



Valérie Devon

Presents

# Vincent Reynouard editorials

In front of historians,  
a few revisionists could be right

Sans Concession tv  
Editorials tv

An argument often comes up in the mouth of those who refuse to consider the revisionist thesis: *"You can't be right in the face of the entire world !"* They tell us.

Below my last video, an anti-revisionist answer me: *"Let's summarize: The set of all historians experts and academics worldwide lie since 60 years and a handful of "researchers (not one single historian among them + curiously almost all extreme right) are right."*

First of all, I would emphasize that the verb used is misleading. You did not sum up my argumentation, dear opponent. No, you have made a reasoning, hiding the major part. So let me explain this reasoning, in order to better analyze it and thus to show its total ineptitude.

Your reasoning is as follows: If the revisionists are right, then it means that the set of all historians experts and academics worldwide lie since 60 years and that a handful of "researchers" (not one single historian among them + curiously almost all extreme right) are right. Thus, a handful can't be right against the set of all experts. Therefore, this handful is necessarily wrong.

Exposed clearly, we see that your reasoning is entirely based on an assertion. "A handful can't be right against a set of all specialists." And why? I could oppose many historical counter-examples. But, I know you will answer: *"It's not the same."* So, I will not waste my time and I would ask you this question: Why a handful of revisionists could not be right against a set of all historians and academics? Because, you would say, the specialists, they, are studying the problem objectively. And, indeed, you are opposing the objectivity of the experts to the fact that we are almost all extreme right. Being a National Socialist, I will not seek a quarrel with you on this statement.

Ultimately, your reasoning is as follows: Knowing that this handful of revisionists is not politically neutral, then it can not be objective in this issue which has political implications. You oppose to them the objectivity of the specialists.

But, you are suggesting, since the specialists are objective, then it is that they are politically neutral. And yes, it's the logic of the contrapositive principle. If not being neutral implies not being objective, so being objective implies being neutral. For you, therefore, the experts are politically neutral.

Really? Do you frankly believe that the accredited historians, those who can speak and publish freely are politically neutral when it comes to National Socialism? Do you really believe, that in our modern societies one can say: *"Uh, regarding National Socialism, no, I don't have any judgment."* Your naivety touches me, unless it is bad faith.

So let me explain to you the problem: The Second World War was an ideological extermination war. From June 11, 1940, Winston Churchill disclosed it. In June 1943, the collaborator Martin Debr e described the conflict as one of a totalitarian world revolution which opposes fundamental ideologies and conceptions of collective life, between which

there is no possible compromise. He was undoubtedly right. That is why this war was fought furiously on both sides. It was a religious war finally.

But, let's move on. From 1942, Germans began large deportation of Jews.



While rumors sprang in the ghettos (**Wladyslaw Szpilman, *Le Pianiste*,p.96**), which spoke of massacres, some, (**Pelagia Lewinska, *Vinght mois à Auschwitz*,p.24**) spoke more specifically of "gas chambers". Why those rumors? Because, as the author, who studied the question (**Véronique Campion-Vincent and Jean-Bruno Renard, *De source sure*,p20**), explains: "*an urban myth symbolically express the fears and aspirations of a population segment.*" Thus, from 1942, facing large deportations for uncertain destinations, many Jews were scared. The ghettos were thus fertile ground for the birth and dissemination of rumors.

During the war, however, Allied leaders refused to believe it. This is why, they never bombed Auschwitz-Birkenau, whereas they repeatedly attacked a nearby camp: Monowitz, where many industries were.

However, the end of the war comes, at least in Europe. The victors have then two objectives: Divert attention from their own war crimes and especially eradicate Nazism spirits after defeating it militarily. For this, the victors are going to use what they have discovered in the camps and they are going to use the rumors born in the ghettos.

To the West, the Anglo-American will give us the blow of the Dachau "*Gas Chambers*", to the East, the Polish-Soviet will give us the blow of the Auschwitz "*Gas Chambers*". The

victims will therefore be the carriers of the rumor born around 1942 in the Jewish circles. But why is this rumor will take in?

For one reason: The author, which studied the rumors and that I have already mentioned, explains: (p,333) "People do not believe in rumors because they seem true, but they seem true because there is a prior belief." Thus, after the painful events that occurred during the occupation, these pictures published, in 1945, will make believe that the Nazis are absolute monsters. It is the prior belief.



Consequently, the "Gas Chambers" rumor will be accepted, not because it seems true, but because people say: "The Nazis being absolute monsters" - prior belief - "then, they were able to do this" - acceptance of the rumor.


This is how the rumor will swell and spread, not only in space but, also in time. And this is where another mechanism comes in, stressed by another specialist of rumors (Jean-Noël Kapferer, *Rumeurs, le plus vieux media du monde*, p.123). "Longer a rumor circulates, the more easily it persuades. Because, not everyone can't be wrong: If the rumor was false, it would not have exceeded the countless persons, who, like us, but prior to us, experienced it." This is why, longer the rumor will spread, the more it will gain authority.

Your argument, dear opponent, comes directly from this second mechanism. When you say that a handful of revisionists can not be right against all historians, you are implying that if the "Gas Chambers" did not exist, historians would have discovered it long ago. But, it's false ! Because, you forget a reality: On July 26, 1946, the one who led the prosecution at Nuremberg trials, prosecutor Robert Jackson, said: (TMI,XIX,p.415) "The Allied are still technically at war against Germany." But, on that date, the weapons were silent since more than a year. So why this statement?

Because, the Second World War was an ideological war of eradication of National Socialism then it would continue as long as this ideological would remain. And knowing that for this war on the mind, the victors had chosen, since the beginning, the "Gas Chamber", as a weapon, then, it is normal that they had to continue with the same weapon.

In this case, what are the historians and academics trained in the Republic institutions? Nothing else than little disciplined soldiers enlisted under the Democratic banner. "Discipline" means they believe, without verifying, the rumors of war that the State spreads. Am I wrong? Then listen.

The Soviets claimed that 4 millions perished in Auschwitz, in which a large majority in the "Gas Chambers", Over the years, Auschwitz became the center of extermination of the Jews.



Then, historians should have, in priority, shown interest in these "Gas Chambers". But, it is a revisionist, Professor Faurisson, who, in 1979, was the first to publish the Auschwitz crematorium designs. Before him, no historians were interested in it. All had believed the rumor.

Do you realize? From 1946 to 1979, those who should have seriously studied the file, to enlightened humanity objectively had not even begun by the beginning: The study of the murder weapon.

Moreover, when the professor caused a scandal by talking about the Auschwitz "rumor", what did the historians answer? (**Le monde, february 21, 1979 ,p.23**)

***"Do not ask how technically such a mass murder was possible,  
it was technically possible because it took place."***

Historians, therefore, did not do their job, and claimed it!

35 years later, things have changed? In essence, no. Read Tal Bruttman's book about Auschwitz, published this year, you will not find a study of the murder weapon, not even a picture of it. And in 2005, in his book about Auschwitz, the historian Annette Wieviorka, had the aplomb to write: **(p.113)** *"The idea that there has to prove anything, remains to me a strange idea. Until 1970, the materiality of the gassing and cremation could not be doubt, even if it was methodical."* So this historian claims the position that the historians had prior to 1979. No study of the murder weapon.

Therefore, you will understand, dear opponent, the people who review history are not historians from universities and are for the most of the extreme right. This is not surprising, since we are at war. On one side the anti-Nazis, on the other the new-Nazis. Does this mean that those are necessarily wrong because they are a minority in front of the accredited historians? Given that these historians are only small disciplined soldiers of an ideological question, the answer is: No.

I add, that in a war, the least powerful army is not necessarily the one who defends the wrong cause.

Good evening.