Various investigators have studied the Diary. The following very brief comments are based on work by Dr Robert Faurisson of France and by Ditlieb Felderer (of Jewish-Swedish parentage), who both visited the Anne Frank museum in Amsterdam and went to considerable lengths to study the problem.

Dr Faurisson spent nine hours interviewing Anne Frank's father in Switzerland in an effort to clear up the matter, concluding that Mr Frank and others had very substantially adapted and enlarged an original manuscript for financial gain, creating in the process a fraudulent document used in thousands of schools across the western world which helps promote sympathy for Zionism.

1. Life Magazine, 15 September 1958, has a photo of Anne Frank on the cover against the background of what is clearly and unquestionably the 'childish', non-cursive handwriting of a very young girl, say 12 years old or younger. Compare this with the handwriting reproduced in a popular softcover edition of the diary, that of Pan Books. In numerous reprintings over decades Pan has included a sample of 'her' writing (cursive) and even a signature attributed to her, both unquestionably and undeniably produced by a very mature adult, say fifty years or older. (Anne Frank's father was born in 1889). This publisher clearly has contempt for the intelligence of their readers. Other editions of the Diary often have either one or the other handwriting style attributed to Anne Frank. The 'childish' handwriting is also reproduced in a French Livre de Poche edition with a date four months later than the date included in the sample in the Pan edition. Find a copy of the Life edition in a library and check for yourself.

2. A report in the New York Post (dated October 9 1980, early editions only) called Anne Frank may not have inked that famous diary says that the German Federal Criminal Investigation Bureau (BKA) examined the diary and concluded that portions of the work were written with a ball pen, only
available from 1951.

3. Anne Frank's father Otto Frank refused to allow any interested party to inspect the diary in spite of 'growing charges of fraud'.

4. Dr Faurisson compares different editions of the diary in different languages and notes strange changes, insertions and omissions, often substantial, showing a continuing creativity at work long after Anne's death.

5. Both Felderer and Dr Faurisson analyze the diary and note many kinds of contradictions and improbabilities.

6. Professor Arthur Butz of Northwestern University says 'I have looked over the diary and don't believe (its authenticity). For example, already on page 2 one is reading an essay on why a 13 year old girl would start a diary, and then page 3 gives a short history of the Frank family and then quickly reviews the specific anti-Jewish measures that followed the German occupation in 1940. The rest of the book is in the same historical spirit.' (Butz, Hoax of the Twentieth Century (1977) p37).

7. Dr Alfred Lilienthal, the courageous anti-Zionist Jewish author of The Zionist Connection, notes 'Any informed literary inspection of this book would have shown it could not possibly have been the work of a teenager. Writer Meyer Levin won a suit in the New York Supreme Court against Otto Frank, Anne's father, for 50 000 dollars as an "honorarium for his work" on the diary' (The Zionist Connection p819).

8. All of this evidence from more than 20 years ago has in no wise stopped the continuing re-printing and publication of the diary, and the major US media have kept quiet about the issue. (Shhht! Zionism must be propped up, no matter what the cost to historical truth!)

9. Anne Frank died of typhus, not in the 'gas chamber'. Typhus caused the adoption of measures including the shaving of heads, showering and the fumigation of clothing using Zyklon B insecticide, all (ironically enough) to SAVE lives rather than the opposite. These well-intended efforts have been turned around into the most transparent lies by the Holocaust industry - why would the Nazis shave heads, if not to control typhus-spreading lice? To fill pillows with lice-infested human hair? Come on! Why did 'gassing apparatus' have to be 'disguised' as showers?According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica Micropaedia (1975), Otto Frank was hospitalized (!!!) at Auschwitz (!!!) and survived the war (!!!).

The vast hordes of 'survivors' in the 1980's and 1990's across the western world have been a wonderful confirmation of the Holocaust deniers' standpoint. (Last night I watched one of those Jewish-produced lawyer-
police TV dramas, in this case with a storyline based on an insurance company enriched through sales of policies to Holocaust victims. The action takes place today, 21st century, but the program still has a Holocaust survivor as a witness! People have been so successfully conditioned to always be conscious of the sacred Holocaust that the extraordinary phenomenon of ever-present Holocaust survivors does not pose a problem.)

10. Anne Frank's Diary was instrumental in turning Dr Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyons II into a confirmed, committed holocaust revisionist. He has virtually sacrificed his life (he has received tremendous vilification and was seriously injured in an attack by Jewish thugs) for the pursuit of the truth surrounding the subject, in spite of being not of German but of French-Scottish ancestry, with a socialist, not national-socialist political alignment. A lecturer in literature where he specialized in close textual analysis, receiving acclaim for his studies of poems by Rimbaud and Lautrèamont, he had set his students the task of analyzing the Diary, and came to the conclusion that it was a fraud. The opposition he received to his announcements of this convinced him that there was a powerful political element who were highly intolerant of historical truth where the Holocaust was concerned.

This led him to investigate other aspects of the subject, and his eventual discovery that the 'gas chambers' as popularly described even by "respectable" Holocaust academics, were scientifically impossible. Numerous other investigators, including various university academics, have confirmed this viewpoint. His first conclusions concerning the 'gas chambers' were published in 1978 and 1979 in the French daily Le Monde.

His overall conclusion: the entire saga is a politically inspired concoction to support Zionism, with financial and other political benefits as well. As Norman Finkelstein of the City University of New York writes in his book The Holocaust Industry, "The Holocaust has proven to be an indispensable ideological weapon. Through its deployment, one of the world's most formidable military powers, with a horrendous human rights record, has cast itself as a 'victim, state' and the most successful ethnic group in the United States has likewise acquired victim status.

Considerable benefits accrue to this specious victimhood in particular, immunity to criticism, however justified " (p3). Every single aspect of the Holocaust is open to fundamental question, from the Nuremberg Trials where the victors were the judges and tortured Germans to obtain confessions, to the capacity of the incinerators of the crematoria. Finkelstein notes "The Israeli Prime Minister's office recently (1999) put the number of "living Holocaust survivors" at nearly a million, (page 83). On page 127 he further notes "If 135,000 former Jewish slave laborers are still alive today, some 600,000 must have survived the war. That's at least a half-million
more than standard estimates.

If Jews only constituted 20% of the surviving camp population and, as the Holocaust industry implies, 600,000 Jewish inmates survived the war, then fully 3 million inmates in total must have survived. By the Holocaust industry's reckoning, concentration camp conditions couldn't have been that harsh at all; in fact, one must suppose a remarkably high fertility and remarkably low mortality rate. If, as the Holocaust industry suggests, many hundreds of thousands of Jews survived, the Final Solution couldn't have been so efficient after all - exactly what Holocaust deniers argue' (pp127-8).

Faurisson in a letter to the editor of the New Statesman dated 30 November 1979 (carefully unpublished) says the following: 'Regarding the tortures systematically inflicted on the German soldiers and officers by the Allies, one should read Sir Reginald Paget's book Manstein: His Campaign and His Trial (Collins, 1951). On page 109 one finds that the (US) Simpson Inquiry Commission "reported among other things that of the 139 cases they had investigated, 137 had had their testicles permanently destroyed by kicks received from the American War Crimes Investigating Team." [It is worth tracking down a copy of Paget's book just to check this quote if you are of the doubting kind.] This gives some idea of how the Holocaust 'truth' was imposed retroactively on the desperate and utterly demoralised German people in the post-war period.
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