

THE TAMING OF HOLOCAUST REVISIONISM 2002

by Guillermo Coletti

"The first and foremost goal of this discussion is the joint and sincere search for truth, in order to contribute to a reconciliation between Jews and Germans which may perhaps result in a realization of my dream of a revival of the German-Jewish symbiosis."

Germar Rudolf The Controversy about the Extermination of the Jews.

In late 1998 one of my most controversial articles, The Taming of Holocaust Revisionism, acquired worldwide distribution. "The Taming" was well received by some of the most brilliant historians subscribed to the revisionist viewpoint. Among these eminences was Prof. Robert Faurisson, who indexed my short essay in his "Ecrits Revisionnistes."

Holocaust Revisionism is not in the kind of shape a friend of the cause would wish it to be in. Actually, it can be said that things which were going in the wrong direction, back when I wrote "The Taming," have indeed become aggravated. It seems, notwithstanding exceptions, that Revisionism has lost its sense of direction. In the July 2002 issue of his "Smith's Report," editor Bradley Smith sees it rather negatively: "American revisionism is in a period of turmoil, uncertainty, and has fallen at the center."

Bradley is not alone. Former Journal of Historical Review editor, Theodore O'Keefe is critical of the revisionist status quo. The crisis is now personalized; O'Keefe has written quite unfavorably about Greg Raven, and Mark Weber, his former bosses at the Institute for Historical Review. The introduction to O'Keefe's very personal "Exit the Whistleblower: My Fall from Grace at IHR" reveals that, for Ted, his "experience with the IHR has been both humbling and disappointing."

Germar Rudolf also seems displeased with the state of Revisionism and has manifested his disenchantments. Rudolf, a neo-revisionist, has displayed ambitious behavior, perhaps even aspiration of leadership. For further comment of this particular matter I direct the reader to my annex, "Rudolf vs. Weber."

IDENTITY CRISIS

Revisionism suffers a crisis that is much more profound than the

simple "people not getting along" type of human failure. This is simply a highly inadequate and insufficient attempt at an explanation. There have been throughout history many important movements that have endured internal malcontent quite successfully. Communism comes to mind as a good example; it can hardly be said that the reds were, or are, a happy family where disagreement goes smoothly yet, their fall from power is attributed to other circumstances. Jews are frequently at each other's throat, but their sense of group identity plays a definitive role at solving all temporary internal crises. In other words, among Jews the tribal instinct prevails over individualism. Capitalists and globalists also face internal obstacles, with little or no evidence of determent arising from it.

Another common explanation is that the difficulties faced by revisionists are too great to overcome. Although revisionism faces great difficulties, for the most part created by Jewish power pressuring dishonest governments to persecute and prosecute Holocaust dissent, it has yet to match suffering and penury endured by other men engaging in resistance to Zionism. I venture to say that the most persecuted revisionist has it easier than the average Palestinian teenager. Revisionists have not had personal properties bulldozed by any army and have not been massacred in the thousands as Palestinians had, at least not yet. And we can not say that the Palestinian cause "has fallen at the center." Harshness usually strengthens the resolve of those suffering it, but not the revisionist crowd.

The greatest crisis facing Revisionism is metaphysical, and ethical. Whatever identity weakness might have existed within revisionism since its insertion, it was definitely magnified by the advancement within the revisionist ranks of newcomers bringing with them an agenda of social conformity. Those people are commonly referred to as neo-revisionists. The neo-revisionists, who to their credit it must be said they are the most active campaigners against the gas chambers extermination fraud, lack a sense of final purpose, as well as a clear understanding of the larger political and social implications that accompany such sort of disclosures. By promoting the principle of a bi-ethnic (Jewish-Gentile, in that order) alliance, they have weakened the human quality of revisionism, at least to the extent of their own sphere of influence. Again, using Rudolf as my example, here's a young man who has been converted into an asylum seeker, a refugee. He can't even visit his native Germany because there he would face a politically tainted criminal persecution, a direct result of his publicized dissenting forensic research. His offense is one of speech! Obviously, his personal predicament must be credited to Jewish pressure, carefully disguised as proper legal enforcement by the German government. Yet, he makes apologies for the Jews by promoting reconciliation and offering his own nation as sacrificial

lamb for the purpose of Judeo-Germanic "symbiosis." It's unbelievable! I think this type of personal behavior weakens the character and the dynamics of Revisionism. It is my personal belief that anyone who makes a career out of pleasing Jews and Jewish demands is in for a thankless job. I have yet to see a single occasion where Jews have told an individual, or a country, "thank you, you have done enough for us, let us now help you." Jews will always look at anyone of us, Gentiles, merely as Goyim, a lesser kind of people, good only to be exploited and never trusted.

WHEN BRADLEY MET DAVID

When Bradley Smith, neo-revisionist patriarch, met David Cole it was as if the neos had found gold. The excitement and spirit of celebration were in the air. So happy were the neos; every day was Christmas and every night Rosh Hashanah. Now they had, they thought, something material they could build their so much preached reconciliation upon. They felt confident on their multi-cultural objectives; a Jew was on their side. What a fiasco it turned out to be! David Cole denounced his own neo-revisionist way and disclosed publicly his much suspected membership in a radical organization of his peers, his real peers. The significance of this sad episode lies in what it tells us about the neos. The neos want to remove the burden of the ugly findings of revisionism away from revisionism itself. They don't want us to deal with unkind political, social, and ethnic implications; they just want us to join in counting holes at Krema II or scrutinizing another new set of forensic examinations of concentration camps. Maybe neos don't know that the extermination lies have already been defeated with material evidence, and logic. What makes neos think any new report a la "Leuchter" will accomplish that which has not yet been accomplished? The fact that they devote resources and enthusiasm to more forensic examinations clearly insinuates that neo-revisionists do not understand that the Holocaust was never about the Allies having irrefutable evidence about the extermination of six million Jews.

Neo-revisionists are the most public of all those involved in the re-examination of the Hoax of the six million, and that is what makes the way they conduct themselves particularly dangerous. In more ways than one they have become representatives of the revisionist perspective. But, how do they represent it? They usually do it with humanistic and submissive attitudes of the lowest kind. About four years ago I attended an IHR conference in which David Irving, Mark Weber, and Bradley Smith were featured speakers. What Smith reported was just another display of what I have been saying about the neos. Bradley lamented how he had been treated unfairly during one of his numerous radio appearances by AM talk radio show host, Michael Jackson. (Not to be confused with the "King of Pop.") Bradley lamented how he was addressed as "Mr. Swine" throughout the whole show. Bradley meekly

accepted his treatment and pretended it wasn't happening. The symbolism behind this episode is fascinating. I understand that media people are modern-day rabbis and newsrooms modern-day synagogues. Yes, I know, there still are certified rabbis, but the real promoters and intellectual advocates of Judaism in America are media personalities, the other rabbis are just traditionalists playing biblical games of inferior relevance. And there are no greater temples to Judaism in America than the mass media conglomerates. So Bradley went to the temple, to explain himself to a rabbi that he was not culpable of the greatest modern-day: anti-Semitism. Bradley, by pronouncing himself as skeptical of the extermination, was non-Kosher persona non grata. And being that, he tolerated continuous derogatory verbal abuse, inflicted by a Jew, in front of a national audience as a representative of revisionism!

When I used the words "fraud and deception" in relation to the Holocaust lies, about four years ago, the neos attacked me. As if revisionist findings indicate anything other than fraud and deception was at work! Neos not only reject that the propaganda of Holocaust faulty information was intentional, they go as far as stating that the purpose of Revisionism is to embrace us all, Jew and Gentile, in peaceful coexistence, symbiosis, and racial fusion. The irrationality of neo-revisionists centers partly on the fact that they intend to prove to us that the extermination story (Shoah) is incorrect, but that there was never an intention to deceive. As an example of this I cite the 1999 "Response to Guillermo Coletti" by Richard Widmann, who wrote:

"It is the issue of premeditation about which we disagree. The key to the definition of fraud is that the deception is intentional. It is incorrect and self-defeating to think that on a widespread basis that Jews are intentionally attempting to deceive in order to receive additional reparations."

Organized Jewry has not only lied consistently about the Holocaust to obtain reparations, they lied in order to dehumanize and vilify any possible opposition to the attainment of their ever expanding goals. The Holocaust was a necessary step— as a state of mind— to justify the creation of Israel, their Judeo-supremacist state. They also lied about the Holocaust in order to justify the brutality they have subjected the Palestinians to. But neo-revisionists have approached Holocaust studies waving white flags, not only incapable of facing the realities of Judeo-Gentile relations, but even promoting the insertion of further Jewishness in Gentile societies. As an example, in the words of Gernar Rudolf:

"I believe a co-existent German-Jewish vision of the future is indeed possible. Well-being and peace are in the best interest of the Germans and Jews alike. To think otherwise is to go against

the very principles on which Revisionism was founded and has existed since its inception."

Now, this is neo-revisionism. To state that Revisionism was founded as a means to promote the best interest of Germans and Jews may sound touching to the bleeding heart, but it is a new view on Revisionism, it is neo-Revisionism.

The ethical crisis of Holocaust Revisionism is coming of age. What once was a promising intellectual endeavor has been diluted to irrelevancy by watered-down concepts that aim at obtaining a place in the mainstream. They create the same lies they originally set out to combat. Neo-revisionists must know by now that the Holocaust is not simply a historical issue. The Holocaust is a Jewish issue, and any avoidance of that truth is either fetishism or a pusillanimous, empty pseudo-intellectual adventure. It is no longer important to continue forensic examinations of Auschwitz, or to discuss the volatility of Zyklon-B. The Jewish nature of the Holocaust issue overwhelms us in many ways; only hobbyists persist advocating more chemical examinations of residue material, etc.

THE SURVIVAL OF REVISIONISM

Revisionism, and its influence, can still be saved as the intellectual force it once was, and perhaps even developed into a larger phenomenon. This much needed revitalization will have to occur in spite of actions taken by the neos. These last few paragraphs summarize some of what I recommend to re-energize whatever is left of Revisionism, and to expand it.

- 1) Revisionist issues must be approached with the understanding that they are part of a greater matter: the Jewish question. The Holocaust story is promoted by Jewish pressure groups operating as one voice that transcends language, citizenship, even economic status or political affiliation. Revisionist articles should address the kosherness of the Holocaust story.**
- 2) The way Holocaust lies have served Jewish interest must also be explained. There is a lot to be taught on this matter, whether political, religious, racial, social, and/or economical. Also, the Jewish character must be explained to every available audience in full detail.**
- 3) Revisionists must attempt to bring their message to younger generations.**
- 4) True revisionists must think of, and develop activities at grass roots level. There are many people willing to contribute their efforts, people who until now have not been guided in any direction at all.**

5) Revisionism must develop its own identity, one that contradicts the aims of multiculturalists.

The worst fate revisionism can encounter is the establishment of the neo-revisionists as leading force of the movement, for reasons cited above. GC