully, my country is complicit in this vast crime against truth, against liberty under law, against civilisation itself. The only way Americans can redeem themselves from being truly guilty of this crime against everything their country once stood for is to speak out and tell all the facts as we know them.

If you do not believe that it is a serious moral crime to speak the truth about our oppressors or to tell the truth about history, try it. If you do, you will immediately learn the penalty. No American will be sent to prison in America for telling the truth – at least, not yet. Thank God, the First Amendment to our hallowed Constitution prevents that. But unless we determine to speak the truth while we still can legally, in spite of the penalties that are certain to follow administered by the press and our alien leadership, it is certain that we will soon be living under lies more profound than we do already, administered by a tyranny such as the people of Russia and Eastern Europe existed under before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The terror, in fact, has already begun. Can you not see it? Today it is a moral if not a legal crime to speak ill of our oppressors or to confront historical lies. What is most frightening, everyone knows it!

Moral terror is the certain precursor to physical terror enforced by the lash, torture and death. Do not make light of this warning.

**Willis Carto**  
Escondido, California, USA  
23 August 2000

\* \* \*

## **The Catacombs**

Asked what could best be done for the Anglo-Catholic cause and his fellow believers, Evelyn Waugh once replied, ‘The catacombs’. Persecution vindicates. This is high among consolations for Holocaust revisionists, quite part from participation in what Robert Faurisson has termed the most compelling intellectual adventure of the era.

Holocaust revisionism is intensely personal. Each individual comes to it in his or her own particular way, and there are no short cuts. Usually the process is accompanied by exceptional experiences of various sorts. The process frequently takes a long time. For this writer it began with a game of softball within the walls of the Dachau Concentration Camp. This was in the summer of 1954, when the premises were used by the US Army for purposes of casual recreation. As an Army draftee, the writer had been sent to Germany and, knowing some German, was assigned to a military intelligence battalion with headquarters at USARFUR in Heidelberg but with a number of branch offices in Bavaria, the site of many of the camps to which refugees from East Germany and elsewhere in Eastern Europe were brought for initial interrogation. What, for example, did they know about uranium mining in Saxony? ‘Nothing’ was the customary reply, but the question was worth asking.

The battalion had an intra-mural softball league and on a pleasant summer day that year a dozen of us from one of the units were sent to play on the well-tended field at Dachau, not far from the main

administration building and the entrance to the Disneyland Dachau of today.

None of us made much of the place one way or another, but after playing the game we were accorded some time to look things over. The first-class masonry of the high walls made a lasting impression, along with the purple hue time had given to the bricks themselves. The location of these prison walls on the gentle tablelands northwest of Munich itself symbolised suffering – this was no place for high walls at all.

We were given no propaganda on the subject by our officers or anyone else but could see for ourselves, if we chose, the propaganda purposes to which the camp had been put in the immediate aftermath of the war. The shower nozzles unconnected to any piping system told their own story.

Why didn't we become revisionists on the spot? Because we did not want to argue the matter; because we felt exaggeration was understandable among sufferers; because the concentration camp system had existed and had cost many innocent lives; and it was beyond all question morally indefensible. So, in this instance, decades elapsed before this writer again pondered that afternoon within the Dachau walls. As the propaganda Dachau came into being (schoolchildren are dispatched there regularly by bus these days), so did scepticism as to many of the basic assertions. And then slowly but surely, came the realisation that exaggeration is not the root of exterminationist contention. Downright lying is at the root.

The Duke of Wellington once remarked in later years that he had heard so many versions of the Battle of Waterloo he sometimes doubted he himself had been there at all. History is certainly elusive, never entirely capturable. But we do know what happened at Waterloo, though it took a long time to sort it all out, and there are still some matters open to scholarly debate.

Due process does win historically in the long run. In any trial for a capital offence, defence counsel demands close scrutiny of the alleged murder weapon. The prosecution must produce the *corpus delicti* or have some tall explaining to do. Witnesses for the prosecution must undergo rigorous cross-examination. Yet application of these principles to what has come to be called the Holocaust brings revisionists into the catacombs. So be it.

**Andrew Gray**  
Washington, DC, USA  
20 October 2000

\* \* \*

## The 'Töben Case' as seen by Voltaire

For the historian, the sociologist or the jurist the case of an Australian revisionist, Fredrick Töben, is one of the simplest and most instructive. It is also both appalling and amusing. One day, moved by curiosity, this German-born Australian left the Antipodes on a journey to Europe in order to confer with a Frenchman who had coined the phrase "No holes, no 'Holocaust'". From there he went on to Poland, to Auschwitz, where with his own eyes he observed that, in the effective absence of any 'holes' in the collapsed roof of an alleged homicidal gas chamber, there was cause to doubt whether such chemical slaughterhouses had ever existed at that spot, veritable centre of the 'Holocaust'. Finally, on a pilgrimage to the Germanic lands, he shared his doubts and asked for explanations, an act that earned him forthwith a stay in prison.

Voltaire would have liked this 'affaire Calas' (of a less tragic sort).<sup>8</sup> From it he could have drawn inspiration for a tale entitled *The Emperor's New Clothes* or *The Imposture*. It seems right to imagine that, as in a classical French play, the story should evolve in five stages.

In the first of these stages, our hero from the other hemisphere hears tell that a certain European emperor, dear to the Jews and thus also to today's Germans, is, in the eyes of his court, bedecked in the most extraordinary attire, whilst in reality he is quite simply naked; it is said that some ingenious rascals had pretended to create for the emperor garments of an exceedingly rare cloth, costing a fortune. In the next stage, our Australian, modern-day Huron of the Voltaire tale *Le Huron ou l'Ingénu*, comes to Europe and prepares to go see for himself, armed with some advice on how to carry out his inquiry; once on location, he in effect gets the impression that this emperor could well be naked. In a third stage, he proceeds to inquire of those around him, going so far as to whisper to the courtiers, 'Is your emperor perhaps naked?' For want of a fitting reply, he resolves to go to the Germanic lands and consult a man of the craft; this latter, most certainly a German and perhaps a Jew as well, has a reputation, the world over, for such good knowledge of the solution to the riddle that he will not abide any answer other than his own. This individual, prosecutor of woeful mien, invites the sceptic to come back to see him two hours later in order to get his answer. This our Australian does not fail to do. There, in the prosecutor's study, with a stranger present, he is asked to repeat his question. Which he does. And so it is that, in a fifth and final stage, the question-man finds himself behind the bars of a German jail.

In the reality of the Töben case, the prosecutor was a man called Hans-Heiko Klein, the stranger was a police informer and the jail was, for seven months, that of Mannheim.

What followed would equally have inspired Voltaire. It throws a stark light on the way in which the German justice system works at present

and on the mode of conduct adopted by a large number of Western democracies as soon as the most hallowed of their taboos, that of the 'Holocaust', looks to be in peril.

Removed from his jail cell, Töben, in handcuffs and duly escorted, was led into a courtroom. But, given the gravity of his case, he had the right only to a mock trial. He was of course provided with counsel but the latter was made to understand that he would do well to keep quiet if he did not want to join his client in prison. The lawyer kept quiet and Töben was found guilty, sentenced to serve time and a heavy fine, then released on bail the next day.

In Australia the authorities were careful not to intervene in favour of the victim. Indeed they fell little short of applauding the German judges' decision, and most likely envied their freedom of action.

In the rest of the Western world, all fell by and large into tune with Germany and Australia. The 'élites' in place kept silent or approved. To none of them did there occur the idea of decrying an outrage. No petitions in support of the heretic, no demonstrations. Amnesty International considered it natural and normal that an intellectual, an academic, should be so treated. In effect, precisely because he is a professor, many must be of the opinion that Töben surely ought to know that some questions simply offend decency.

### Already 20 years before

Twenty years previously, I myself had lived through an experience comparable to that of my Australian colleague. In the columns of *Le Monde*, 34 French historians – amongst whom some, like Fernand Braudel, enjoyed international renown – had come out with a joint declaration rebuking me for having put a question that propriety forbade me to conceive. I had discovered that the existence and operation of the alleged Nazi gas chambers were, for physical and chemical reasons understandable to a child of 8, fundamentally impossible. In the late 1970s I had therefore asked Germany's accusers how, for them, such mass murder by gassing had been technically possible. The answer took some time in coming, then gushed forth:

It must not be asked how, *technically*, such mass murder was possible. It was technically possible, since it happened. That is the requisite starting point of any historical inquiry on this subject. It is incumbent upon us to state this truth plainly and simply: there is not, there cannot be any debate on the existence of the gas chambers.<sup>9</sup>

I had the awkwardness to think then that I had just brought off a decisive victory. My adversaries were taking flight. They showed themselves to be unable to reply to my arguments except by spin. For me, the myth of the alleged gas chambers had just breathed its last.

## **Pressac's surrender, Spielberg's triumph**

Of course, from the scientific standpoint, those gas chambers had fallen back into nothingness. The following years were to confirm this. From 1979 to 1995 all attempts to demonstrate their existence would abort: the Rückerls and Langbeins, the Hilbergs and Brownings, the Klarfelds and Pressacs would all suffer the most humiliating failures. It is not I who say this but rather one of their keenest apostles, historian Jacques Baynac. In 1996, in two long and particularly well-informed articles, this fierce opponent of the revisionists drafted, with a heavy heart, an assessment of the vain tries to establish the existence of the Nazi gas chambers.<sup>10</sup> His conclusion: the historians had failed totally and, therefore, recourse was had to the judiciary in order to silence the revisionists. In March 2000 Jean-Claude Pressac was, in a way, to announce his own surrender; on this point one may read an interview with him by the French academic historian (and firm anti-revisionist) Valérie Igounet.<sup>11</sup> The last two pages of the interview are staggering: Pressac states that the 'rubbish bins of history' await the official story of the concentration camps! Supposedly dating from 15 June 1995, this text of a recorded talk must have been somewhat modified afterwards.

But, as is well known, the sphere of science, on the one hand, and that of the mass-media, on the other, are plainly different in nature; in the latter sphere, whilst the Nazi gas chambers have had a very rough time of it, the adjoining myths of the genocide and the 6 000 000 are thriving thanks to a booming promotion. Hilberg and his like may have failed in their work as historians but Spielberg, the master of special effects cinema, triumphs with his holocaustic epics. Today, the kosher version of World War II history has force of law and of custom to such a degree that the nasty 'deniers' seem annihilated.

### **The particular case of Töben**

Nevertheless, a number of these rebels called revisionists remain alive, and very much so, to the despair of the thought police and their lackeys in the prosecution service, the judiciary and the media. Among these revisionists stands Fredrick Töben, who, upon leaving prison, did not have the decency to show the least contrition or, as is said today, repentance. It may be feared that, for him, the emperor (of the Jews) will stay definitively naked, and that he will go all about repeating 'No holes, no 'Holocaust'', or, in allusion to the fabric that is not, 'No clothes, no 'Holocaust''.

Beginning with the indomitable Paul Rassinier, a good many other revisionists besides our Australian have endured or still endure a thousand travails. A few months ago, one of them, in Germany, was

driven to suicide. Professor Werner Pfeifenberger at Münster killed himself on 13 May 2000 after years of an exhausting struggle against his persecutors. On 25 April 1995, in a Munich square, Reinhold Elstner immolated himself by fire.

What distinguishes the revisionist Töben's case from that of others is its simple and swift unwinding, and therefore its illustrative value. One might call it a synopsis, an all-in-a-nutshell sketch. It is nothing but the story of a man who, for having made a prosaic remark on a material fact, finds himself in prison. To whoever cared to listen, he had, in fact, held forth thus:

At Auschwitz–Birkenau, day after day, a deadly substance was apparently poured through four openings, specially made in a reinforced concrete roof, so as to kill, each time, the thousands of persons confined in the room below. How could such an operation be possible given that manifestly, as one may remark today, none of those four openings ever existed? Of course, the roof is now in ruins but, on the surface, no trace of those openings can be made out and, if one slides down beneath the ruin, one can see that the ceiling has never had any openings in it. How do you explain that?

He was not answered. Then, he went to find a man who, by definition, must know the answer to his query (and the answer to several others of the same calibre, material and rudimentary). As his only reply, that individual deemed it necessary to throw him into jail. But, once out of jail, what did our impertinent friend do? He repeated his question, but this time *urbi et orbi*, and with renewed vigour.

A story edifying in its brevity and not without spice.

### **Töben in an ingénue role from a tale by Voltaire**

I shall say it again: a Frenchman familiar with Voltaire is tempted to see in this antipodean a reincarnation, in his own mode, of *Candide* or the *Huron* (the original *Ingénu*). Under Voltaire's pen, the ingenuousness, real or feigned, of those two heroes, wholly of his imagining, ended up putting them through numerous ordeals but it also helped them overcome adversity, and not without opening for the reader some interesting perspectives on the beliefs and superstitions to be found at the foundations of our society and institutions. The story of Töben (German as was *Candide*) would probably have appealed to Voltaire on another score, that of the execrable intolerance of the Jews and their high priests.<sup>12</sup>

Today, in France, the re-editions of some of the works of the 'patriarch of Ferney' are expurgated, for fear of displeasing the Jews. No-one can doubt that, if he came back to this world, Voltaire, following Töben's example, would be 'put inside' for his disrespectful questions. Even Switzerland, where in his time Voltaire knew he could find refuge, would not fail to lock him up today.



## Note on a false attribution to Voltaire

It is by mistake that the following remark is attributed to Voltaire: 'I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it', sometimes with the adjunct 'Monsieur l'abbé...'. In reality, a London author called Stephen G. Tallentyre (real name – Evelyn B. Hall) in *The Friends of Voltaire* (1906) wrote on the subject of the attitude taken by Voltaire in case of an intense disagreement with an adversary: 'I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it was his attitude now'.<sup>15</sup>

Robert Faurisson

Vichy, France

22 August 2000

\* \* \*

## An eerily touching, slightly unsettling, disquieting experience

Nine words have haunted me from the moment they were uttered by Dr Fredrick Töben during his visit to Toronto, Canada, where I interviewed him at length for my *Voice of Freedom* satellite television show. He said, no doubt to please me with a compliment, 'I want to be the Ernst Zündel of Australia'. Little did we both know that his wish would be granted by fate faster than either one of us could realise at the time.

Töben had arrived in Toronto on a fact-finding trip through many countries, trying to strengthen emotional bonds and cooperation with leading revisionists. He looked sun-tanned and in good physical shape – a man of rugged features, muscularly built, with a ready smile, in his eyes a mischievous twinkle. He looked every inch the accomplished professor. As he sat there, utterly relaxed, in my basement studio, he struck me more as a hobbyist philosopher than as a candidate for martyrdom. He willingly answered my probing questions about his life, his upbringing, his education, his travels – and, above all, his encounter with, and finally his embrace of, revisionism.

As the interview progressed, fine pearls of perspiration were beginning to form on his forehead and upper lip from the unrelenting heat put out by the powerful lights necessary to produce those crisp, sharp images suitable for broadcasting on television. Probing, recorded TV interviews are very similar in 'feel' for the interview 'victim' as are police interrogations or court cross-examinations in the witness box. As I put question after question to him, I thought to myself, 'If this man wants to be the Ernst Zündel of Australia, this will be as good an introduction to what will be in store for him as any'.

I watched and listened intently, making mental notes, as Töben answered my questions in a firm and pleasant voice, not once getting

rattled in the process. Words were rolling off his lips with the elegance and ease of a man, university-trained, sure of a polished vocabulary and a quickness of mind that was bound to confound judges and, especially, prosecutors in the future, should his odd wish be granted. After all, I had been the reviled and vilified ‘Canadian Ernst Zündel’ for more than 40 years, a role not always easy, involving as it did not only politically romantic, constitutionally granted and supposedly state-protected street activism – but having to face terror, bombs, arson and numerous jailings along the way.

The minutes turned into an hour, then two. During tape changes, Töben would mop his brow, banter with my sound and lighting crew and engage in animated conversation with the cameraman. I was warming to my interview subject. This man was no cream puff. He was not going to be a pushover inside or outside the courtroom or during any public debate. He was articulate, polite and firm. He had good recall of facts and placed them in the context of history, religion and politics with ease and comfort, weaving a virtual tapestry of his mind.

I thought to myself, ‘No doubt he can hold his own in an academic setting. He has the intellectual tools and rhetorical skills to wrestle with the forces of evil he will encounter in his path. But does he have the ‘right stuff’?. Would he have the emotional stability, the grin-and-bear-it attitude he would have to possess to sustain him through sleepless nights spent in dank cells shared with wife beaters and axe murderers? Would he be able to take the daily hurts and indignities, the endless harassment by police, customs, immigration, the media, the diabolically clever mental and psychological persecution daily inflicted on the Ernst Zündels, the Robert Faurissons, the David Irvings of this world? The answers to those questions would have to be answered, I thought that evening, in other places and at future times. I could probe his heart, his mind, even try to get a glimpse of the inner workings and make-up of his soul – only an inscrutable fate veiled from mortal men would reveal the true and sum-total of the man, Fredrick Töben, when he had to confront his tormentors – as he most certainly would, should he continue on his trajectory of becoming the ‘Ernst Zündel’ of his adopted country.

For me, the meeting with Töben was an eerily touching, slightly unsettling, disquieting experience for I felt as if I were given a future peek into the keyhole of history unfolding. I knew that the man who sat there so leisurely would be arrested, would face interrogations, trials, tribulations, convictions and jailings if he persisted on his quest for truth at a time when governments of Western countries have declared that when it comes to World War II and, especially, the Holocaust, truth was not allowed as a defence. What I could not know was the dizzying speed with which fate would catch up with Töben and grant him his odd wish.

The details of Töben’s trip to Germany, his visit to Hans-Heiko Klein, the apparently legally sanctioned entrapment in the prosecutor’s very office,

his arrest and months-long ordeal in prison and subsequent developments are told in this book. This experience of the ‘Töben Arrest’ made headlines around the world and showed up Germany as the ruthless dictatorship it has become. It must be seen as a juncture – a most critical juncture for every revisionist in similar circumstances. Germans call it ‘die Feuertaufe’ (baptism by fire).

Under pressure and duress, ostensibly strong men have weakened, agreed to compromises with prosecutors and police, and casually betrayed their cause, once so fervently expressed, in order to avoid prosecution and imprisonment. Fredrick Töben did not weaken. He went to prison like a man. The rest is history.

Töben’s life has since taken on many similarities to mine. The press coverage has been distorted and poisoned. His life is now, as was mine, riddled with official harassment, with ‘invitations’ to appear before a human rights tribunal, and similar indignities. He has achieved notoriety and has been vilified for what he believes – or more correctly, what he does not believe. As has happened to me for four long decades, he is now disliked by many who are brainwashed and hated by those who hate the truth, who hate to have their actions and lies scrutinised in public. He is feared for the clarity of his mind and honesty of his words by the morally bankrupt political elite and the prostituted media of his adopted country.

I also know from first-hand experience that he will be admired and even revered and loved by some that can appreciate a man of principle in an age of pervasive compromise. But make no mistake. This is the mere beginning of the Australian saga in the struggle for freedom of speech and belief, not the end.

Front-line revisionist activists who will have lasting impact are forged into fine steel blades through a lot of hard, repeated hammer blows of destiny on the anvil of history so that they serve as tools with which to cut the Gordian knot of lies.

**Ernst Zündel**

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

9 November 2000

\* \* \*

## Endnotes

- 1 Adelaide Institute newsletter, Jan. 1998, pp. 1, 8.
- 2 Adelaide Institute newsletter, Feb. 1998, p. 10.
- 3 <http://pubweb.nwu.edu/~abutz>.
- 4 *Prisoners of Conscience* (Amnesty International Publications, London, 1981), pp. 1-2.
- 5 Egon Larsen, *A Flame in Barbed Wire* (Frederick Muller, London, 1978; W.W. Norton, NY, 1979).

- 6 Efraim Zuroff, Israeli director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, quoted in the *New York Times*, 14.1.1995, p. 6.
- 7 *Chicago Tribune*, 15.12.1993 (sec. 1, pp. 1, 16), 19.12.1993 (sec. 1, p. 4) and 27.6.1994 (sec. 1, p. 4). Publicly the talk was about stopping 'neo-Nazi' propaganda but that is a common camouflage or package term when Holocaust revisionism is a target that it would be inexpedient to identify.
- 8 Voltaire (1694–1778) was notably the author of *Candide ou l'Optimisme* (philosophical tale, 1759), *Le Huron ou l'Ingénu* (satirical tale, 1767) as well as the *Dictionnaire philosophique ou la Raison par alphabet* (1764). He intervened in a series of court cases, such as that of the Calvinist Jean Calas, to speak out against what he called the crimes of intolerance or of superstition. He spent his last 20 years at Ferney, near the Swiss border.
- 9 *Le Monde*, 21.2.1979.
- 10 *Le Nouveau Quotidien*, Lausanne, 2 and 3.9.1996.
- 11 Valérie Igounet, *Histoire du négationnisme en France* (Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 2000), pp. 613–52.
- 12 See Henri Labroue, *Voltaire antijuif* (Les Documents contemporains, Paris, 1942).
- 13 Paul F. Boller jnr and John George, *They Never Said It: A Book of Fake Quotes, Misquotes, and Misleading Attributions* (OUP, New York and Oxford, 1989), pp. 124–26. Such is, in any case, the information that I have drawn from an article in *L'Intermédiaire des chercheurs et curieux* (November 1993, p. 1157), kindly sent to me seven years ago by the Belgian revisionist Pierre Moreau, to whom I had confided my failure to find the remark in any of Voltaire's writings.