A Prominent False Witness: Elie Wiesel

By Robert Faurisson

ELIE WIESEL won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986. He is generally accepted as a witness to the Jewish "Holocaust," and, more specifically, as a witness to the legendary Nazi extermination gas chambers. The Paris daily Le Monde emphasized at the time that Wiesel was awarded the Nobel Prize because: (note 1)

These last years have seen, in the name of so-called "historical revisionism," the elaboration of theses, especially in France, questioning the existence of the Nazi gas chambers and, perhaps beyond that, of the genocide of the Jews itself.

But in what respect is Elie Wiesel a witness to the alleged gas chambers? By what right does he ask us to believe in that means of extermination? In an autobiographical book that supposedly describes his experiences at Auschwitz and Buchenwald, he nowhere mentions the gas chambers. (note 2) He does indeed say that the Germans executed Jews, but ... by fire; by throwing them alive into flaming ditches, before the very eyes of the deportees! No less than that!

Here Wiesel the false witness had some bad luck. Forced to choose from among several Allied war propaganda lies, he chose to defend the fire lie instead of the boiling water, gassing, or electrocution lies. In 1956, when he published his testimony in Yiddish, the fire lie was still alive in certain circles. This lie is the origin of the term Holocaust. Today there is no longer a single historian who believes that Jews were burned alive. The myths of the boiling water and of electrocution have also disappeared. Only the gas remains.

The gassing lie was spread by the Americans. (note 3) The lie that Jews were killed by boiling water or steam (specifically at Treblinka) was spread by the Poles. (note 4) The electrocution lie was spread by the Soviets. (note 5)

The fire lie is of undetermined origin. It is in a sense as old as war propaganda or hate propaganda. In his memoir, Night, which is a version of his earlier Yiddish testimony, Wiesel reports that at Auschwitz there was one flaming ditch for the adults and another one for babies. He writes: (note 6)

Not far from us, flames were leaping from a ditch, gigantic flames. They were burning something. A lorry drew up at the pit and delivered its load -- little children. Babies! Yes, I saw it -- saw it with my own eyes ... Those children in the flames. (Is it surprising that I could not sleep after that? Sleep has fled from my eyes.)
A little farther on there was another ditch with gigantic flames where the victims suffered "slow agony in the flames." Wiesel's column was led by the Germans to within "three steps" of the ditch, then to "two steps." "Two steps from the pit we were ordered to turn to the left and made to go into a barracks."

An exceptional witness himself, Wiesel assures us of his having met other exceptional witnesses. Regarding Babi Yar, a place in Ukraine where the Germans executed Soviet citizens, among them Jews, Wiesel wrote: (note 7)

Later, I learn from a witness that, for month after month, the ground never stopped trembling; and that, from time to time, geysers of blood spurted from it.

These words did not slip from their author in a moment of frenzy: first, he wrote them, then some unspecified number of times (but at least once) he had to reread them in the proofs; finally, his words were translated into various languages, as is everything this author writes.

That Wiesel personally survived, was, of course, the result of a miracle. He says that: (note 8)

In Buchenwald they sent 10,000 persons to their deaths each day. I was always in the last hundred near the gate. They stopped. Why?

In 1954 French scholar Germaine Tillion analyzed the "gratuitous lie" with regard to the German concentration camps. She wrote: (note 9)

Those persons [who gratuitously lie] are, to tell the truth, much more numerous than people generally suppose, and a subject like that of the concentration camp world -- well designed, alas, to stimulate sado-masochistic imaginings -- offered them an exceptional field of action. We have known numerous mentally damaged persons, half swindlers and half fools, who exploited an imaginary deportation; we have known others of them -- authentic deportees -- whose sick minds strove to go even beyond the monstrosities that they had seen or that people said had happened to them. There have been publishers to print some of their imaginings, and more or less official compilations to use them, but publishers and compilers are absolutely inexcusable, since the most elementary inquiry would have been enough to reveal the imposture.

Tillion lacked the courage to give examples and names. But that is usually the case. People agree that there are false gas chambers that tourists and pilgrims are encouraged to visit, but they do not tell us where. They agree that there are false "eyewitnesses," but in general they name only Martin Gray, the well-known swindler, at whose request Max Gallo, with full knowledge of what he was doing, fabricated the bestseller For Those I Loved.

Jean-François Steiner is sometimes named as well. His bestselling novel Treblinka (1966) was presented as a work of which the accuracy of every detail was guaranteed by oral or written testimony. In reality it was a fabrication attributable, at least in part, to the novelist Gilles Perrault. (note 10) Marek Halter, for his part, published his La Mémoire d'Abraham in 1983; as he often does on radio, he talked there about his experiences in the Warsaw ghetto. However, if we are to believe an article by Nicolas Beau that is quite favorable to Halter, (note 11) little Marek, about three years old, and his mother left Warsaw not in 1941
but in October of 1939, before the establishment of the ghetto there by the Germans. Halter's book is supposed to have been actually written by a ghost writer, Jean-Noël Gurgan.

Filip Müller is the author of *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, (note 12) which won the 1980 prize of the International League against Racism and Anti-Semitism (LICRA). This nauseous best-seller is actually the work of a German ghost writer, Helmut Freitag, who did not hesitate to engage in plagiarism. (note 13) The source of the plagiarism is *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, another best-seller made up out of whole cloth and attributed to Miklos Nyiszli. (note 14)

Thus a whole series of works presented as authentic documents turns out to be merely compilations attributable to various ghost writers: Max Gallo, Gilles Perrault, Jean-Noël Gurgan (?), and Helmut Freitag, among others.

We would like to know what Germaine Tillion thinks about Elie Wiesel today. With him the lie is certainly not gratuitous. Wiesel claims to be full of love for humanity. However, he does not refrain from an appeal to hatred. In his opinion: (note 15)

> Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate -- healthy, virile hate -- for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of the dead.

At the beginning of 1986, 83 deputies of the German Bundestag took the initiative of proposing Wiesel for the Nobel Peace Prize. This would be, they said, "a great encouragement to all who are active in the process of reconciliation." (note 16) That is what might be called "going from National Socialism to national masochism."

Jimmy Carter needed a historian to preside over the President's Commission on the Holocaust. As Dr. Arthur Butz said so well, he chose not a historian but a "histrion": Elie Wiesel. Even the newspaper Le Monde, in the article mentioned above, was obliged to refer to the histrionic trait that certain persons deplore in Wiesel:

> Naturally, even among those who approve of the struggle of this American Jewish writer, who was discovered by the Catholic François Mauriac, some reproach him for having too much of a tendency to change the Jewish sadness into "morbidity" or to become the high priest of a "planned management of the Holocaust."

As Jewish writer Leon A. Jick has written: "The devastating barb, 'There is no business like SHOAH-business' is, sad to say, a recognizable truth." (note 17)

Elie Wiesel issues alarmed and inflammatory appeals against Revisionist authors. He senses that things are getting out of hand. It is going to become more and more difficult for him to maintain the mad belief that the Jews were exterminated or were subjected to a policy of extermination, especially in so-called gas chambers. Serge Klarsfeld has admitted that real proofs of the existence of the gas chambers have still not yet been published. He promises proofs. (note 18)

On the scholarly plane, the gas chamber myth is finished. To tell the truth, that myth breathed its last
breath several years ago at the Sorbonne colloquium in Paris (June 29-July 2, 1982), at which Raymond Aron and François Furet presided. What remains is to make this news known to the general public. However, for Elie Wiesel it is of the highest importance to conceal that news. Thus all the fuss in the media, which is going to increase: the more the journalists talk, the more the historians keep quiet.

But there are historians who dare to raise their voices against the lies and the hatred. That is the case with Michel de Boüard, wartime member of the Resistance, deportee to Mauthausen, member of the Committee for the History of the Second World War from 1945 to 1981, and a member of the Institut de France. In a poignant interview in 1986, he courageously acknowledged that in 1954 he had vouched for the existence of a gas chamber at Mauthausen where, it finally turns out, there never was one. (note 19)

The respect owed to the sufferings of all the victims of the Second World War, and, in particular, to the sufferings of the deportees, demands on the part of historians a return to the proven and time-honored methods of historical criticism.

Notes

2. There is one single allusion, extremely vague and fleeting, on pages 78-79: Wiesel, who very much likes to have conversations with God, says to Him: "But these men here, whom You have betrayed, whom You have allowed to be tortured, butchered, gassed, burned, what do they do? They pray before you!" (Night, New York, Discus/Avon Books, 1969, p. 79). In his preface to that same book, François Mauriac mentioned "the gas chamber and the crematory" (p. 8). The four crucial pages of "testimony" by Elie Wiesel are reproduced in facsimile in: Pierre Guillaumé, Droit et Histoire (La Vieille Taupe, 1986), pp. 147-150. In the German-language edition of Night (Die Nacht zu begraben, Elischa [Ullstein, 1962]), on 14 occasions the word "crematory" or "crematories" has been falsely given as "Gaskammer" ("gas chamber[s]"). In January of 1945, in anticipation of a Russian takeover, the Germans were evacuating Auschwitz. Elie Wiesel, a young teenager at the time, was hospitalized in Birkenau (the "extermination camp") after surgery on an infected foot. His doctor had recommended two weeks of rest and good food but, before his foot healed, the Russian takeover became imminent. Hospital patients were considered unfit for the long trip to the camps in Germany and Elie thus could have remained at Birkenau to await the Russians. Although his father had permission to stay with him as a hospital patient or orderly, father and son talked it over and decided to move out with the Germans. (See Night, p. 93. See also D. Calder, The Sunday Sun [Toronto, Canada], May 31, 1987, p. C4.)
3. See the US War Refugee Board Report, German Extermination Camps: Auschwitz and Birkenau (Washington, DC), November 1944.

Summary

Elie Wiesel passes for one of the most celebrated eyewitnesses to the alleged Holocaust. Yet in his supposedly autobiographical book Night, he makes no mention of gas chambers. He claims instead to have witnessed Jews being burned alive, a story now dismissed by all historians. Wiesel gives credence to the most absurd stories of other "eyewitnesses." He spreads fantastic tales of 10,000 persons sent to their deaths each day in Buchenwald.

When Elie Wiesel and his father, as Auschwitz prisoners, had the choice of either leaving with their retreating German "executioners," or remaining behind in the camp to await the Soviet "liberators," the two decided to leave with their German captors.

It is time, in the name of truth and out of respect for the genuine sufferings of the victims of the Second World War, that historians return to the proven methods of historical criticism, and that the testimony of the Holocaust "eyewitnesses" be subjected to rigorous scrutiny rather than unquestioning acceptance.
Elie Wiesel: One More Lie

by Robert Faurisson

On February 7, 1996, Elie Wiesel, Nobel Peace Prize laureate and professor at Boston University, was awarded an honorary doctorate by Jules Verne University at Picardy, France. Reporting on the speech delivered by Wiesel on that occasion, the local newspaper (Le Courrier Picard, Feb. 9, 1996) informed readers:

One question the public was anxious be answered: "And what do you make of the emergence of revisionist and Holocaust denying tendencies?" Wiesel responded: "Those are [the work of] virulent and vicious anti-Semites, organized and well-financed. On the day I received the Nobel Prize there were hundreds in the street demonstrating against me. Never will I afford them the dignity of a debate. These are morally sick individuals. While I am able to fight against injustice, I have no idea how to go about fighting against ugliness."

Here one can see Elie Wiesel's typical phraseology, but his statement that "on the day I received the Nobel Prize there were hundreds in the street demonstrating against me" is something new, and constitutes yet one more lie by this "prominent false witness," as I have called him, or "Shoah merchant" as Pierre Vidal-Naquet (in an interview with M. Folco, in Zéro, April 1987, p. 57) has called him.

As someone who was present in Oslo at the site of the award ceremony in December 1986, I am able to report that the number of protesters there was precisely zero. Three persons did show up to distribute a leaflet, printed in both Swedish and English, entitled "Elie Wiesel: A Prominent False Witness" [also available as an IHR leaflet]. All three of these persons were Frenchmen: Pierre Guillaume, Serge Thion and myself.

About the author:

Robert Faurisson is Europe's foremost Holocaust revisionist scholar. Born in 1929, he was educated at the Paris Sorbonne, and served as a professor at the University of Lyon in France from 1974 until 1990. He was a specialist of text and document analysis. His writings on the Holocaust issue have appeared in several books and numerous scholarly articles, many of which have been published in this Journal. A four-volume collection of many of his revisionist writings, Écrits Révisionnistes (1974-1998), was published in 1999.

The Elie Wiesel item is a translation and adaptation of a piece originally written in February 1996, and
published in Rivarol, March 15, 1996, p. 2. The item about Rossel and Lanzmann is adapted from a text originally written on June 25, 1999.
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Elie Wiesel: Messenger To All Humanity


Reviewed by L.A. Rollins

Pushkin claims a beautiful lie is superior to a debasing truth. I don't agree: Truth alone elevates man, even when it hurts. The task of the writer is, after all, not to appease, or flatter, but to disturb, to warn, to question by questioning oneself. -- Elie Wiesel, A Jew Today, translated by Marion Wiesel (New York: Vintage, 1979), p. 130.

Robert McAfee Brown is a professor of theology and ethics at the Pacific School of Religion. In relation to "Holocaust survivor" Elie Wiesel, however, Brown regards himself as "the pupil," and refers to Wiesel as his "rebbe," or teacher. (pxii)

But although his teacher has written that the task of a writer is not to appease, or flatter, Brown flatters his teacher outrageously in Elie Wiesel: Messenger to All Humanity, his study of Wiesel's writings. Indeed, this literary lickspittle tells his readers right away, "This is not a 'critical' appraisal of Wiesel, and I make no apologies for the fact ..." (Ibid.)

Rather than criticize Wiesel, Brown has devoted himself to brown-nosing his teacher. Thus, for example, he tells us that Wiesel "does not evade ghastly revelations of human depravity, nor will he let us do so." (p. 2) But this is hogwash, if only because of the fact that Wiesel routinely evades ghastly revelations of Jewish "depravity. "

In an open letter entitled, "To a Young Palestinian Arab," Wiesel pretends to denounce "the injustice endured by Arab refugees in 1948." (A Jew Today, p. 122.) But, like any other Zionist propaganda hack, Wiesel puts the entire blame on Arab leaders, who supposedly "incited the Arab population to mass flight in order to return 'forthwith' as victors." (Ibid.) Wiesel makes not the slightest mention of the massacre of about 250 women, children and old men in the Arab village of Deir Yassin by Irgun and Stern Gang terrorists, commanded by those incipient statesmen, Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, on April 9, 1948, shortly before the Israeli "declaration of independence." Anti-Zionist author Alfred Lilienthal cites various sources regarding the impact of this massacre:

Jon Kimche, the Zionist writer, calling the incident "the darkest stain on the Jewish record throughout the fighting," stated, "The terrorist justified the massacre of Deir Yassin because it led to the panic flight of the remaining Arabs in the Jewish state areas. Jewish writer Don Peretz described the result of Deir Yassin as a mass fear psychosis which grasped the whole Arab community. Arthur Koestler wrote, this
"bloodbath ... was the psychologically decisive factor in the spectacular exodus of the Arab refugees."
(The Zionist Connection, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1978, p. 156.)

According to Brown, "Wiesel seeks to enlist us in the ongoing struggle of light against darkness, of memory against indifference." (p. 192) Here he parrots Wiesel's phony rationale for habitually harping on "the Holocaust"-the importance of "memory." But the Deir Yassin massacre is just one of many episodes of Jewish history which Wiesel finds eminently forgettable.

Thus, Wiesel has written, "There were never any religious persecutions instigated, organized or implemented by Jews." (A Jew Today, p. 210.) Down the Orwellian "memory hole" goes the forcible conversion to Judaism of the Idumeans by John Hyrcanus. Also consigned to oblivion is the participation of Jews in instigating persecutions of Christians during the rule of pagan Rome. According to Bernard Lazare, the French-Jewish anarchist who later became a Zionist:

The Church, in those evil days, could not count on its rival, the Synagogue, for assistance; in some places where the struggle between the Jews and Christians had reached an acute stage the Jews, recognized by Roman legislation and possessed of vested rights, would join the citizens of the towns in dragging the Christians before the court. In Antioch, for example, where the enmity between the two sects was most bitter, in all probability, the Jews, like the pagans, demanded the trial and execution of Polycarp. They are said to have fed with great eagerness the stake upon which the bishop was burned. (Antisemitism, London: Britons, 1967, p. 37.) Book Reviews 375

Mister Memory has also forgotten the Jewish persecution of Jewish heretics. According to Lazare:

In 1232, Rabbi Solomon of Montpellier issued an anathema against all those who would read the Moreh Nebukhim [Guide of the Perplexed by Maimonides] or would take up scientific and philosophic studies.... The fanatical rabbis appealed to the fanaticism of the Dominicans, they denounced the Guide of the Perplexed and had it burned by the inquisition. At the instigation of a German doctor, Asher ben Yechiel, a synod of thirty rabbis met at Barcelona, with ben Adret in the chair, and excommunicated all those who read books other than the Bible and the Talmud, when under twenty-five years. A counter-excommunication was proclaimed by Jacob Tibbon, who, at the head of the Provencal rabbis, boldly defended condemned science. All was in vain: those wretched Jews, whom everybody tormented for their faith, persecuted their coreligionists more cruelly and severely than they had ever been persecuted. Those whom they accused of indifference had to undergo the worst punishments; the blasphemers had their tongues cut; Jewish women who had any relations with Christians were condemned to disfigurement: their noses were subjected to ablation. (Op. cit., p. 64.)

(The dictionary definition of "ablation" is: the surgical removal of a growth, organ or part of the body. Therefore, Lazare presumably meant that their noses were cut off.)

Despite these and similar facts, including some about the present-day State of Israel, Wiesel denies that Jews have ever perpetrated any religious persecutions. Indeed, he also denies that Jews have ever hated their enemies, or become executioners when they have had power and their enemies none. And he denies that any of the "notorious" killers in history were Jews. (A Jew Today, p. 210.)
Robert McAfee Brown, wretched creature that he is, studiously ignores Wiesel's brazen whitewashing of Jews. Meanwhile, he obsequiously echoes Wiesel's accusations against Gentiles, as well as Wiesel's hypocritical denunciations of those who deny his accusations.

To deny the truth of the "Holocaust" story is an "ugly way" to avoid involvement," says Brown. (p. 8) "There is no greater indignity," he tells us, "than to say to a suffering person, 'Your suffering is a fake.... You invented it to gain sympathy.... You are an impostor.' " (p. 10) Furthermore, "... attempts to deny a past Holocaust almost ensure that there will be a future one." (p. 11) Brown even approvingly quotes Wiesel's characterization of revisionist writings as "the recent attempts to kill the victims again." (Ibid.) (I sometimes wonder if Wiesel isn't a resurrected victim of the homocidal "steam chambers" of Treblinka, he's so full of hot air.)

"In the face of those who 'speak obscenely' by attempting to deny the story, we too must register disgust. And having done so, turn our backs on those who disgust us and listen no longer, listening instead to Elie Wiesel telling the story once more, a story that supplies its own credentials." (pp. 11-12) Is this Brown's euphemistic way of telling us that Wiesel's tall tales about "the Holocaust" are self-evidently true? Apparently so. Wiesel, it should be noted, does not claim to have been an eyewitness to any of the alleged mass gassings of Jews by the Nazis. Indeed, he only claims to have seen one event relevant to the allegations about mass extermination-the burning alive of a truck-load of babies in a flaming pit on the night that he arrived at Birkenau. Obviously it's a hell of a story. But is it true?

Consider what Wiesel himself has said in an anti-revisionist lecture given at Northwestern University:

The boy that began to talk to you tonight, where is he? Did he dream or live his dreams of fear and fire? Did he really witness the agony of mankind, through the death of his community? Did he really see the triumph of brutality, did he hear or imagine the laughter of the executioner? Did he really see killers throwing children, Jewish children, into the flames alive? I rarely speak about this, but in this place we must. For a very long while I resisted accepting this story as mine. For years and years I clung to the belief that it was all a dream, a nightmare. No, I did not see the children. I did not see the flames. It was no dream. It was real. Jewish children, living Jewish children were thrown into the flames in order to save money because the gas was costly. (Dimensions of the Holocaust, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1977, pp. 17-18.)

Wiesel does not tell us when, or how, or why he decided that the incident was real, and not a dream. He simply expects us to accept without question his present assertions about the matter. That may be good enough for Robert McAfee Brown, who revels in grovelling before the Shrine of the Sacred Weasel. But, for those of us who are not oblivious to Wiesel's obvious hypocrisy and dishonesty, his unsupported assertions are not conclusive evidence of anything. And, as a matter of fact, there are some positive reasons for doubt about Wiesel's story of children being burned in pits at Birkenau, though, for the time being, I'm going to keep those reasons for doubt up my sleeve.

As for Robert McAfee Brown, like the whale that swallowed Jonah, he swallows Wiesel's "Holocaust" stories whole. From that starting point, he devotes the bulk of his book to Wieselian weaseling about the moral, religious and theological "implications" of "The Event." He faithfully follows all the twistings and turnings of Wiesel's non-Aristotelian "Auschwitz logic." Paradoxes parade past the reader. "The Event" is
relentlessly made mysterious.

And yet ... through the mist of mystification some conclusions shine through quite clearly: the incomparable importance of "The Event"; the necessity of giving special attention to Jews as victims of "The Event"; and the guilt of Christians for complicity in "The Event." All the fundamental dogmas of Wiesel's brand of "Holocaust" Fundamentalism.

Brown, a member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, of which Wiesel is the chairman, was not content to compose this book-length hymn of praise to Elie Wiesel. He had to dedicate it to him as well. In his dedication, he tells Wiesel, "At every stage" of the writing "it seemed a tampering with things I had no right-to touch." For this reason, "I tried very hard, my friend, not to write this book." He should have tried harder—much, much harder.

About the author
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