

The Gulag is No Place for a Lady

There is a French saying: *Jamais deux sans trois*. The English version, *Not twice, but thrice*, is no longer in common usage. In my own family, where sayings based on folklore are occasionally used, this has been modified to *Bad things come in twos and threes*, referring to loss, illness or death, all of which of course are inevitable at some point during our short lives here on this God-given planet.

Now, imagine that any such loss occurs not twice, not thrice, but in fact at least 109 times. If we are to heed constant complaints that the 110th episode is imminent, e.g. because music from Schindler's List was used by a German figure skater in her final programme at the Winter Olympics, or because an English singer writes songs mocking the likes of Irene Zisblatt, then what the heck happened on these 109 previous occasions?

Jamais deux sans cent-neuf? How unfortunate for the victims of such a considerable number of losses! Why does it keep happening to them? What could they possibly have done wrong to deserve such repeated suffering?

At a recent conference in Vienna entitled 'An End to Anti-Semitism' (yawn), Israeli-French 'philosopher' Bernard-Henry Lévy said in his opening keynote speech:

"Actually whether they [anti-Semites] disappear or not seems to me to be indifferent as long as they are *contained* to the point where they do no harm."

Asides advocating a tripartite programme of *containing* anti-Semites, 'to name [them], to reply and to counter-attack,' how does BHL propose they should be *contained*?

Distinguishing badges? Gulags?

In short, BHL and likeminded Zionists are demonstrating the exact kind of behaviour which has led to Jews being evicted from their host nations 109 times.

*

Last weekend February 17, a commemoration event took place in Dresden to honour the hundreds of thousands of victims of Allied saturation bombings in 1945. The organiser, German revisionist Gerhard Ittner, had invited me to go along and give a short speech. For various reasons, I had to decline. Perhaps a wise choice in view of police closing the meeting following an impassioned speech from Australian-born British free speech advocate, Michèle Renouf.

Some German speakers were naturally upset that Renouf seemingly provided Dresden authorities with the excuse they needed to shut down the event. Dagmar Brenne writes:

"Michele R. as an Englishwoman was *fehl am Platz* - wrong time, wrong place. She caused the event to be cut off not even half way through and prevented others from having their say. There are times and places to become 'political', I felt Dresden was not the place. It is easy to be brave when you don't have to live there and can trot

off back home under the protection of British citizenship. Germany as a defeated country would not be too hard on an English lady without causing a nasty backlash.”

The unfortunate occurrence can be seen from various angles and also raises questions regards the German authorities’ methods when dealing with so-called ‘Holocaust denial’ – a crime punishable by jail under Section 130 of the German penal code for incitement.

Renouf in her speech said, ‘The only holocaust in Europe during the 1940s was against the Germans’.

How does this compare legally with other statements from German political dissidents Ursula Haverbeck, Sylvia Stolz and that of Canadian citizen of German origin, Monika Schaefer - currently on remand awaiting trial – who all believe the official gas chamber narrative to be a lie and have courageously said so, openly and in public?

Schaefer’s brother, Alfred, has endured countless police raids, his computers seized and he has been fined for his outspoken views. Haverbeck has been sentenced to jail; Stolz, Ittner have already done time for their political opinions and Horst Mahler is still in prison.

Not officially invited to the event as a speaker, Renouf had made her way there as a supporter. Much of her speech is a word-for-word repetition of what she has already said in the past, including last year on German local TV. Hardly impromptu but rather a rehearsed role as played at the theatre.

Her polished performance gave rise to widespread media coverage which must be seen as a positive outcome. Many of us would agree that points made by Renouf are valid and expressed with the right sentiment.

Of course, the nuance is all in what constitutes ‘denial’. Technically, Renouf is not a ‘denier’. Like millions of other good folk worldwide, she supports revisionists’ right to freedom of expression. Can she be blamed for going out there and ‘doing her thing’ which, prior to last Saturday, had never resulted in legal action either in Germany or elsewhere?

Rather than blaming Renouf, should criticism instead be directed at the authorities who, no doubt fully aware of how these things are likely to pan out, decided that stopping the event at that particular moment, with an ‘English lady’ speaker, would severely piss off those still to speak and therefore spark a rift, causing yet further division within our somewhat beleaguered movement?

Nevertheless, German media outlets are remarkably silent about the whole caper. As well, it is nigh on impossible to find any mainstream confirmation of Renouf’s claims of actual arrest and criminal charges brought against her. All sources state clearly that she and one other speaker are ‘under investigation’. Tag24.de uses the term ‘Renouf wurde vorläufig festgenommen’ – ‘provisionally detained’ i.e. questioned under caution? I am no legal expert – especially not regards German law – but as in the case of Monika Schaefer it seems that a court appearance is normal legal procedure, at the latest one day following arrest. The only source of Renouf’s arrest is Renouf herself.

In summary, how can German authorities on the one hand justify their treatment of the delightful Monika Schaefer, whose 'offending' video is an apology to her own German mother, whilst subjecting Renouf only to a few hours' kid-gloved detention and questioning?

If BHL and his co-religionist cronies have their way, managing to have the likes of Monika, Alfred, Ursula, Sylvia and myself *contained* for expressing political views with which they disagree, would they also – as German authorities and media seem to be doing – grant Renouf amnesty because the gulag is no place for a lady?

Would being '**contained to the point where they do no harm**' be reserved for plebs only, or would the inconsistencies of German (and British) authorities suggest that only those considered **effective** in posing a real threat to the System should be *contained* and made to suffer a spell in the gulag?

*

As comrades, our first duty to the cause involves standing by and supporting one another in this struggle to the death. Therefore, to what extent should we allow internal disputes to compromise the undeniable reality of our combined strengths?

As Jews themselves are the common denominator in all 109 pogroms to date, should we be wary of similar 'common denominator' patterns forming within our own ranks?

Some may argue that women have no place in politics. In some measure and despite myself, I have to agree. For the past year and more, I have listened to constant warnings that my music forms part of a reckless strategy. According to Renouf, causing 'gross offence' with my satirical songs poses a real danger to *bona fide* historians and other academics whose work includes publishing books, papers based on scientific research, official documents, etc.

On reflection, Renouf's attitude towards my music and indeed towards my person barely differs from my accusers in that they all wish to see me silenced. Under the pretext that my songs pose grave danger to the movement as a whole, Renouf has tried to use her influence to manipulate others with the aim of discrediting me. In response to Renouf's disapproval of my art and her disparaging remarks regards 'living off charity', I have always stood my ground and shall only stop singing once I'm dead.

Now, after preventing the voices of German comrades in Dresden from being heard, yet seemingly facing no legal consequences herself, what are we to deduce from Renouf's actions? Having been regularly cc'd or forwarded emails which circulate within the revisionist movement, I have been privy over the past months to several examples of comradely disputes, all of which involve Renouf.

Jamais deux sans trois ou quatre? As with Jews being the common denominator in 109 pogroms to date, it does

rather seem that Renouf plays a similarly recidivist role when it comes to causing *trouble at t' mill* – **this despite Renouf never having refuted the 'Nazi gas chamber' narrative.**

In my case, the prosecution has so far failed to submit any evidence actually proving that I would have broken any laws. Whilst Renouf rightly hails as heroes those who choose to break ridiculous 'denial' laws in Germany and elsewhere, her definition of what constitutes 'recklessness' and who is 'reckless' is applied selectively, illogically and, least of all, to herself.

There is, in my view, far more than meets the eye regards Dresden and Lady Renouf. However, I wish her no harm and hope that the above 'food for thought' will not be the cause of further collateral damage. Whilst retaining no illusions as to any future reconciliation, I am deeply hurt and saddened by Renouf's personal betrayal. Whatever our differences, if we are to succeed in this struggle, then we must stand together – our continued existence as a race depends on it.

'We win by singing.' – Manfred Röder.

Alison Chabloz

February 26, 2018