

## AAARGH REPRINTS

MARCH 2006

We reproduce the English translation, new to us, of a part of an important book written by Pierre Guillaume, of The Old Mole Group, on our relations with Noam Chomsky. The translation was meant as a weapon AGAINST Chomsky, seen from the point of view of the most extreme conservative Zionism. Paul Bogdanor, the publisher of this English translation is a fanatical Zionist. To him, Chomsky is worse than the Devil himself. His site is a collection of the most reactionary point of views of the last 40 years !!! The guy must be a comic ! The translation is preceded by a note, which is pure calumny :

*NB: The following essay, by a leading French Holocaust denier, gives a detailed account of Chomsky's collaboration with the French Holocaust denial movement. Chomsky's remarks at the end indicate that he assisted the Holocaust denier in the preparation of this essay. Readers are forewarned that the author is an antisemite and a Nazi apologist; therefore much of the material that follows is extremely offensive. Translated from *French* - Webmaster.*

We have republished the original book in French (Law and History), and we have online a long series of texts, both in French and in English, on this very subject:

*L'indéfectible solidarité de Noam Chomsky avec les révisionnistes*  
<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/chomsky/chomsky.html>

*The Unfailing Solidarity of Noam Chomsky with Revisionists*  
<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/engl/chomsky.engl.html>

Pierre Guillaume, *Droit et Histoire* <pdf>  
<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres5/pgdeth.pdf>

[From Pierre Guillaume, *Droit et Histoire* (Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1986), pp. 152-72.]

[p. 152]

# A Clarification

By Pierre Guillaume

Noam Chomsky was attacked with the greatest crudeness in a letter dated June 26, 1984, signed by Chantal Beauchamp and distributed in circles supporting Faurisson, a letter in which I myself am accused of dissembling (see *nota bene*, p. 172).

This brings me, a bit earlier than envisaged, to clarify a point of history.

I met Noam Chomsky in 1979. He had a meeting with Serge Thion for a short academic discussion about Cambodia. Serge Thion introduced me and we were able to talk for about fifteen minutes. I quickly explained to him the outline of the Faurisson affair, which, of course, he had never intended to discuss. Let us recall that at this date Serge Thion's book had not yet been published, or written. We had therefore issued almost no material and no documentation, and even if we had been able to assess the seriousness of Faurisson's work, we had nothing to make anyone share our judgment and we did not ourselves have a final opinion on the correctness of Faurisson's conclusions.

Chomsky asked me three questions to ascertain the sincerity of my involvement and assured me that he would try his best to defend the freedom of expression and the rights of Faurisson.

Some months later, and without further communication between us, Chomsky signed and made his colleagues sign the following petition:

Dr. Robert Faurisson has served as a respected professor of twentieth century French literature and document criticism for over four years at the University of Lyon-2 in France. Since 1974 he has been conducting extensive independent historical research into the "holocaust" question.

Since he began making his findings public, Professor Faurisson has been subject to a vicious campaign of harassment, intimidation, slander and physical violence in a crude attempt to silence him. Fearful officials [p. 153] have even tried to stop him from further research by denying him access to public libraries and archives.

We strongly protest these efforts to deprive Professor Faurisson of his freedom of speech and expression, and we condemn the shameful campaign to silence him.

We strongly support Professor Faurisson's just right of academic freedom and we demand that university and government officials do everything possible to ensure his safety and the free exercise of his legal rights.

This petition, lodged with the court, had the effect of a shower on our enemies and played a role in determining the course of the affair.

The lynch-trial that LICRA [League Against Racism and Antisemitism] was preparing, with a case that was empty but stuffed with the sob-stories of a crowd of avengers and fabricators, came to a sudden end. Finally appreciating the nature of the obstacle, our enemies went looking for documents to support their case, [the supposed existence of the gas chambers. aaargh.] which at last allowed us to write about the historical controversy, to assemble and define a body of documentation, which at long last allowed a rational scholarly debate in which they entangled themselves.

Chomsky's signature also played a role determining the attitude of the court, which suddenly understood that a shoddy judgment would not easily put an end to the matter.

At the time Faurisson, tormented by worries provoked by the repercussions of the affair on his family, saw his ability to work reduced virtually to nothing ; the task was crushing, the situation almost desperate.

While he was himself preoccupied in a difficult battle in the United States, beset by calumnies, Chomsky jumped into the water to help us and to stand up in practice for his own principles, without calculating the personal risks he was taking.

It is easy, now, in 1984, after the symposium of July 2, 1982 and the press conference by Raymond Aron and François Furet, after the publication of the *Réponse à Pierre Vidal-Naquet* [by Robert Faurisson. a], after the end-point on April 26, 1983 [i.e., the date of the court decision], to take Faurisson's research seriously. One needed a lot of courage, conscience and

rigor to take the position that Chomsky took in 1979.

For this reason alone, Chomsky has earned the unanimous respect and recognition of La Vieille Taupe, whatever positions he may have taken later.

**[p. 154]** But Chomsky did not stop the concrete application of his principles there.

He sent friendly replies to two of Faurisson's letters, which did not relate to the historical scholarly discussion, but the general circumstances of the debate. We are well placed to know how rare and courageous such politeness is.

Better still : Jean-Edern Hallier, who had hoped to stage a red-hot publicity stunt, had offered me editorial control over a book series on the Faurisson affair ; then, suddenly appreciating the difficulties and risks, he took fright. To compensate me for his promise, he offered to let me publish *Political Economy of Human Rights*, by Chomsky, and *Khmers Rouges !*, by Serge Thion, two books languishing for lack of money with Editions de la Différence. Chomsky accepted without demurring that his book should be published in a series that I directed and proposed Serge Thion and Michele Noel for the translation. That is, he accepted that his personal work would suffer harshly from the backlash of the vile reputation given to us, rather than joining, for whatever reason of his own, in the ostracism and isolation of which we were the victims. It was perhaps also to show our enemies in the clearest way that he remained firm on his principles and very attentive to the outcome of the affair.

Chomsky knew very well that we attached sufficient importance to his book to be ready to conceal our involvement so as not to damage his audience. He did not even ask us to do this. However, as soon as this publishing project was known, our enemies were ready to guarantee this publication, to guarantee him the widest publicity, to cover Chomsky with praise, to make allowance even for his "courageous defense of freedom of expression" by affirming that they themselves had nothing against it, that there had been a misunderstanding, that Faurisson could express himself, etc., provided that Chomsky agreed to distance himself from us. At the time Faurisson could no longer express himself and our enemies again believed that they would easily triumph. Chomsky did not give in. His book appeared with Hallier-Albin Michel Publishing, in my series. It was received by the impressive silence of unanimous rejection. **[p. 155]** Its distribution remained clandestine. Weakness of sales led the publisher to pulp the stock in 1984. [\*]

At this time I wrote Chomsky a letter in which, recalling the tremendous power of our enemies, I concluded by saying that revolutionaries retained a decisive advantage over them : we were communicating instantaneously via "thought transmission." I'll explain. Facing compound conspiracies, we always had the absolute, permanent certainty that our mutual relations could always develop absolutely along the lines of our principles and that they were therefore predictable. No Jesuitism, no casuistry, no opportunism, and therefore absolute trust, which doesn't imply any loyalty, and which accepts as self-evident that each one of us maintains a no less absolute "mistrust" towards the other. It is the same type of rapport that I maintained with Faurisson. It is the only organizational structure of La Vieille Taupe.

The petition, lodged with the court, set off for Chomsky an avalanche of letters from his good friends in Paris, among them Jean-Pierre Faye, who had returned from various ideological wanderings and was relying on the learned American's works to make himself look good and to restore his reputation in Parisian opinion, and was presenting himself everywhere as the Chomskyan of Paris. People there were describing La Vieille Taupe in hellish terms. All the resources of political science, psychology, psychoanalysis and psychiatry were being mobilized to explain the diabolical association of Faurisson and La Vieille Taupe. The situation in France was being portrayed in an apocalyptic manner. Nazism was at the doors. (This was the period of media reporting on FANE [National European Action Federation, a fascist organization] and [its founder, Marc] Fredriksen; because they had discovered a policeman located in FANE's ranks, they were portraying the police as thoroughly riddled with neo-Nazis.)

Confronted by a good dozen renowned intellectuals, some of whom had published him, invited him to conferences, distributed his writings, sung his praises for his scientific work or his political commitments, [p. 156] Chomsky had nothing but the rigor of his principles and his power of analysis. Chomsky answered firmly. He sent me, for my information, not only our enemies' letters (as manners require), but some of his replies. As attacks raged against us, I asked him for permission to publish this correspondence. As is his right, he thought it improper to publish letters referring to private correspondence. Therefore he offered to write an essay that would have the same contents but would refer only to our enemies' public writings. Such is the origin of the polemic appearing as the preface to the book *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*, by Robert Faurisson. This polemic, sent to Serge Thion to make best use of it, was lodged with the Paris court. Informed by LICRA, our enemies resumed the siege of Chomsky. The latter, disturbed by the atmosphere of hysteria and total irrationality that he perceived, was afraid that the fact of even appearing to support the contents of Faurisson's ideas would have the effect of destroying any credibility for his point of view and that we would all be swept away by the storm. We are in October 1980. To date, nobody, absolutely nobody, in the University, has taken a position in favor of Faurisson's ideas or even in favor of his freedom of expression. *Mémoire en défense*, by definition, has not been published. Nobody can be sure, have a guarantee, that Faurisson's historiographical conclusions are accurate. It is wholly reasonable to establish several lines of defense. It is necessary to require of our enemies a respect for a minimum of formalities. Our camp, at the time, was overwhelmed, its survival was permanently threatened. It should be recalled that the book *Intolérable Intolérance*, with the viewpoints of Karnoouh, Monteil and Tristani, will only appear more than a year later. No-one, in September-October 1980, can foresee how the debate will turn out. Our enemies have serious and obviously solid arguments, which will require a huge task of deconstruction from us. Many of the sledgehammer arguments we're using now had not yet come to mind. Many of the documents we're using in [p. 157] 1984 were not known, except perhaps to Faurisson. At this time, neither my own nor Thion's convictions were wholly established. It was to a great extent the monograph by Vidal-Naquet, *Un Eichmann de papier*, which, after verification and reflection, definitively convinced us through his sloppiness, his falsehoods and his displays of ignorance that our enemies really didn't have anything to say in reply. Still, time and effort were required from us.

Let us return to Chomsky's polemic. It was dated October 11, 1980. In a letter written on December 6, 1980, which was posted on the 9th and arrived on December 16, 1980, Chomsky wrote to me:

I've received stacks of letters from France asking me to withdraw the thing I sent you on civil liberties and Faurisson. The general tone of what people are writing to me indicates that the general level of hysteria is so high that no-one will pay attention to the facts in any case, and that the whole anti-imperialist effort will be undermined by a campaign aiming at linking me with neo-Nazism. It is with reluctance that I finally tend to agree. I don't know what the situation is at the present time. If publication not yet in hand, I suggest firmly that you do not put it in a book by Faurisson [...] but that you either drop this essay or publish it separately elsewhere. I'm sorry, perhaps it's already too late.

We (Thion and Guillaume) immediately phoned Chomsky who, in the meantime, on December 12, had received copies of the book. His immediate reaction was clear : he stood by his preface and asked us to treat his letter as null and void.

So, at the matter's boiling-point, when no French intellectual had made a stand, Chomsky, who could reasonably fear seeing all his political work ruined in an instant, had not even withdrawn his essay, as he had the right to do, but had "firmly suggested" that we do so – explaining this to us with a mild statement of serious and considered arguments – and then he had abandoned this final reservation the moment he received the book.

One must say that, in any case, Chomsky stood by the contents of his essay, which was a true beacon of hope in the atmosphere of the time. He had already done a huge amount in

practice to defend Faurisson's rights [p. 158] and resist censorship, including by involving himself personally through numerous private letters, care of his acquaintances in Paris – and it is this courage, unique among all intellectuals, that gets him attacked by Chantal Beauchamp today !

Let's return to December 1980. Things were thus perfectly clear between Chomsky and La Vieille Taupe. But on Thursday, December 18, in the course of Anne Sinclair's program, "Thursday Guest," Jean-Pierre Faye, a surprise guest, mentioning "his long friendship with Noam," quoted a truncated and out-of-context sentence from a personal letter from Chomsky, announced that Chomsky was retracting his essay, and claimed possession of Faurisson's book, which he was holding for safekeeping as a bibliographical collector's item that would be one of the few surviving copies!

On December 18 at 11pm, after Chomsky's agreement by telephone, Thion communicated to AFP [Agence France Presse] and all the national newspapers the following release, which AFP did not reproduce and all the newspapers ignored. To the contrary, on [December] 19, the entire press announced Chomsky's "volte-face" and communicated Jean-Pierre Faye's version.

### **The Chomsky-Faurisson Affair**

**Released by Serge Thion**

Paris, Thursday, December 18, 1980, 11pm.

In the Faurisson affair, Noam Chomsky is withdrawing nothing. In the course of the program "Thursday Guest" on Channel 2, Jean-Pierre Faye mentioned a letter that Noam Chomsky had sent him and he quoted the following sentences: "OK, you've convinced me. I've written to Faurisson's editors not to publish the preface or to dissociate it from any publication that has a connection with Faurisson."

In the private letter he sent to Serge Thion for Faurisson's editors (letter written on December 6, posted on the 9th, arrived the 16th), Chomsky says in particular (and we quote with his permission):

I've received stacks of letters from France asking me to withdraw the thing I sent you on civil liberties and Faurisson. The general tone of what people are writing to me indicates that the level of hysteria is so high that no-one will pay attention to the facts in any case, and that the whole anti-imperialist effort will be undermined by a campaign aiming at linking me with neo-. It is with [p. 159] reluctance that I finally tend to agree. I don't know what the situation is at the present time. If publication is not yet in hand, I suggest firmly that you do not put it in a book by Faurisson (or in whatever you intend to publish) but that you either drop this essay or publish it separately elsewhere. I'm sorry, perhaps it's already too late.

There was therefore a campaign waged in Paris to establish that Chomsky is withdrawing his libertarian positions, which remain unchanged. Jean-Pierre Faye has even cited these names: Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Mitsou Ronat, Jacqueline Gueron, Dan Sperber. It happens that Faurisson's work has appeared, preceded by Chomsky's essay. The latter has received Faurisson's book and for him there is no question of disavowing his essay. Questioned by telephone, Chomsky has just declared that he takes full responsibility for an essay enunciating principles that Faurisson's detractors would like to see applied only themselves.

Without the means of distributing our message, we had to leave unchallenged the version that Chomsky would have withdrawn his essay but was too late to stop publication, though he firmly stood by its contents. Unlike our enemies, we had no access to the press, and it is harder to disseminate information that is even remotely accurate on the subject of the gas chambers than it is to climb up the Niagara Falls by swimming.

The Jean-Pierre Faye/Ann Sinclair circus had succeeded perfectly. Chomsky was about to endure all the burdens of his intellectual courage, exacerbated by the fact that the public had the impression that all this was not very clear.

But if the storm was raging in the press and on the airwaves, the essay itself was lodged with the court, along with the book. And the judges well understood that, whatever the unanimous press might say, if the book wasn't being recalled, if our enemies weren't even producing a letter from Chomsky, the reality is that Chomsky had in no way departed from his uncompromising support for Faurisson's freedom of expression and civil rights. It would be necessary to take it into account. The rest was no more than the frothing of waves.

Only in 1981 did systematic study of massive communications of materials by LICRA allow us to make decisive progress in the project of strictly scholarly research on the gas chambers and to arrive at collection of findings transmissible to a rational mind without demanding an enormous personal effort from our interlocutors, and which [p. 160] therefore made it possible to reinforce the initial revisionist core. And, one has to say, this decisive step could be taken only thanks to the invaluable support that Chomsky afforded us, not because he would have defended Faurisson's analyses in any way, whether openly or covertly, as devilish people want to believe, but because Chomsky had held himself, with a rare firmness, to his principles: knowledge of facts can emerge only from an open, honest and sincere debate.

The scandal ignited around the Chomsky-Faurisson affair gave the issue an international resonance and led new readers to learn about these writings.

On December 16, 1980, Ivan Levai hosted on Europe 1 [radio] channel LICRA president Jean-Pierre Bloch, who in a few minutes uttered no less than thirteen outright lies. The reason for this invitation : Chomsky's stand.

On December 17, in reply, Faurisson in turn went on the channel, where Ivan Levai had invited him expecting to catch him in a trap, to make him stumble and to expose him to ridicule once and for all. This program, where Faurisson pronounced his famous sentence of sixty words, set fire to the gunpowder.

All that, we owe to the intervention of Chomsky, who found himself at the center of a campaign without precedent.

In France, the consensus tale spread in the intelligentsia that Chomsky must have been deceived by La Vieille Taupe, that Faurisson's freedom of expression and civil rights are not threatened, that Chomsky understands nothing about anything. In the United States and in England, where the imperial ideology of the West has been reconstituted, Chomsky had already seen his audience reduced and was the victim of crude defamation campaigns. The same man who had criticized the American war in Vietnam, without ever idealizing or deluding himself about Eastern-bloc regimes, saw himself accused of supporting Pol Pot or North Vietnamese Stalinism, including by the very people who had held precisely this attitude and wanted to make people forget it. They now accused him of supporting Faurisson's views, with the intention of destroying him [p. 161] completely. On this side of Atlantic, where the Faurisson question was shaking the temples of thought, people were claiming that in the end Chomsky was opposed to Faurisson's ideas. On the other side of Atlantic, people were claiming the opposite. Certain very Parisian clowns managed to make both incompatible claims at the same time (see Chomsky's *Réponses inédites à mes détracteurs parisiens*, Paris, Cahiers Spartacus, 1984).

Chomsky was constrained to answer this flood of madness and frenzy in order to restate the facts, all in “defending concretely, forcefully and effectively” Faurisson’s freedom of expression and civil rights. He successively answered Nadine Fresco in American magazines and Gitta Sereny in the British weekly *New Statesman*, then tried to reply in France, but his responses were censored (see *Réponses inédites...*). Therefore he reiterates the facts against his slanderers by saying that he has never taken a position in favor of Faurisson’s ideas. He quotes a phrase of his, written in 1969 and included in his book *Peace in the Middle East* in 1974, according to which “the massacre of the Jews was the most fantastic outburst of collective insanity in the history of humanity,” and thus, as long as he writes nothing that contradicts this phrase, all those who accuse him of being a revisionist must have patience and interpret Chomsky’s essay only as it was written.

Truly, Chomsky’s enemies are first of all the enemies of freedom of thought, freedom of expression. They are opposed to an open, honest and sincere debate, because this debate definitely couldn’t come out their advantage. If they were really convinced that the gas chambers existed, they would seek out debate, or at least not avoid it.

The position adopted by Chomsky is unavoidable and unanswerable. It is absolutely essential for anyone who has not abandoned any strength of character. It is minimal, necessary and sufficient so that the knowledge of facts advances and the truth triumphs.

Is it because in their confusion they smell the danger that our enemies try by all means to flush Chomsky out of this position by force?

And hasn’t Chantal Beauchamp found some task more urgent than helping them there?

[p. 162] She quotes, mockingly, this sentence from Chomsky:

If, contrary to what I believe, someone demonstrated that there had been no gas chambers, but that the of millions of Jews was the result of dreadful conditions in forced labor camps, it would not change my evaluation of the Nazi genocide.

This sentence, published in 1984, was written in September 1981 (*Réponses inédites*, p. 46). At this time, though we knew with certainty that the figure of six million Jewish victims of Nazism was very exaggerated, we had no serious or verified statistical formula for advancing a well-founded calculation and there is still no serious statistical publication. [†]

The huge mortality in the camps is disputed by no-one. It was not until 1983 that we began assembling irrefutable documents proving that the number of survivors was much higher than we had believed and especially that the great majority of the victims had died in the last three months of the war and the two months following the liberation, and that, therefore, their decimation was attributable neither to the permanent living conditions in the camps, nor to a deliberate policy of extermination, but rather to hunger and lack of hygiene, caused not by the green or red *Häftlingsführung* [prisoner leadership], but by hellish and uncontrollable chaos resulting from total war and from the final collapse of the German state, by famine and epidemics that also decimated the German civilians in the cities.

It was only in May 1984 that the testimony of a deportee allowed me to confirm this analysis, and the sentence by Chomsky that Chantal Beauchamp mocks in 1984 probably represented the thought of a good part of those who supported Faurisson in 1979-1980. And if this sentence may seem erroneous and excessive to a small number of informed persons, it is thanks to [p. 163] a keen research effort that could develop only because the courageous positions of Chomsky made it possible for the minimal conditions to exist. Besides, this sentence, written *urbi et orbi* by Chomsky, had, at the time it was written, the priceless advantage of transmitting the essential message: questioning the existence of the gas chambers by no means implies that one is abandoning radical criticism of Nazi ideas and condemnation of the concentration camp system and antisemitic measures.

A final remark on Chomsky's standpoint: he multiplied the number of viewpoints supporting Faurisson's freedom of expression, denounced in particularly energetic terms the lawsuits brought against him and the low blows of his enemies, while leaving to Faurisson the responsibility and the glory of defending his own work. Every time he has said that his opinions remained "diametrically opposed" to those of Faurisson, he has done it in terms that were incapable of harming Faurisson; and he has always indicated, by a word or a phrase, that his "diametrically opposed" view was more a matter of opinion than of scientific knowledge.

In fact, this sudden aggressiveness with regard to Noam Chomsky rests on a phantasm and an illusion. Chomsky is perceived as an academic enjoying a considerable media influence who could reverse the situation with a single word and a wave of the magic wand. All that is entirely wrong. Chomsky, whose work in linguistics has gained a worldwide reputation, was always terribly isolated in his political commitments, save for brief moments when his commitments corresponded to vast social movements (the movement against the Vietnam war), but where his notoriety was achieved by dint of the media sweetening the sum of his views. From 1973 to 1982, Chomsky was completely isolated, again. A first version of his book *Political Economy of Human Rights* had been withdrawn from circulation in the United States by the publisher, and the second publisher, South and Press [sic] [In fact "South End press, aaa"], is a minuscule publisher, hardly distributed, primarily by militant circles. While his position in the Faurisson affair should logically have received general approval, on the contrary he found himself completely alone, proof that in this affair there is a dose of irrationality that must be taken into account. If he had become [p. 164] involved in a genuine historical debate, on one side or the other, in line with his convictions, it would have been necessary for him to undertake a huge effort, because he could not have confined himself to forming a personal opinion and then expressing it; he would have had to defend it, justify it, and therefore to assimilate enormous documentation, to make an attempt to verify it, etc. - to do what we did, constrained and coerced by the French situation.

He would have needed - and here, we are well placed to know - to give up all other activity, and so to give up his own work and the drafting of his books: *Towards a New Cold War*, 1982; *The Fateful Triangle*, 1983. Without taking into account his work in linguistics. But that would have saved him from being treated as a fool by Chantal Beauchamp.

All this would not have much importance if it were not the sign of a real danger.

Chantal Beauchamp no longer believes in the gas chambers. She has been persuaded that Faurisson is right. So be it. Me too. I hope that this conviction spreads and I think that if this conviction happens to spread I will have been one of those who played a certain role in this complex process. But, for Chantal Beauchamp, this newfound conviction is instantaneously becoming a new truth, fortified by a fixed division of good and evil that will allow a new inquisition against all those who do not share her own personal conviction. The logic of her five pages is no longer the logic of La Vieille Taupe, it is the constitution of a Faurissonist cult, a new LICRA. In the name of the new dogma, people will hunt the heretics. Soon, it will be necessary to distribute numbered cards to certify the date of admission to Faurissonism and to create an order of companions of the liberation.

The same causes produce the same effects; this logic will lead Chantal Beauchamp to use immediately, and ipso facto, the same methods as our enemies.

She quotes Chomsky in quotation marks: "There are no [p. 165] reasonable grounds to doubt the existence of the gas chambers." Chomsky himself wrote to her: "For me, there are no..." ["Pour moi, il n'existe pas..."]. Chantal Beauchamp excises the "For me, ..." ["Pour moi, ..."] and replaces the lower case "i" following the comma with an "I" [i.e., she changes "... il n'existe pas..." to "Il n'existe pas..."]. The "For me," is important; it was not necessary to remove it from page 3 of her essay in support of her reasoning, even if she had already quoted it, correctly this time, on page 1 of her letter. Especially since this passage followed a long excursus where Chomsky forcefully stood up for Faurisson and was followed

by an unambiguous statement: “Only a religious fanatic could refuse to investigate questions of fact”; then by a second unambiguous statement: “I myself have not undertaken such an investigation”; then by a third unambiguous statement: “The thesis that there were no gas chambers seems highly improbable to me and the denial of the holocaust seems totally impossible to me.” So Chomsky clearly meant that his present opinion (September-October 1981) had no other source nor any more weight than conventional opinion and that therefore investigation was legitimate.

By the suppression of this “For me, ...” Chantal Beauchamp distorts Chomsky’s position and affords herself the luxury of “discovering,” in his writings, an inconsistency that he himself acknowledges unambiguously and that to some extent he himself brings into the picture. And, so that everything is perfectly clear, here is Chomsky without ambiguity: “It has been claimed (for instance by Vidal-Naquet) that it was ‘scandalous’ to defend Faurisson’s right to free expression without denouncing his conclusions.” How better to say and show that Chomsky is not denouncing Faurisson’s conclusions, something he takes care to state unambiguously: “That of course would require me to analyze scrupulously all his documentation, etc.”

After the specious truncation of a text on page 3, Chantal Beauchamp is about to use another method hitherto characteristic of our enemies: denounce and hurl anathemas, firmly entrenched in her righteousness and moralism. I must be a dissembler! And that, for having published completely, in succession, the petition, polemic and unpublished clarifications by Chomsky! And I must take my readers for fools for having written: “Noam Chomsky, who prefers not taking [p. 166] a position on the basic issue of the affair”! Well, I insist on it: Chomsky did not take a position on the basic issue of the affair, he is someone who invokes the status of his opinions only while making his own relative amateurism clear and while underlining the equal amateurism of most of those who believed they were able to take a position against Faurisson. I maintain that Chomsky defends Faurisson’s freedom of expression concretely, energetically and effectively. And I add that I would equally have published any clarification by Chomsky, even if he had taken a position against Faurisson’s ideas.

A third approach characteristic of our enemies: the search for hidden and shady explanations to explain unwelcome behavior. Chantal Beauchamp writes :

Anyway, having no particular insight into what motivates Guillaume, I cannot therefore determine if it is to speak further about these dismaying facts of deception, dishonesty, and attempted of Chomsky by Guillaume or mutually. One thing is certain, however: Guillaume tried to manipulate people he knows to be convinced of the accuracy of Faurisson’s works, by gravely misleading them about the contents of an essay, hostile to the aforementioned works, that he himself published.

My relations with Chomsky, as with Faurisson, as with the persons present at the meeting of June 16, 1984, and with the readers of my circular of May 18, 1984, are crystal clear. There is neither falsehood, nor dissimulation, nor conspiracy, nor manipulation. Everyone is free to get together on foundations other than those of La Vieille Taupe and establish a league of guardians of the truth waging war against heretics and the “lukewarm.” This type of behavior will immediately reinforce the delusions of our enemies, who will not fail to find there the justification for refusing any debate, for refusing to take the measure of the controversy and study our arguments and for substituting political and ideological confrontation for historical and scientific debate. The danger is great that our work and all our progress could see themselves swept away because our enemies don’t care about accuracy. It is in any case a good thing that Chantal Beauchamp’s letter demonstrates such an unbelievable belligerence with regard to myself and [p. 167] La Vieille Taupe that she makes it clear that her attitudes are completely foreign to La Vieille Taupe.

It remains no less true that the publication in May 1984 of writings by Chomsky that were written in 1981-1982 and censored at their inception appears out of step with the development of the historical debate in France. That makes it possible to measure the tremendous progress

achieved in two years. The freedom to express ourselves, we won through major confrontation, even if it is still very far from being exercised under normal conditions and even if one needs a lot of courage and determination to use it. The historical debate made decisive progress thanks to the lawsuits whose actual historiographical results we have yet to learn.

Chantal Beauchamp, a historian by profession, would have been better advised to write a synthesis of a dozen pages, to circulate it and send it to Chomsky asking what he thought of it, rather than hurling anathemas and pronouncing the excommunication of Chomsky, René Lefevre (publisher of *Cahiers Spartacus*) and myself in a collective *Herem* [sic: Hebrew for ban] that lacks even the minimum of politeness...

It is true that René Lefevre lacked clarity and firmness in this affair and I targeted him for it at the time (*La Guerre Sociale*, supplement to number 3, p. 84). It is no less true that he was also opposed to my slanderers and that his attitude in his circle certainly prevented several plans of attack against me from materializing!

In this affair, very few are those who stayed firm and irreproachable on principles on every occasion. If it can be convenient to denounce weaknesses, it is often criminal and always absurd to denounce weak people, and it is often what marks the degeneration of revolutionary comradeship in the militant underground. What matters is to reduce the causes of the excessive pressures we're all undergoing.

Chomsky got involved while he was also personally involved in work and in taxing struggles that absorbed all his attention and all his energy. Dramatic events were taking place in the Middle East. His own work exposing the material and psychological sources of [p. 168] American imperialism, the realities of Zionism and the State of Israel, took on an immediate significance, something that could lead to practical results. How is this work less important than Faurisson's and why should his have been sacrificed as soon as the false appearances imposed by fanaticism were able to generate a conflict between them?

Shouldn't he have preoccupied himself more with the debate raging in France, abandoning all his projects? Why wouldn't Chomsky summon Faurisson or Chantal Beauchamp to take a stand without delay on his own efforts? These attacks targeting him today at any rate confirm his evaluation of the irrational and deranged character of intellectual circles in France and justify his trying first of all, at the time of this affair, to revive thoroughly forgotten general principles.

Let's imagine a point when, the taboo being broken, a real debate commences and the non-existence of the Hitlerian gas chambers and the genocide of the Jews is accepted by all historians. Those who continue to maintain that these chambers existed and publish studies compiling testimonies, admissions and documents that official history has acknowledged as legends could be accused of disturbing social order and inciting hate. Wouldn't it be necessary to forbid this literature? Wouldn't it be necessary to suppress these peddlers of hateful and self-serving war propaganda? It certainly seems that in France the after-effects of collaboration, resistance and Stalinism at the root of the ideological struggle leave the mind defenseless in the face of such a childish hypothetical.

There is a fundamental opposition between conceptions of the social and political order structured by monotheism (or its atheistic inversion) which make the social order depend on collective adherence to a universal ideology, therefore on shared belief, and conceptions which hold that ideologies, states of consciousness and beliefs are products of social experience and are attributes of the individual or a people. According to this second conception, it is up to the social order to organize the coexistence and confrontation of ideologies and beliefs, and to react against the hegemonic and totalitarian claims of a particular ideology.

[p. 169] In the latter case, scientific progress has the privilege of imposing consensus views without any mechanism of authority and constraint.

To appreciate how odious are the attacks targeting Chomsky, on the part of someone who

poses as a defender of Faurisson, one may want to think hard about the following analogy.

At the height of the affair, during a trip to Bolivia, a Professor Faure meets a friend who tells him about the case of a Bolivian professor persecuted for having published conclusions about population genetics that the whole intellectual establishment regards as an incitement to the massacre of Indians!

The Bolivian professor defends himself. He seems to know his case but cannot make himself heard. It is clear, for Faure, that if the Indians are massacred in Bolivia, it's for economic, social and political reasons that have nothing to do with scientific arguments on the monogenism or polygenism of humanity. The reactions of the intellectual establishment have more to do with protecting the taboos of the tribe (of intellectuals) than protecting the Indians. In any case, the Bolivian professor's scholarly conclusions are either true or false and their truth or falsity must be established within the framework of debate and normal scientific procedures. It is also clear that to support this professor will lead to the most insane associations and will paralyze a little more, if not totally, the debate arising from Professor Faure's own work. Besides, all of Faure's Bolivian friends beg him not to get involved, maintain that this Bolivian professor is a dangerous nut, an eccentric, perhaps even a Nazi, that he has been used! It is clear that to make a stand will have little or no benefit, but will involve a terrible setback to any possibility of reasonable reflection concerning Faure's work and the whole revisionist school.

What should be done? And what would Faure have done? Nobody can tell him and nobody has the right to require anything from him. (If they persist, these cannibals, in making heroes of us, they will soon see that our bullets are for our own generals!)

The only thing that can be said is that to capitulate on one point or other means an irreparable defeat [p. 170] for the spirit. If, by contrast, someone finds in himself the strength to concede nothing, it is probably a sign that a whole historical era has ended and a new spirit is being born.

Well, Faure jumped into the water. He underwent all the foreseeable ordeals and, three years later, he is being vilified for not having taken a position in support of the Bolivian professor's genetic hypotheses, by a Bolivian qualified in genetics from whom this is the first known public intervention!

- September 28, 1984.

---

*The first version of the preceding text included numerous errors of detail and an error of evaluation that Chomsky indicated to us while reaffirming that his position was fixed and unchanged. We corrected in the text errors that did not affect the reasoning and we give Chomsky's comments below.*

---

My case was not in the least unique in the world ; the story is entirely typical and could be illustrated with numerous examples. My case was perhaps more remarkable because I had been very visible, undoubtedly, from 1969 to 1973, to the point where, in a study undertaken in 1970 on the "American intellectual elite" (a ridiculous concept, it goes without saying), the majority of participants (rather paranoid) attributed to me almost magical powers over the mass media and public opinion. Three reasons explain why I was particularly vilified : first, I was particularly "visible"; second, in 1969 I began treating Israeli policy in a rather critical fashion, which, among American intellectuals, is comparable to criticizing the Soviet Union among Stalinists; third, a large proportion of my writings was devoted to critical analysis of the activities of the "intellectual elite," which is not likely to make you a sympathetic figure among the commissars.

In the first years of the Seventies, this situation worsened. Publications "that count"

aren't publishing my articles any more, apart from very rare exceptions, and a flood of slanders and insults, like the ones you've been used to for some years, made its appearance and is still continuing, in fact continuing to grow. The reason for this is transparent, and the comparison you make can be misleading. Although it is perfectly true that both other people and myself, those of us who deviated from the party line, have been marginalized (neutralized, as Vidal wrote in the *New York Review*) since the Seventies, the situation has not reverted to what it was in the middle of the Sixties. On the contrary, although the vast popular movements of the Sixties have become [p. 171] less visible, they're surviving and even growing during this period, to the great distress of the commissars - I mean the liberal intellectuals who constitute the priesthood of the State religion. There is even a technical term to describe this disturbing phenomenon: "the Vietnam syndrome" or the "crisis of democracy." That's continuing to our day. In fact, that's why Reagan calculated that he could not attack Central America directly, as his model, John F. Kennedy, had been able to attack Vietnam twenty years earlier. Also, throughout this period, while I was excluded from fashionable and polite circles (without much regret, I should say, given my total contempt for their intellectual and moral level), urgent requests for conferences, etc., kept increasing, the audiences grew and became more supportive and so on.

That continues to be true today, causing much hysteria in the establishment. Last week, for instance, *The New Republic*, in a new stream of its Stalinist-type lies (invoking what must be my "denial of the holocaust," etc.) proclaimed despairingly that I am completely discredited and that even my friends no longer want to be associated with me. This was printed in a pamphlet distributed by a group of fanatical and rather clapped-out Zionists, outside a room where I spoke about the Middle East to an enthusiastic audience of over a thousand people at the University of Michigan, before rushing to Detroit the same evening to speak on the same subject in front of another packed room. And this happens all the time. For instance, *Political Economy of Human Rights*, which received zero publicity in the mass media and which many retailers refuse even to stock, is nevertheless selling many more copies than the books I wrote at the height of the anti-war movement. There is a real *Kulturkampf* [ideological struggle] here. The secular priesthood has lost control over public opinion and they very much want it back. They don't stop pretending that people like me are "isolated" or "discredited" and they do it with all the more passion as they know that exactly the opposite is true. I cannot accept even a fraction of the speaking invitations sent to me, and it isn't like the Sixties, when I spoke to five people in a church, instead there are real crowds on campuses and in communities. In the same way, they write non-stop about how the popular movements of the Sixties have disappeared and been discredited, and how the country is "swinging to the Right," knowing that the popular movements have survived and remain effective and full of life, and that anti-interventionism is much more powerful now than in the past. In fact, in the last Gallup poll I saw, more than 70% of the population (but far fewer of the "leaders of opinion" and practically none of the establishment intelligentsia) answered "yes" to the question: "Was the Vietnam war 'fundamentally wrong and immoral,' and not simply a mistake?" This is the type of phenomenon that terrifies the commissars.

- Chomsky, October 27, 1984.

---

[p. 172] NOTA BENE - To make this text comprehensible, let us simply clarify that the letter he is answering had been provoked by the volume published through my efforts, *Réponses inédites à mes détracteurs parisiens*, by Noam Chomsky. In a circular to customers of La Vieille Taupe, I had introduced this work as "a concrete, energetic and effective defense of Faurisson's freedom of expression." In the same circular, I shamed "all those who make a profession of thinking up and inventing a thousand reasons for not familiarizing themselves with the evidence, for running away from the key texts, for postponing debate."

However, in the published material, written at different times, not only does Chomsky not take a position on the basic issue, but he even writes that for him, "there are no reasonable grounds to doubt the existence of the gas chambers."

Inconsistency on my part?

That would be to forget that Chomsky showed exceptional courage and determination, that he got involved unambiguously by denouncing the dishonesty of Faurisson's enemies and that he firmly indicated that the defense of freedom of expression wasn't limited to the defense of the freedom of allies. Careful reading of his writings leaves no doubt in this regard.

So that the references are less murky, let's add that Chantal Beauchamp is a qualified history professor. Close to far-left circles, from whom she originally learned of the case, she began to adhere to revisionist ideas and, unlike many, became involved in activism as a result.

Monogenism and polygenism, to which reference is made at the end of the essay, are two opposing doctrines on the origin of the human race. Monogenism believes in a single origin and a successive differentiation of the human groups constituting, notably, the three major races. Polygenism believes in a plural origin from a process of humanization of apes. Voltaire, for instance, was a polygenist, more as a reaction against biblical monogenism than for scientific reasons. Independently of the scientific debate (essentially paleontology and genetics), some partisans of monogenism accuse their enemies of the blackest intentions and, notably, of wanting to exterminate their "others." For my part, I don't have the necessary competence to resolve this and, above all, I don't care.

#### FOOTNOTES

[p. 155] [\*] Informed by the publisher Albin Michel, I offered to find a fair solution. They replied that the stock had burned, except for copies in storage, i.e., a few hundred.

[p. 162] [†] Since then, there has appeared in the United States: Walter N. Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, which closes the demographic debate by confirming point by point, in an exhaustive fashion, Paul Rassinier's work, *Le Drame des juifs européens*, reissued by La Vieille Taupe.

French original : <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/chomsky/PGmisaupoint.html>

<http://www.paulbogdanor.com/guillaume.html>

\* \* \* \*

#### **AAARGH**

**THE WEBSITE WAS FOUNDED IN 1996 BY AN INTERNATIONAL TEAM**

<http://vho.org/aaargh>

<http://aaargh.com.mx>

<http://litek.ws/aaargh>

If you intend to connect to the AAARGH website from France, you need an anonymizer.

[HTTP://ANON.FREE.ANONYMIZER.COM/HTTP://WWW.AAARGH.COM.MX/](http://anon.free.anonymizer.com/http://www.aaargh.com.mx/)

**OR: [HTTP://AAARGH.COM.MX.NYUD.NET:8090](http://aaargh.com.mx.nyud.net:8090)**

We work in French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, Rumenian, Russian, Czech, Danish, Indonesian, Portuguese, Dutch, Hungarian...

#### **THE QUARTERLIES OF AAARGH**

<http://geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo>

*Conseils de révision*

*Gaette du Golfe et des banlieues*

*The Revisionist Clarion*

*Il resto del siclo*

*El Paso del Ebro*

*Das kausale Nexusblatt*  
*O revisionismo em lingua português*  
*Arménichantage*

**NEW ADDITIONS ON AAARGH**

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/nouv.html>  
<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/nouv.html>

**BOOKS (260) PUBLISHED BY AAARGH ON INTERNET**

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/livres.html>  
<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html>

**DOCUMENTS, COMPILATIONS, AAARGH REPRINTS**

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/reprints.html>  
<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/reprints.html>

**FREE SUBSCRIBE: (E-MAIL)**

[revclar@yahoo.com.au](mailto:revclar@yahoo.com.au)  
[elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar](mailto:elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar)

**MAIL:**

[aaarghinternational@hotmail.com](mailto:aaarghinternational@hotmail.com)  
[elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar](mailto:elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar)

**AAARGH, TO AVOID DYING STUPID.**

**MAKE COPIES OF THE SITE. JOIN AAARGH. BROADCAST AAARGH. WORK FOR AAARGH. LET'S  
TOIL FOR OUR COMMON FREEDOM.  
LET'S TRAMPLE THE CENSORS.**