

Holocaust deniers: credible historians or irrational anti-Semites?

“We can never know the whole or absolute truth about anything in the past... But it doesn’t follow that there is no such thing as the truth”¹

In 1945, as a result of both Russian [*David Irving comments: Soviet; Russia was just one of the countries of the Soviet Union*] and United States liberation of Germany, the world was shocked to learn that between 1939 and 1944, the Nazis in Germany believed that they had to make their new empire “Judenfrei” (Jew free) [*David Irving comments: adjective, judenrein, or judenfrei; only nouns have capital letters in German*] under the leadership of Hitler. At first the Nazis simply tried to force Jews out of the lands they controlled. However once the Second World War started, they developed ghettos². They then, historians agree, [*David Irving comments: this is weak; identify the historians who agree, or leave it out*] sent Jews to concentration camps and then, finally to death camps [*David Irving comments: by calling them ‘death camps’ you are accepting a priori what you intend to prove; so call them “internment” or “concentration camps” if you want to look objective*], where the primary killing method was the gas chambers. This period in history was later named, [*David Irving comments: lose that comma*] the Holocaust. The general consensus of historians was that the estimated figure of Jews that were murdered during the Holocaust, was six million. This figure has been arrived at due to the differing population figures of 1939 to 1946. [*David Irving comments: No, you can not do meaningful statistical operations on a pre-war or post-war Europe in which (a) the frontiers repeatedly changed; (b) the censuses were taken in different years; (c) the very definition of “who is a Jew” was disputed. The figure was put to Mr Justice Robert H Jackson, chief prosecutor, in June 1945 in a meeting with Jewish community leaders in New York as being a good basis for prosecution: see his diary, which I quote in “Nuremberg, the Last Battle”.]*

However, perspectives of the Holocaust have changed over time. Evidence of its severity was immediately clear. The first death camps in Poland were liberated in 1944 by the Russian [*David Irving comments: Soviet*] Army. The unspoken policy in Germany was to keep quiet about the atrocities that were committed by the Nazis on the Jewish people. The result was a deafening silence throughout the country. Many people accused the survivors who wanted to talk about their experience, as refusing to “get on with life”. It was

¹ Professor Richard Evans of the University of Cambridge. Quoted in the video tape “The great debate about history” [*David Irving comments: give a proper source and location; mention here that Evans is a much derided senior teacher of history at the University of Cambridge, whose total lack of objectivity was remarked upon by the university authorities in New Zealand when he was hired to do an identical hatchet job on Joel Hayward of the University of Auckland. Evans has since then lived up to his soubriquet, “Skunky”, but squirting poisonous slime on the reputation of every renowned historian around the world whose views clashed with his.*]

² Italian Jewish word for the Jewish “quarter” of a city

clear that, despite the reports from the head SS³ guards from the camps at the end of the war, very few people had any clear idea of exactly what the survivors went through.

It seems hard to believe that people can deny the Holocaust [David Irving comments: Why do you not comment on the nonsense contained in this three word phrase? “The” Holocaust is not a religion. It is not yet blasphemy to question some of its tenets and beliefs.] absolutely, however, the revisionist viewpoints, which first emerged in the 1950’s, [David Irving comments: Unlikely to have emerged as early as that, as the notion of “the” Holocaust did not emerge until the early 1970s. You might like to check *The Times* index, or that of *The New York Times* to verify this – these are certainly available in your local university or big public library.] consisted of three main elements which construct the Holocaust denial framework and ideology. Firstly, some historians refute the notion that a well-organised extermination program [David Irving comments: If it were well organised, which it most certainly was not, it would not have allowed millions of Jews to escape extermination, including the Anne Frank family, who either died of typhus or were cured by SS doctors in Auschwitz hospital (her father): why not comment on this paradox? Perhaps you mean “systematic”?] was created using gas chambers and crematoria. Secondly, others deny that the estimated six million Jews were killed. Thirdly, some take the view of denying that there was an intention to commit genocide of Jews based on racial ideology.

One of the earliest people to speak out against the accepted Holocaust history was the Frenchman Paul Rassinier (b.1906 d.1967). Rassinier had apparently been beaten by a communist fellow-prisoner in the Buchenward concentration camp⁴ and then developed the impression that his fellow-prisoners seemed more dangerous than the SS guards. He eventually was transferred to camp Dora, [David Irving comments: You might add, ... Dora, which supplied slave labour for the underground missile and missile-engine plant at Nordhausen] where he was well treated by a senior SS officer and it seemed that these experiences prejudiced him in favour of the Nazis, this shows his motivation for writing about his experiences of the Holocaust. He published a defence⁵ of the SS guards where he challenged their critics and denied the reports from survivors who either witnessed or experienced atrocities in the camps. He also disputed the existence of gas chambers and finally claimed that Jews started the Second World War. [David Irving comments: You should surely add that Rassinier, as a communist, cannot be accused of fascist propaganda; and that as a survivor of the camps his evidence deserves at least some consideration: or are we being picky and selective in what we accept...? The bit about the Jews “starting the war” is irrelevant to your paper, even if untrue – upon which history will eventually rule.]

The first attempt to present Holocaust denial in a pseudo-academic form [David Irving comments: On what criteria do you distinguish a pseudo-academic work (e.g. by Butz, of North-Western University, Chicago) from an academic one (e.g. by Lipstadt)? Both are tenured professors in recognised academic institutions. Being picky again? Having met both, and read works by both, I know without doubt whose work I respect the

³ Abbreviation for German word Schutz taffel, [David Irving comments: Schutzstaffel] literally meaning ‘defence squadron’, a special Nazi armed force known for being particularly vicious.

⁴ Imprisoned due to communist affiliation

⁵ ‘The holocaust story and the lies of Ulysses’ published in 1950.

more. Lipstadt works from unverified press clippings; need I say more?] was in the 1976 book *The hoax of the twentieth century* by Arthur R Butz. The book stated that Zyklon-B gas was never used to kill Jews in gas chambers but was used strictly as an insecticide [David Irving comments: pesticide; there is a difference]. Butz also claimed that Auschwitz was an industrial plant not a concentration camp [David Irving comments: I strongly doubt that he ever wrote that; please provide a source, if he did. Do not set up straw dummies to shoot down, just because you can't shoot down the real man] and that any death that occurred at these camps was caused by the disease typhus [David Irving comments: Butz's actual view is that most deaths in these camps were caused by the typhus epidemics, and I share that view; this is not quite the same as you have written] and that no gassing of Jews took place. He also put forward the view that when the Nazis talked or wrote about the destruction of Jews they meant the destruction of Jewish power, not people. Finally Butz said that the Holocaust, as a concept, was created after the War by the Jews for their own advantage.

Writers such as Rassinier and Butz worked on the fringes of public life [David Irving comments: What does this dismissive sentence mean; it tells us more about you and your neutrality than about them.]. Their books can rarely be found on the shelves of "respectable" or mainstream bookshops or libraries and could only be obtained through mail order. [David Irving comments: If you later become aware of how the publishing industry works, and the ramifications of distribution control, literary reviewers, and the rest of the commercial pressures involved, not to mention the laws suppressing free speech that now exist in countries like Germany, you will understand why Real History must frequently go "off campus" to find out what actually happened.] "They seemed to belong in the world of sensationalised newspapers that you could buy in American supermarkets, recounting the experiences of people who had been abducted by aliens"⁶. [David Irving comments: Yes, that is about the schoolboy level of "Skunky" Evans' arguments. The wheels of history will drive across his few and turgid works without trace] This statement is a common reaction for the Holocaust deniers of the 1970's, as they were trivialised and generally ignored.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the Holocaust deniers tend to organise journals, conferences and institutes to exchange views and distribute publications. It is due to this that they have attracted attention from academic scholars such as Deborah Lipstadt, who wrote a book aimed at refuting Holocaust denial. [David Irving comments: Why is Lipstadt an "academic scholar" but I, who have written thirty highly praised books, "a writer": you give the game away with such gently loaded words. Lipstadt was never a victim, is not even the daughter of one; was never in the archives; speaks no languages other than English, Hebrew and perhaps Yiddish: some Holocaust scholar!] Although she was by no means the first to address this topic of Holocaust denial, her book *Denying the Holocaust: The growing assault on truth and memory* published in 1993 attracted much attention due to the lawsuit which followed.

The diversity of her historical viewpoint and the heat of debate was reflected in the fact that in July 1996 the British writer David Irving sued Deborah Lipstadt because, in

⁶ Quoted in 'Lying about Hitler' by Richard J Evans. Published 2001. Pg 108

her book she portrays Irving as a key figure in “ a movement to rehabilitate the Nazis by denying the historical reality of their crimes.”⁷ She states that Irving bends historical evidence “until it conforms with his ideological leanings and political agenda”⁸ Hence the general debate seems to have become personalised between these two individuals, each representing opposing views.

David Irving is known by many, to be a key Holocaust denier. [*David Irving comments: The familiar cowardly usage of the impersonal passive-voice. When there are no sources of repute to cite, hey, then use the passive voice, it produces the same effect among the gormless and unthinking readers!*] His many speeches for [*David Irving comments: at, not for; “Skunky” Evans got it wrong. I had spoken by the time of the Lipstadt trial just five times over twelve years to audiences of IHR members. I myself am not one. I have also spoken to US Army officers in Germany several times; I never spoke “for them” either*] the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) show his ideology. He claims that he can not be described as a Holocaust denier because “the gas chambers themselves were a hoax”⁹. [*David Irving comments: This is an invented quotation; I challenge you to provide a source*]

In effect, in order to win the lawsuit [*David Irving comments : You’d better identify which, this is the first mention. D J C Irving vs. Penguin Books Ltd and Lipstadt, Jan-April 2000, Queen’s Bench, High Court, London*], Lipstadt was forced to prove the reality of the Holocaust and therefore this case was extremely important for Lipstadt and Holocaust survivors everywhere. Lipstadt not only had to defend herself but also the integrity of all the survivors of the Holocaust and the millions who were not as fortunate to survive. The case became a focus for the issue of historiography and the different versions of history.

Professor Richard Evans was an expert witness at the trial [*David Irving comments : and as neutral an expert as is anybody who has been paid half a million dollars by one side, the defence, to state his views*] and said “Irving falsified evidence to change the meaning of the evidence, for example an order from Berlin not to annihilate the Jews was doctored as Irving removed the words ‘from Berlin’ which made the document appear to be an order that no Jews anywhere were to be annihilated”¹⁰. [*David Irving comments: This is a hugely muddled statement, if he really made it. I translated a Himmler note of Nov 30, 1941, “Judentransport aus Berlin” as “transports of Jews from Berlin.” I then learned after publication, from other documents provided by Prof Gerald Fleming, that one specific train transport of Jews from Berlin to Riga was probably referred to. I corrected it in later editions. I also printed the original document even in the first edition as a facsimile! Some falsification! On that date all the killing of German Jews transported to the east was stopped, and it did in fact halt for many months. Explain that, “Skunky”.*] This shows that Irving performed prejudicial editing on this document.

⁷ Deborah Lipstadt in ‘Denying the holocaust: The Growing assault on truth and memory’

⁸ Op. Cit.

⁹ David Irving

¹⁰ Professor Richard Evans of the University of Cambridge. Quoted in the video tape “The great debate about history”

Interestingly Irving was not always known as a Holocaust denier. In the 1970's and 1980's he wrote the book *'Hitler's War'* which was mainly established as a relatively accepted version of the history of the Holocaust, [David Irving comments: flattering, but unlikely, as the book's first edition was written from 1964 to 1974, -- yes, a ten-year project - , by which time there had still emerged no public discussion of "the" Holocaust; see above] which discussed the extermination of the Jews. However in the 1991 edition of his book it was clear that Irving had changed his views. The references made in the introduction of the edition of 1977 to "the extermination of the Jews" and "the extermination machinery"¹¹ had been deleted completely from the 1991 edition. In fact, the word "extermination" no longer appeared at all. This is just one example of the severe [David Irving comments: several?] alterations Irving made. [David Irving comments: It was not a severe alteration, merely an act of prudence: having seen the forensic tests results on Auschwitz, the "death camp" about which there had been so much noise, I decided to excise all homicidal references to it, e.g., as a "death camp," until further evidence emerged either way]. Word choice Irving uses is highly significant in presenting a certain bias in his historical writings, which could be described as a neo-fascist bias. This shows Irving's pseudo-empirical methodology, as well as the careful selectiveness of his sources. Irving's methodology affects his assessment of history as it shows a clear bias against Jewish people [David Irving comments: and they, with all the media wattage they can command, have no bias against me?!].

Irving's views changed substantially between the two editions and it seemed the turning point for his views was the 1988 trial of Ernst Zundel, [David Irving comments: Zündel, not Zundel; spot the difference] a well known Holocaust denier, anti-Semite [David Irving comments: i.e., somebody of whom the Jews disapproved] and self confessed admirer of Hitler [David Irving comments: 49 million Germans "admired" Hitler enough to vote for him in 1938; and quite a few still do feel that way – as witness the German Government's instruction two years ago that Hitler's name was to be removed from the list of candidates for "Germany's Most Important Statesman Ever" polled by German television -- after preliminary returns had strongly indicated who would otherwise be the clear winner!]. Irving appeared as an expert witness in his trial and admitted under oath that he had changed his mind since 1977 on the issues of, [David Irving comments: lose that comma] the number of Jews killed and also the use of gas chambers. Irving said, "My mind has now changed because I understand that the whole of the Holocaust mythology is, after all, open to doubt".¹²

Irving's motivation changed after the Zundel trial, which seems due to the influence of Ernst Zundel himself. [David Irving comments: No. It was due entirely to having read, the night before giving evidence in April 1988, the actual tables of laboratory tests on the residues for the Auschwitz "gas chamber" fabric brought back by Mr Leuchter to New England for forensic tests. They were shattering proof that there had been some hard lying ever since WW2] Irving realised that history can not be accepted unconsciously and that even a widely believed event can be open to doubt. This motivation seems reasonable but

¹¹ Hitler's War by David Irving

¹² Quoted in 'Lying about Hitler' by Richard J Evans. Published 2001. Pg 114

it should not lead to the ideology that there is “no such thing as the truth”¹³ as professor Richard Evans asserted during a debate.

Evans is credited as being an empirical, academic and credible historian [*David Irving comments: Once again the cowardly use of the passive-voice, “is credited”. By whom, pray? For some scathing actual views of fellow-historians on Evans, see <http://www.fpp.co.uk/Legal/Penguin/experts/Evans>] who holds a conflicting historical view to Irving [*David Irving comments: I was not paid half a million dollars to express a different view*]. It seems that Evan’s motivation is to be an academic historian who attempts to understand history as best as he can, which is also conflicting with Irving’s motivation.*

In more recent years Irving has increasingly expressed his opinions in a less historically evidenced way and has become offensive and ill-mannered and hence a great deal of his writings seemed to be linked to racial hatred and anti-Semitic animosity. "When I get to Australia They are going to wheel out all the so-called eyewitnesses. One in particular, Mrs. Altman, I've clashed with once or twice. She is very convincing. They can be very convincing. Because they have to do it so often over the years. They've had a free run. We're going to meet because she has that tattoo. I am going to say, 'you have that tattoo, we all have the utmost sympathy for you. But how much money have you made on it! In the last 45 years! Can I estimate! Quarter of a million! Half million! Certainly no less. That's how much you've made from the German taxpayers and the American taxpayers.' Ladies and gentlemen, you're paying \$3 billion a year to the State of Israel. Compensation to people like Mrs. Altman. She'll say, 'Why not, I suffered.' I'll say you didn't. You survived... You're the one making the money."¹⁴ [*David Irving comments: Now, can you even guess what passage was cut out of this last sentence (...)? I do not have the transcript here, it was seized with all my other possessions in May 2002; but as it made the whole point I know it by heart: “You survived, but tens of thousands of ordinary Australians who were interned by the Japanese in the war, and put to hard labour building the Burma Road and the railways or in other Japanese slave labour camps, did not; the Australians who suffered have never received a bent nickel for the suffering they endured – you are the ones making the money.” And I asked why. Now, isn’t that a fair point to make, when talking to a professional Jewish-Holocaust survivor on Australian television? And what does it tell us about the English professor, “Skunky” Evans, who decided to cut those last sentences out!*]

Irving regularly alienates the Jews through his use of vocabulary such as “they” through out this speech which singles out the surviving Jews to show that “they” are different to the general public. It seems that his true ideological beliefs are coming through in his speech.

¹³ Professor Richard Evans of the University of Cambridge. Quoted in the video tape “The great debate about history”

¹⁴ Speech in Portland, OR. September 18, 1996. (Posted on internet) [*David Irving comments: give the full source URL, and state whether the text posted is edited or complete; it is not on my website*]

Occasionally, Irving even went as far as to say that all the Jews who died in Auschwitz had died from disease. “Probably 100 000 Jews died in Auschwitz, but not from gas chambers, they died from epidemics”¹⁵ [*David Irving comments: needs a fullstop*]

It is hard to believe that, after having made such statements as the above, Irving can claim that he is not a Holocaust denier. After all, one of the main elements of Holocaust denial [*David Irving comments: Who says so, apart from “Skunky” Evans?*] is denying the existence of gas chambers and the minimization of the number of Jews killed, which is what he has done on many occasions.

Another attempt by Irving to minimise the number of Jews deliberately murdered by the Nazis was his claim that, “The Yad Vashem Museum, Jerusalem, has compiled a list of no more than three million names....The same names appear in this list many times over”¹⁶. This does not mean that the same names are necessarily the same people, as many people share similar names [*David Irving comments: ... and the same dates of birth? That is a bit far fetched*] The fact that the list of names on accounts for three million people does not mean that six million Jews were not murdered, it just shows that some were not documented as being there. However, Irving did not take this into account. Irving’s methodology is to be selective with his evidence, in order to give an ideologically driven account of history, which fits his ideology. Irving did not research his source extensively or try to understand other possible reasons for the differing figures. Irving is therefore not empirical but is more philosophy driven. [*David Irving comments: not so; but “Skunky” Evans and his fellow experts in the Lipstadt trial, most of whom were well known Marxists, are not?*]

When Irving is asked where the six million Jews that were in the population figure of 1939 but were missing in the 1946 figure were, he claimed that the Jews did not die but were secretly transported to Palestine by the Haganah¹⁷, and given new identities. If this statement were true, it would seem that after the Second World War was over they would have made contact with their loved ones but once again Irving did not take this into account. [*David Irving comments: If you read the media, you will find repeated instances, even now, of long-lost siblings finding each other having believed the other dead in Auschwitz; it is a perennial silly-season story*] There seems to be no empirical evidence for his hypothesis. Irving seems to be generalising and speculating.

Irving claimed “I am not a Holocaust denier, and that word really offends me, but I am a Holocaust analyst”. It appears that he is using the term analyst as a euphemism for the term denier, again Irving is manipulating language. Irving’s claim of being a Holocaust analyst would lead one to believe that he was a pseudo-empirical analyst who does not shift his ideological belief system for no amount of evidence.

Holocaust deniers, when faced with evidence which does not agree with their belief structure, attempt to discredit the facts and personal accounts of others. [*David Irving comments: And “they” don’t do precisely the same with “us”? Have a look at this URL, and see how the Canadian Jewish Congress, having found that my world-wide reputation as an historian was founded on detailed archival research for my books, decided that the*

¹⁵ David Irving in 1993. Quoted in ‘Lying about Hitler’ by Richard J Evans. Published in 2001. Pg 116

¹⁶ Quoted in ‘Lying about Hitler’ by Richard J Evans. Published in 2001. Pg 117

¹⁷ Zionist underground

only thing to be done was to start a secret campaign to vilify me and ensure that “his alleged legitimacy be eradicated” as an historian. I would like to add that I am not accusing them of having done so, but I can't: http://www.fpp.co.uk/Legal/Discovery/DL/0500_Littmann.html] For instance, in response to the confessions of the SS guards that they had seen Jews being gassed, the deniers explained that the guards' confessions were forced out of the Nazis by the allies. [*David Irving comments: That reminds me of the New Jersey senator who wailed, when his state was obliged to introduce mandatory Holocaust teaching in schools three years ago, “The trouble is those revisionists [i.e. “deniers”]. They keep coming with their facts and figures.” Um, yes.*] Deniers would also claim that surviving witness accounts were exaggerated and their memory was unsound. The evidence that the camp commandant [*David Irving comments: add name, Rudolf Höss, of Auschwitz,]* who confessed that he not only, [*David Irving comments: lose that comma*] heard, saw and participated in the process of gassing the Jews but helped orchestrate it, is countered by the deniers claiming that he was tortured into saying that. But his autobiography was written after his trial, conviction and sentencing to death, when he had nothing to gain by lying. Deniers argue that they can not explain why people confess to ridiculous crimes.

Similarly, when shown architectural blueprints of gas chambers [*David Irving comments: These don't exist. You should write, using your favourite cowardly passive-voice, “... shown what are claimed to be architectural drawings of gas chambers”*] and crematoria, Holocaust deniers will say these buildings were used strictly for delousing as disease and lice were rampant. Also the huge orders of Zyklon B gas were justified as strictly for delousing all those diseased inmates. The fact that speeches were given by Hitler, Himmler, Frank and Goebbels talking about the “extermination” [*David Irving comments: You should in fairness use or add the German word used, Ausrottung; in the 1930 is did not have the connotation of killing, as I showed from 1930s dictionaries produced in the Lipstadt trial*] of the Jews, deniers explain that they really meant “rooting out of the Jews” as in deporting them out of the Reich.

The deniers believe that the German Government confessed that the Nazis attempted to exterminate the Jews, so they could rejoin the family of nations. The deniers state, in order to regain credibility and post war acceptance, that the numerous photos and newsreels of the liberation of the camps with the starving, dying inmates and the masses of dead bodies, was misinterpreted. They claimed that the Jews were taken care of until the allies bombed the supply lines and the Nazis even tried to save their prisoners but they were not as strong as the allies. They also argue that the accounts by prisoners of the brutality of the Nazis was just the nature of war. Holocaust deniers will not step outside their belief paradigm and therefore adapt evidence to fit it.

The deniers are persistently determined not to give up their belief system [*David Irving comments: Untrue, while revisionists are constantly prepared to adapt and amend their beliefs on the basis of new evidence, the conformist historians are not and do not, because they are scared to*]. In fact they rely on “after the fact” reasoning to justify contradictory evidence [*David Irving comments: as you do in your very first paragraph: a priori*]. They continually choose to distort the evidence that does not prove their theories and constantly give evidence which suits them and ignores all others. [*David Irving*

comments: To take one example; after WW2 the courts heard survivors from the Dachau camp give eye-witness evidence of the Nazi gas chambers there used to kill victims. Not even the bravest conformist would *now* claim that there was ever a homicidal gas chamber in Dachau. Thus the “witnesses” from there lied. And those from Auschwitz too perhaps? Who knows.]

One example of Holocaust Deniers approach is when Irving questions, that six million Jews had been gassed with hydrogen cyanide and not leave the slightest significant trace of chemical residue in the walls of the gas chambers. This claim is based on the Leuchter report. [*David Irving comments: See my earlier remarks about the forensic tests, which were appended to the Leuchter Report. The report was flawed in minor ways, the forensic tests, by a qualified laboratory, were not*]. In this report French Holocaust denier Robert Faurisson [*David Irving comments: Interesting that you do not give Faurisson his professorial rank; oh yes, he was brutally stripped of this, as a punishment for taking the revisionist line. The same punishment was meted out to other academics. Others have been jailed and deported. Toe the official line, or else! So much for the consensus of opinion among historians about which you write.*] commissioned Fred Leuchter¹⁸ to analyse the gas chambers after which he declared that his examination of the cyanide residues in the inner walls of the gas chambers in Auschwitz proved that they had not been used for gassing at all.

The Leuchter report has long since been exposed [*David Irving comments : There’s that cowardly passive-voice again. We need to know: Who exposed it? Why? What was their position? How much were they paid?*] as an incompetent and thoroughly unscientific document compiled by an unqualified person. It was completely discredited along with its author at the second Zundel trial in 1988. [*David Irving comments: This is not true in this form. The Court refused to allow its introduction as evidence, on the ground (if I remember correctly) that Leuchter was not a toxicologist. If he himself had made the forensic tests, he would have been allowed to testify. This did not prevent Mr Justice Gray from allowing the highly-paid expert witness Prof Robert Jan Van Pelt to testify in the Lipstadt Trial on her behalf as an architect, toxicologist, and expert on aerial photography, although he admitted under my initial cross examination that he had never even studied architecture, was not an architect, and was not qualified to lecture on architecture, let alone on the other areas on which he pontificated.*] Yet again Irving completely ignored the significant objections to the reports [*David Irving comments: needs apostrophe*] credibility. [*David Irving comments: In my Introduction, which is on the Internet at [http://www.fpp.co.uk/ Auschwitz/Leuchter/ReportIntro.html](http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Leuchter/ReportIntro.html), you will find that I did highlight its flaws. But my opinion was based solely on the tables of forensic tests appended to it, which Mr Leuchter himself had commissioned from a qualified laboratory, but not written.*] This shows that Irving is conforming to the Holocaust deniers’ belief system as he is denying that the estimated six million were killed. The issue is the credibility and methodology of the scientist in this case. Irving failed to check his source of evidence and the credibility of the scientist who was conducting the report.

¹⁸ Designer of gas chambers and lethal injection devices.

In an interview with a survivor of the Holocaust, _____, *[David Irving comments: another living testimony to the absence of any ruthless Nazi extermination plan, but this inconvenient factor is overlooked?]* when asked he said to the people who deny the Holocaust he replied “ I can only tell you what I have seen with my own eyes and that there are many others like me that have also survived the Holocaust that are still alive or have died but have kept a record of their account of what happened”¹⁹.

When asked specifically about David Irving, he said “ The man is making money from his books and speeches *[David Irving comments: in fact because of my non-conformist position on “the” Holocaust, I have lost millions of dollars in royalties since 1988]* and chooses to ignore the evidence, which does not support his beliefs”²⁰. _____ also believes that there is enough evidence to support the Holocaust. He choose *[David Irving comments: spelling?]* to tell his story of what happened to him and his family, at the Sydney Jewish Museum, to those who want to hear about his experiences with an open mind.

Another element in Holocaust denial is the refusal to accept that the extermination of the Jews was a systematic, organised or centrally directed. *[David Irving comments: We are joined in this belief by such experts as Professor Christopher Browning. See his latest books]* Irving continually denied that the extermination of the Jews had been ordered by Hitler. Irving fits another Holocaust denier profile perfectly. *[David Irving comments: Browning agrees there is no evidence of Hitler’s involvement. Another “denier”?]*.

It is clear through reading work from Holocaust deniers like Arthur Butz, that Holocaust deniers wanted their readers to believe that the evidence for the Holocaust was fabricated. Likewise Irving has claimed that the ‘Holocaust legend’ was invented by political warfare executives of the British Government. He said that “British intelligence deliberately masterminded the gas chamber lie” ²¹.

Once again Irving claims to be a Holocaust analyst but with such statements as “ I’m forming an association especially dedicated to all these liars, the ones who try to kid people that they were in these concentration camps. It’s called ‘The Auschwitz Survivors, Survivors of the Holocaust, and Other Liars’ - A.S.S.H.O.L.E.S” (laughter in the audience).²². This shows that he is utterly disrespectful to the Jewish survivors *[David Irving comments: If you read the speech you will see that membership is reserved for the Jewish liars and other pathological story-tellers, e.g. those who wrongly pretend to have been at Auschwitz in order to reap rewards, like Benjamin Wilkomirski. For such people we should have no respect. Or?]* and their families and also has an underlining anti-Semitic ideology. Also the fact that his audience laughed showed clearly the sort of audience Irving’s writings and speeches are directed at. *[David Irving comments: I had no idea that the Australians were such a sensitive bunch. Any audience would have laughed at that line, whether anti-Semites or not.]* As with much of his writings Irving uses

¹⁹ Interviewed at the ‘Sydney Jewish museum’ in November 2004 *[David Irving comments: why anonymous? “Deniers” are never afraid to be known by name.]*

²⁰ Op. Sit.

²¹ Speech in Toronto on 13th August 1988

²² Speech he told a Canadian audience in 1990. Quoted in ‘Lying about Hitler’ by Richard J Evans. Published in 2001. Pg 133

extensive emotive language through out his speech which shows that historical approach is an emotional approach rather than an academic one.

Irving also believes that, against all the evidence of the massive amount of scholarly research carried out by non-Jewish historians in many countries, that the history of the extermination of the Jews had been written by Jewish historians. So why did Jewish historians write the history in the way they did? According to Irving that was because

“Israel is drawing millions of dollars each year from the German taxpayer, provided by the German government as reparation for the gas chambers.”²³

Other historians [*David Irving comments: name them, because it is rubbish; the German word is Wiedergutmachung*] point out that the money was paid to Israel for resettlement of survivors, not as compensation for the dead. If the state of Israel had wanted to maximise the amount of reparations, as Deborah Lipstadt pointed out, they would have argued that, millions of Jews fled to Israel and were not killed by the Nazis.

Irving claims once again that he is not an anti-Semite but in a speech he told his audience (referring to Jews)“ You are disliked, you people. You people have been disliked for three thousand years.....That’s the difference between you and me. It never occurs to you to look into the mirror and say, why am I disliked?”²⁴. [*David Irving comments: As with the earlier excerpt from Portland, Oregon, this is a disgraceful example of taking sentences out of context and quoting them: it is typical of how the Lipstadt defence team and “Skunky” Evans worked. My speech made plain that if I were a Jew, I would begin to ask what is it we are doing if as a people we can not remain in any country very long before we have become so unpopular that we are obliged to move on. None of Hitler’s neighbours hesitated when invited to hand over their Jews to the Nazis; none of the other countries invited by Hitler before the war to accept the Jews, like Sweden, Britain, and even the USA, was willing or eager to do so. Why? It is a fair question, and has nothing to do with attitudes*] He is saying openly that whatever atrocities occurred to the Jews it was their own fault because they should have acted differently, this seems to be an anti-Semitic statement.

David Irving has been proven to be a typical Holocaust denier and has been a key figure in the study of Holocaust denial and also assists others to understand why Holocaust deniers chose to deny history, although much evidence is given. Also the elements of Holocaust denial are useful in understanding how previously credible historians or socially accepted intellectuals chose to become Holocaust deniers.

The historiography of the Holocaust has been an interesting journey that has changed over time. The holocaust was misbelieved [*David Irving comments: word?*] at first but as evidence was uncovered [*David Irving comments: or manufactured; remember that the “gas chamber” at Auschwitz shown to the public is now admitted by the Poles to have been built in 1948, three years after the war ended.*] it became widely accepted. By the 1970’s the holocaust denial attitude began to form and the revisionist view of history was developed. In the present time the general public believe the accept [*David Irving comments: accepted*] history of the holocaust, which is that approximately six million

²³ Interview printed in ‘The Guardian’ on 7th of July 1992

²⁴ Speech in Tampa Florida on 6th October 1995

Jewish people were murdered in gas chambers due to racial hatred. Although [*David Irving comments: hatred, although*] there are still revisionist and post-modern historians that [*David Irving comments: who*] assess the history of the Holocaust as Holocaust deniers. However they are not widely accepted by the public as being credible historians. [*David Irving comments: the cowardly passive-voice again. How do you know what “the public” accepts? What public opinion polls have been conducted in this vein?*]

The Irving vs. Lipstadt trial showed that “attempts to discredit the Holocaust rested on demonstrable forgery and falsification of the evidence”²⁵. The trial seemed to crystallise the divergent approaches to history.

It would be unjust to claim that all Holocaust deniers are anti-Semitic but it is clear from my study and understanding of some of the key Holocaust deniers in history, the elements of Holocaust denial and the historiography of the Holocaust, that key deniers, like Irving, have been proven to have some anti-Semitic views and choose to rationalize the evidence which does not support their arguments, and their methodology is selective with their sources as they use evidence which supports their ideology and ignore all others. Therefore Holocaust deniers tend to write an ideologically driven history.

The pursuit of history, as Thomas Haskell [*David Irving comments: who’s he?*] has argued, ‘requires of its practitioners that vital minimum of ascetic self-discipline that enables a person to do such things as abandon wishful thinking, assimilate bad news, (and) discard pleasing interpretations that cannot pass elementary tests of evidence and logic.’²⁶ Holocaust deniers do not do this and therefore in my opinion they do not deserve the title of ‘credible Historian’.

²⁵ Professor Richard Evans of the University of Cambridge. Quoted in the tape “The great debate about history” [*David Irving comments: I note that you persistently quote only him; at very least, for balance you should quote or read my closing speech at <http://www.fpp.co.uk/trial/judgment> and use the menu.*]

²⁶ . Quoted in the tape “The great debate about history”