



Login

user:

pass:

Remember me

[register](#)

[RU](#)

[EN](#)

[ES](#)


User Menu

- Home Page
 - [«Mirror of the World»](#)
 - [Support the Site](#)
 - [Contacts](#)
 - [Iraq-War board rules](#)



- Articles
 - [Iraq News](#)
 - [Around the World](#)
 - [Historical analysis & facts](#)
 - [Current analysis](#)
 - [Economics](#)
 - [Hot News](#)
 - [Rankings](#)

- Forums

RSS feeds

 RSS feed for articles and news

Weather

Baghdad	
	WE, 23/04 +38..+40 °C N, 6 m/s
Basrah	
	WE, 23/04 +37..+39 °C W, 5 m/s

Calendar-Filter

< Apr > < 2008 >

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			
Today						

French Radio pulls plug on Faurisson interview

By: atheo on: 20.04.2008 [00:47] (1443 reads)

A great "thank you" goes to Fred Scrooby who undertook the translation of this interview.
April 18, 2008

(24711 bytes) [c]

Self-censorship at Radio Courtoisie (Paris) "[Radio Courtesy](#)"

1) Statement by "Bocage" (April 11, 2008)

It was in greatest secrecy that Martin Peltier had invited Professor Faurisson to be on his monthly radio show's April 9 broadcast on Radio Courtoisie. Both men had agreed to avoid any violation of the Fabius-Gayssot Law, not just to keep from being prosecuted themselves, but to keep from jeopardizing the radio station which, they knew, was under surveillance by the CSA (Conseil supérieur de l'audiovisuel) [Superior Audiovisual Council](#).

The program began at 7:30 PM. The two participants, extremely careful not to violate the Gayssot Law, told of the persecutions which revisionists the world over have been subjected to. (Any interested readers can request a transcript of the broadcast.) But at about 27 minutes into the interview the broadcast was silenced ... The immediate reason given was, "It is being terminated at the CSA's request."

Now, here's what appeared at the website of the daily newspaper Le Parisien at 10:30 that evening:

STRANGE SILENCE AT RADIO COURTOISIE

Brutal interruption of Wednesday evening's programming at Radio Courtoisie

As the station, which bills itself as "the all-conservative radio station," was broadcasting a program on revisionism, transmission suddenly went dead. Without warning, the "Free Journal Show," hosted by Martin Peltier, was suddenly replaced by classical music. The show never resumed.

As for the program by Paul-Marie Coûteaux, MEP, which was to have started at 9:30 PM, it was rescheduled to a later date.

We contacted Henry de Lesquen, station manager, who explained the broadcast had been interrupted "by the government's Delegate for Editorial Matters, who considered some comments expressed by one of the participants unacceptable." However, he didn't say which comments, or why the programming never resumed.

It seems not only was there censorship of the broadcast itself, there was censorship of the above article announcing the censorship, since Prof. Faurisson's name isn't even mentioned!

2) Here is the transcript (thanks to "Bocage") of Martin Peltier's broadcast on Radio Courtoisie of Wednesday, April 9 at 7:30 PM:

Guest: Professor Robert Faurisson. The program had been scheduled to run an hour-and-a-half but was abruptly silenced after 27 minutes.

Martin Peltier: Good evening, Professor. I have to explain to the listeners why I decided to invite into the studio someone who's been prosecuted for law-breaking. We're different in every way: you're a university professor, I was never a good student; you're half-British, and Great Britain is my pet political villain; you're an atheist, I'm Catholic. Why, then? Well, there are reasons, some perhaps not so valid – for example, stirring things up is always fun, and there are also frivolous

motives: you like Nerval and you feel Isidore Ducasse cannot be taken seriously, and that's very good.

And then there are two valid reasons: To begin with, I think of the Gospel where Jesus says: Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Matthew 25:40 Now, in today's society "the least" isn't the unemployed, or the illegal immigrant who benefits from the good will and support of all sorts of well-meaning organizations. "The least" is the revisionist, the naked mangy wretch who spreads the worst of plagues: that which affects the memory.

And there's a second reason for this invitation: today we won't be speaking about your ideas or your work, Professor Faurisson, because to speak of those has been forbidden to us by law. But the manner in which you have been treated by the media and government agencies is disgusting and shocking. One can very well understand that thoughts and their expression must be limited, must be guided — maybe it's even desirable; does one ever know? But that a society which has made blasphemy a virtue and loudly proclaims its desire for unrestricted liberty represses "incorrect thought" with extreme ferocity is intolerable from the points of view of reason and morality, both. It is therefore necessary to denounce this situation specifically and vigorously: we cannot remain our whole lives prostrate before the diktat handed down by the powerful and the inaudible they impose. For the honor of the press and of the French people we must from time to time attempt to lift ourselves off the ground even if all we can manage is the tip of an ear.

So today we're going to do history, a little history of revisionism. There will be absolutely no justifying of any claims whatsoever, only telling what has happened.

With that said, let's be clear that we are not going to talk about the gas chambers! The 1990 Gayssot Law forbids debate on the subject of "crime against humanity" as defined by the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1946. And unless I'm mistaken, it even forbids the semblance of debate.

What is the law's text exactly? Can you quote it from memory?

Robert Faurisson: That's right, this law, passed July 13, 1990, which we've come to call the Fabius-Gayssot or Gayssot Law, forbids debate on crimes against humanity as defined, judged, and punished in particular by the international military court in Nuremberg in 1945-46. But this law of July 13, 1990 has come to be interpreted in such a way that there exists today a body of legal precedent saying you have neither the right to debate nor, to put it simply, the right to merely seem to debate. As a result, anything, or nearly anything, can be interpreted as debate.

MP: Of course. And it's there that — if I may — it's no secret, Professor, that you have raised questions about the existence of execution gas chambers in occupied Europe under Hitler and you revise considerably downward the generally accepted 6 million figure of Jews who died during the Second World War. Therefore I won't ask you to comment on this subject and if you happen to stray onto it I'll cut you off without hesitating or showing you the least courtesy, I warn you. You are here under surveillance, in a sense — it was the best I could offer, and we will limit ourselves to three subjects that were strictly defined prior to the broadcast. Furthermore, to be honest with you, even without the Gayssot Law I wouldn't let you expand on your revisionist ideas: apart from legal penalties enacted by lawmakers and decided by judges there are others, spontaneously applied, no matter whether applied quietly or demanded loudly: these are the pressures on families, the negative comments in the workplace, the assaults against those who think wrong thoughts and those who make their expression possible. There are extra-legal forces in our country functioning with complete freedom; there are militias above the law and I admit I'm afraid of them; I'm scared of the more or less hidden power one sees busy at work around the memory of the years called the darkest of our history.

And the first thing I'd like you to talk about is precisely the persecution of revisionists in France and the rest of the world. You yourself were beaten up and left for dead by a bunch of thugs whom the police finally preferred to let go. You've lost your employment. Several legal proceedings have ruined you financially. But still, you consider yourself fortunate, because when all is said and done you've never gone to jail for revisionism. What is ... how do you view yourself where this whole business is concerned?

RF: To reply to your question: "to judge is to compare"; I compare my situation with that of many other revisionists, especially Germans and Austrians. I judge the legal system that has condemned me but I also compare it to the German, Austrian, Swiss, and British legal systems, the English-speaking Canadian legal system, the

American legal system, and others — the Australian legal system, for example. And I feel I'm fortunate to live in the bountiful country called France. I'll add that for me, the French government is fine when it's not in a war or a civil war, overt or insidious. And finally, I must confess, I'm lucky.

MP: You've given a little summary of the situation. I'd like to return, point by point, to ... Is ... Exactly, one must teach. Already, the story of the various persecutions. Can you tell us the true situation in the different countries? Can you say, for example, what the situation is in Switzerland? What trials of revisionists have there been, and what persecutions have they been subjected to? I'm thinking perhaps of Amaudruz?

RF: Well, there's Amaudruz who at age of 82, I think, went to prison for three months I believe — and there've been others. I admit this is a subject I don't like getting into so much, because bringing up the persecutions revisionists have been subjected to is a way of complaining. The question is to learn whether, at bottom, we are right or not — but on that subject you've forbidden me to speak.

MP: Absolutely. On that I'm very clear. But by definition, one can't speak of things one can't speak of. It's a tautology. But I love tautologies: they're my favorite sport. And so I think it is nevertheless interesting — you don't wish to speak about it but I want to make you talk about it because I believe the public, even the educated public, doesn't ... you, you're immersed in it, a bit like Obélix, since you were small but the broad public, even educated, even informed, has not appreciated the extreme ... I won't say severity, but the extreme bizarreness of criminal penalties imposed on several individuals. All right, let's look at Austria. I have two cases I'd like you to talk about: the case of Mr. Honsik and that of Mr. Frölich. I don't ask you to talk about them for hours, but in two minutes you can do it justice — go ahead.

RF: Gerd Honsik is indeed a revisionist, who lives in Vienna; he was convicted of revisionism; he fled to Spain and, not long ago, Spain extradited him to Austria and so Honsik is in jail.

MP: They extradite people charged with that?

RF: They do!

MP: It's a misdemeanor or a felony? It's got to be a misdemeanor, no?

RF: Well, "misdemeanor" or "felony," it all depends, doesn't it; for example, in Anglo-Saxon law one speaks of "crime," which can include misdemeanors; it's a question of vocabulary — no matter. The fact, the important fact — you are right to underline it — is that they succeeded in extraditing someone. Now, in this regard, I'll continue therefore to respond, since you spoke of Honsik but also of Frölich; I'll quickly mention Frölich then I'll come back to this business of extradition because, you're right, it's important. Frölich is an expert in gas chambers that are used for disinfecting, and he said the Nazi gas chambers were, in his judgment, impossible because ...

MP: Yes but, there we're really ...

RF: Wait ... that's it. Therefore, for being a revisionist he was convicted and, I believe, has been sentenced to something like six years and five months in prison.

MP: OK.

RF: Getting back to the question of extradition. You know, they stress that France has laws against revisionism.

MP: Yes.

RF: It's also the case with Switzerland, Belgium, Spain, Germany obviously, and other countries. They stress that in the Anglo-Saxon countries there are no laws against revisionism. Pure hypocrisy! And that's what I'm getting at with the question of extradition. Take the United States. It's a country where, I must say, personally I felt free. It's about the only country in the world where I felt free. Well, that's finished. Because if we take the case of a prominent revisionist, Ernst Zündel, he lived in Tennessee and one fine day saw five burly cops arrive, put him in handcuffs, and take him to jail, whereafter he was delivered to Canada; Canada — listen to this — put him in prison for two years in the most abominable conditions ...

MP: Meaning?

RF: Meaning: in his cell, where he froze in winter, had no right to a chair, no right

to a pillow, no right to anything, was subjected continually to anal searches and intimidation with the use of dogs – they would put him down on the floor, and dogs – can you imagine? – drooling on him: that’s how he was treated for two years in Canada, then ...

MP: A technical question, while it occurs to me: he had been brought to Canada from the U.S. on an international warrant, a request for extradition?

RF: Not even. Yes, there was a request; it wasn’t international: it was Canada who requested and obtained him, it was an agreement between the U.S. and Canada. So, the United States, where they have the First Amendment, where you’re supposed to be able to express yourself freely, treats a revisionist like a gangster using gangster methods. And he was handed over. And he was tried in a special court, I repeat, special, called the Human Rights Commission. And I know from experience what that involves, and I think the listeners will be interested in this point.

MP: All right, what’s a “Human ...

RF: This: some said when, in 1992, Zündel finally won the unbelievable trials of 1985 and 1988 by a decision handed down in 1992, certain individuals — I won’t name them — said this wasn’t acceptable; something had to be done. They said we need the Human Rights Commissions. And the good people said yes. Then the legislators said yes. Then came the second stage — but wait: it would need human rights courts, not ordinary courts, and they created special courts where the judges are appointed according to how sensitive they are to a particular problem — I trust I don’t need to spell it out — and one is called before these courts — it happened to me when I came forward to defend Ernst Zündel. They have you raise your right hand, they have you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and the next minute if you make the mistake of saying, “But Ernst Zündel has done nothing wrong because what he says is true, it can be demonstrated, and I feel confident I am able to demonstrate it,” the court interrupts and tells you, “Be advised that here, truth is no defense. It doesn’t matter to us whether or not what you say is true. All that matters to us is to know the pain you are liable to inflict on a segment of Canadian society.”

MP: All right, getting back to what you were saying – so, he was tried in Canada in this fashion ...

RF: Then Germany wanted him, and he was handed over and tried under horrible conditions ...

MP: A further extradition ...

RF: A further extradition, and in Germany not only was he sentenced to five years in prison but they refused to take into account the two years he had spent in jail in Canada and, furthermore, one of his lawyers is now in jail ...

MP: What’s her name?

RF: Sylvia Stolz. “Stolz” means “proud” in German. She’s being called “the German Joan of Arc.” And another of his lawyers is due to go on trial. His name is Jürgen Rieger.

MP: Wow, these people are busy!

RF: Right. But you know, if you consider the physical suffering inflicted on revisionists, this isn’t that bad!

MP: We’ll come back to that later ...

RF: I don’t know how much good it’ll do ...

MP: But at the moment we’re dealing with a purely judicial issue. There’s that case in Australia I think, a Mr. Toben; in Belgium there’s a former Vlaams Blok senator; there’s Costas Plevris in Greece ... Apart from purely judicial questions, confining ourselves to punishments which are not brutal punishments or court-imposed punishments, there are disciplinary punishments or punishments by universities. I have in mind, in France, people such as Notin, Plantin, Bruno Gollnisch ...

RF: Of course!

MP: Could you say just a few words about that? To me that does not at all seem insignificant.

RF: Take the case of Notin. For having inserted, in a genuinely confidential scientific review, a tiny reflection expressing skepticism to do with the question you do not wish me to talk to about, for doing that, Notin was put through hell. It began with the killing of his house pets: they killed his dogs ...

MP: His cats.

RF: Yes, pardon me, his cats. Then they went after his wife, his children, himself, and then ...

MP: Insults? Threats?

RF: Everything you can think of. To keep this brief I'll tell you the outcome of his ordeal: his colleagues took it upon themselves, of course, to judge him and convict him. The unfortunate journal which had published his article got pounded: some people went around to all the libraries and confiscated every copy. Finally, he was unable to practice his profession of instructor at the University of Lyon-3; and thereupon, seeing himself condemned, and under the weight of a trial, he, well, had the misfortune of selecting a lawyer — who shall remain unnamed but who is not someone to be taken seriously — who had him sign a retraction. I should add that Notin — today he no longer hides from it, I believe — apologized to me for that retraction, saying he was advised to do it. It ended up serving no purpose: at one point, when he had hopes of obtaining a position abroad, and was under the impression he was going to get it, "they" found out and, naturally, that was no longer possible. It was to have been in Morocco. He finally wound up in Mexico and, of course, divorce: wife, four kids — finished. An example was made of him. Translation note: or, "And that's one example."

And you mentioned another case, that of Plantin. It's unbelievable. Plantin was a very serious, prudent, reasonable man. He had presented a thesis defense at university which had gotten him a grade of "Very Good" from a professor named Régis Ladous. It wouldn't be called "revisionist" but it did touch on it. Then the following year he earned another diploma. But that's not important. Ten years passed. Someone remembered this episode, at a time when it had been quite a while since Plantin had been associated with the university, and no one particularly knew his whereabouts. Here's what they had the nerve to do — get this, it's absolutely incredible; I don't think it's ever happened before in the history of the world yet it happened in Lyon, France: they concocted a fake thesis defense 10 years after the fact! What they did was oblige Ladous to come, they summoned Plantin — who, of course, didn't show — and there they proceeded to pretend to do a thesis defense! It took I think 10 minutes; Ladous retired to deliberate, and came back declaring that the thesis, which had earned a grade of "Very Good," now, ten years later, got a grade of ... I don't remember the adjective but it was something like "intolerable"!

Yes we have unbelievable examples. I'll cite more if you're interested ...

MP: Yes, this subject interests me.

RF: I'm not particularly interested but if you are I'll continue translation note: in the original there was some banter here between the two men, which I didn't translate. Well, look what happened to me last year: a well-known Italian professor invited me to come give a brief series of lectures in the original there's more light banter in here, which I've left out, and so I went to the University of Teramo. If you picture Rome, on a straight line drawn from that city to the Adriatic you'll find Teramo. I went to the University of Teramo and, as planned, I showed up in the morning early. And what did the university president do? I don't know if the like has ever happened before. Well, he closed down the university!

MP: That was very Italian. They can be very sly, because a solution had to be found.

RF: (Laughing) You seem to approve!

MP: No, but one has to have imagination.

RF: And then, what follows is interesting: well, we found ourselves a hotel where we thought we'd be able to hold our little conference, and there I encountered a group of Italian reporters. Italians, you know, can be very subtle ...

MP: I'll say!

RF: ... and it's only human. I found myself at the door of the hotel — which was

refusing me entry — right next to one of these beautiful Italian town squares. The reporters questioned me, I answered them but not the way I'm doing with you: right off, I brought out my big guns, namely, the 60-word sentence which I won't say to you ...

MP: No, don't!

RF: And at that point I said to them, "But you know, what's happening here is amazing. Because in France it would be unthinkable for me to discuss this subject, more or less right on a public street, in the company of reporters." I told them, "Or, so far! Up to this point it's gone all right." No sooner had I said that, than I heard an uproar — it was a particular group of individuals whom I won't describe further, who'd come by train from Rome, led by a very brawny butcher's assistant who threw a punch — and I mean a punch which could've been fatal — at the professor who'd invited me, and ...

here the broadcast suddenly went dead "at the request of the CSA," followed by uninterrupted music.

3) Message from Eric and Monique Delcroix to radio host Martin Peltier: translation note: Eric Delcroix, a lawyer, has defended Prof. Faurisson in court against charges of revisionism

Dear friend,

It was a bit prematurely that we rejoiced at hearing your interview with Prof. Faurisson ... Censorship of the most brutal sort, supposedly at the spoken request of the CSA, cut short one last illusion ... And you had taken every precaution so as not to be in violation of the Fabius-Gayssot Law. The predictions of the late humorist Pierre Desproges are coming true. One is reminded of his "Tribunal des flagrants délires" translation note: there's a French play on words here which would be hard to retain in translation; the French means, literally, "Court of Outright Delusions", where he has the court bailiff announce the prisoner as "Monsieur Faurisson," eliciting the judge's response, "No, not that name, it's not permitted!" Soon we won't even have names; we won't exist. "Blow up"! Orwell warned us.

Best wishes,

Eric and Monique Delcroix

4) Heard on the news (Radio France, evening of April 12)

Martin Peltier has just received a letter from Henry de Lesquen informing him of the permanent termination of his radio program. To listeners who had called expressing surprise, Radio Courtoisie explained that the order to cut off the interview came from CSA. But it's likely that at 7:30 to 8 o'clock PM the CSA offices are closed, with nothing working but phone message machines which the censors will play back the next day. In reality, the censorship decision seems to have been taken within Radio Courtoisie by Madame Paoli, Delegate for Editorial Issues, after conferring with Monsieur Henry de Lesquen. In Radio Courtoisie's favor it must be said that intolerance expressed through the media today is such that self-censorship is practically become a necessity. Martin Peltier forged ahead without reflecting; as a result he'll be called irresponsible for jeopardizing an entire enterprise. "He should at least have asked other individuals than Faurisson to come and talk about repression of revisionism!" Which others?

Paul-Marie Coûteaux, MEP with views similar to Philippe de Villiers, was supposed to be interviewed at Radio Courtoisie at around 9 o'clock but he indicated that he refused to go on after Faurisson. Therefore he didn't show up. For their part, Emmanuel Ratier and Alain Sanders volunteered to Henry de Lesquen that they didn't know Faurisson was to come on after them. It's unlikely E. Ratier will report anything about this affair in his next edition of "Faits et Documents."

Breaking with usual procedure, Radio Courtoisie did not re-broadcast Martin Peltier's interview with Robert Faurisson the next day. Further, it didn't offer any explanation or apology to its listeners. It didn't even acknowledge the significance of an event likely without precedent in its twenty years of existence.

<http://www.thecivicplatform.com/2008/04/18/english-translation-of-prof-robert-faurissons-latest-radio-interview/#more-6775>

Only comments

Comments per page 50

Article and comments

Send

Delegate for Editorial Matters

by Crack_Smoke_Republican on 20.04.2008 [18:32]

We contacted Henry de Lesquen, station manager, who explained the broadcast had been interrupted "by the government's Delegate for Editorial Matters, who considered some comments expressed by one of the participants unacceptable." However, he didn't say which comments, or why the programming never resumed.

F***ing J**s and their scared, paid-off editorial children! Comments like the above deserve a Leather boot on the Idiot Jew head that croak it out.

Let the man speak for God's sake. Zundel felt free in Tennessee... well if the CSR ever becomes President of the USA after the Idiot Puppet of Jews GWB leaves office, I'll send in commandos to release Zundel and will personally purchase him a home in the USA and present him with a Smith and Wesson to just say... "Next time they come to get you...just open up with this.". Call me a modern Anton Goth, but let the man speak.

Where are the brave people in Europe on this matter with Zundel? F***ing J*w pay-offs everywhere and pure weakness. Disgusting!

The Gayssot Act - More Jew SH*T on Europe

by Crack_Smoke_Republican on 20.04.2008 [18:41]

The Gayssot Act (Loi Gayssot), voted for on July 13, 1990, makes it an offense in France to question the existence of the category of crimes against humanity as defined in the London Charter of 1945, on the basis of which Nazi leaders were convicted by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in 1945-46 (art.9). Proposed by the communist deputy Jean-Claude Gayssot, it is one of several European laws prohibiting Holocaust denial. Its first article states that "any discrimination founded on the membership or non-membership to an ethnic group, a nation, a race or a religion is prohibited." The Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme (Human Rights Consultative National Commission), created in 1947, is charged of making a yearly, public report on the situation of racism in France.

After Robert Faurisson was removed from his university chair under the act,[citation needed](#) he challenged it as a violation of his rights to freedom of expression under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The Human Rights Committee upheld the Gayssot Act as necessary to counter possible anti-Semitism¹.

Polish Jew Communist Propaganda still lives

by Crack_Smoke_Republican on 20.04.2008 [19:10]

www.scrapbookpages.com/poland/majdanek/Majdanek.html

as a ghost from WWII in Europe. A lot of research has been done since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 which has proven that much of the holohoax was a Military PsyOps campaign. While killings, murders, etc. did occur during the war, it hardly requires a Gayssot Act from a Communist in modern Europe.

According to my tour guide, the Russians had already decided that after the war, Poland would be a Communist country, in keeping with the political ideology of the liberators. Consequently, Lublin was immediately set up as the capital of the new Polish government, which was to follow the Communist dictates of the Soviet Union. Anti-Communist Polish citizens were dispatched to Siberia from Lublin after the war.

The decision to make the Majdanek camp into a Museum was made in August 1944, a month after the liberation of the camp. According to a Museum booklet, the Majdanek Museum was set up in November 1944 and became the first such museum at a former concentration camp, long before any of the other Nazi camps were even liberated.

During the Communist regime, which lasted until 1989, all Polish citizens were encouraged to go on government-sponsored group tours to the former Nazi concentration camps as part of their indoctrination in hatred of the opponents of Communism. According to the tour guide, Polish schools taught a censored version of history during the Communist rule, leaving out such details as the Russian invasion of Poland in 1920, but emphasizing the crimes of the Nazi Fascists.