

# Anne Frank's Diary



**A HOAX**

by Ditlieb Felderer

**DITLIEB FELDERER**

**ANNE FRANK'S  
DIARY**

—

**A HOAX**

**AAARGH**

Edited by Lewis Brandon  
(aka David McCalden)

Institute for Historical Review 1979  
under license from Bible Researcher 1978

Originally published by Bible researcher, Taby, Sweden  
ISBN N° 91-85560-02-2

Much of this material originally appeared as articles in the Swedish  
English-language magazine *Bible Researcher*  
ISSN N° 0347-2787 during 1978.

<html> by Radio-Islam  
<pdf> by AAARGH Editions  
Internet  
2005

## FOREWORD

It is with mixed feelings that we present here the first real exposé ever undertaken on *The Diary of Anne Frank*. From having been positive to the diary our standpoint gradually changed to the negative until we finally had to dismiss the whole thing as a forgery. This study gives our reasons for believing so. In all honesty we must admit that our previous positive stand was not based on a serious study of the diary itself. Like most other people we neither had the inclination to search into a young girl's miseries and tragedies nor did we have the time to give the diary a detailed study. Any negative statement we viewed as most others likely have done: coming from anti Semites, Jew haters, former Nazis or Fascists. The issue was then dropped. Recently our interest got rekindled partly by our attempt to rebut Richard Harwood's book *Did Six Million Really Die? The Truth At Last*. The book threw us completely out of our senses for we felt surely it must be a well established fact that more than six million Jews had been exterminated and that there were gas chambers all over Hitler's Germany. We immediately recognized the danger if this sort of distortion should spread and so we decided to find errors in the book and in this way counteract it. We felt the task would be simple seeing the facts of the "Holocaust" are so thoroughly documented. Perhaps this was our mistake for in doing so we could not help but get intrigued and involved with an issue we would never have dreamed to get involved with only a few years ago. Have we been fooled? If so, by whom and how could they so easily have fooled us? Were we not trained researchers? What is the purpose of those trying to fool us? While reasoning these matters out we necessarily also stumbled on Anne Frank. After all, she is the pinnacle of the Holocaust theory. Harwood mentions in the first edition of his book that the diary is a forgery. Unfortunately for Harwood, he seems to have been misled as the court case concerning Meyer Levin apparently did not concern the diary but a play built on the diary. (Compare Meyer Levin, *The Obsession*, Simon & Schuster, NY, 1973). However this discovery proved to be even more unfortunate for us, for while we found this out, checking up pertinent material we could not help but discover numerous peculiarities, some so grave we wondered how it was that no one had aired these problems before. Harwood had recognized the patient was sick but he had apparently given the wrong diagnosis. The question now came up: Should we keep silent or tell the world about our discoveries? Perhaps the lie after all did some good? Did it not expose Hitler and his Nazi Germany? Was it not useful in giving Jews their own homeland in Palestine? Did not her case give us the feeling Jews had the right to evict the Palestinians? Did not Anne symbolize the persecuted Jewish child? Was not in fact the whole Holocaust propaganda built up on the diary? These and other questions kept circulating in our minds, disturbing us with many sleepless nights. However, truth prevailed. We have found no other choice but to give to the world that which we have found. Truth and propriety must stand above everything else. If truth is destroyed our earth is on the brink of collapse. The environment is built on truth. Truth should have nothing to fear. And so we present our study to the readers. The colossal hoax surrounding the Anne Frank diary is so immense, the implications so profound that mankind must find out about it. It is our solemn wish that mankind, through our exposure will be inspired to keep fighting for truth no matter whom it might hurt. Our intention to expose the racket is further prompted by the callous spirit of those people defending it without the least consideration whether it is a genuine document or not. Numerous people who in one way or another have been involved with the diary have pleaded with us to keep the matter quiet. They feel that the "intentions" were well meant. However when we recognized their selfish interests it only gave us more assurance we were doing the right thing by exposing it.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

DITLIEB FELDERER is one of four refugee children who were all born in different European countries. His younger sister was born in Sweden; his elder sister in Italy. His brother was born in Germany and he himself was born in Innsbrück, Austria on 23 April 1942. The family suffered severe deprivations because of the war, and ended up fleeing first to Italy and then to Sweden, where they became citizens. In 1959 Mr. Felderer became converted to the Jehovah's Witnesses and went on extensive evangelizing tours, including one to north east America, stopping at New York, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal. During all this time he was a vigorous supporter of the Holocaust legend. Around 1968, he began to notice certain discrepancies in the Exterminationists' descriptions. In the early 1970s, while writing a research thesis on the Nazi persecution of the Jehovah's Witnesses, he began to accumulate and study a wide range of Exterminationist and Revisionist literature. After weighing up the two views, he was convinced that the Revisionist view was correct.

Since then, Mr. Felderer has founded his own excellent magazine and publishing house, both called Bible Researcher. He also organizes study tours of the various concentration camps in Poland each year, and has gathered together a unique collection of slides which illustrate the fraudulent nature of the "gas chambers." Mr. Felderer is married to a Philippina, and lives in Stockholm.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AB - *Aftonbladet*, Stockholm, Sweden, (newspaper)
- AFF - *Anne Frank Foundation*, Amsterdam, Holland, n.d., (leaflet)
- AFFA - *Anne Frank Foundation Amsterdam*, Holland, n.d., 5th edition
- BE - *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie*, Wiesbaden, Germany, 1966-1974
- BER - Anne Frank, *Berättelser*, Stockholm, Sweden, 1960
- BG - *Brief Guide To The Anne Frank House*, n.d., (leaflet) Fig. 18
- BR-RH - *Bible Researcher-Revisionist Historia*
- Card. ed. - Anne Frank, *Anne Frank: The Diary Of A Young Girl*, Cardinal edition, New York, USA, 1963, 36th printing
- DGD - *Das Grosse Duden-Lexikon*, Mannheim, Germany, 1964-1969
- DN - *Dagens Nyheter*, Stockholm, Sweden (newspaper)
- EBM - *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, 1975
- EI - *Encyclopedia International*, Grolier Inc., USA, 1963-1964
- EJ - *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Jerusalem, Israel, 1971-1972
- ENE - *Eesti Noukogude Entsuklopeedia*, Tallinn, 1970
- GSO - *Gyldendals store Opslagsbog*, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1967-1970
- McWD - *McGraw Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama*, USA, 1972
- MEY - *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon*, Mannheim, Germany, 1971-1977
- MWD - Myron Matlaw, *Modern World Drama, An Encyclopedia*, England, 1972
- OXAL - James D. Hart, *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*, 4th ed., New York, USA, Oxford University Press, 1965
- Pan. ed. - Anne Frank, *The Diary of Anne Frank*, London, England, 1975
- RE - William Rose Benet, *The Reader's Encyclopedia*, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., USA, 2nd ed., 1965
- Rottenberg - Dan Rottenberg, *Finding Our Fathers*, A Guidebook to Jewish Genealogy, Random House, New York, USA, 1977
- ST - *Stockholms-Tidningen*, Stockholm, Sweden (newspaper)
- VJ - *Vecko-Journalen*, Sweden, (weekly magazine)
- Wiesenthal - Simon Wiesenthal, *Mördarna Mitt Ibland Oss (The Murderers Among Us)*, New York, USA, 1967
- Alb. Bonniers boktryckeri, Stockholm, Sweden, 1967

For the first part of our book we used the Swedish edition of Ernst Schnabel's *Anne Frank Spur Eines Kindes*. Swedish Edition: Ernst Schnabel, *Vem Var Anne Frank? En bok om flickan som blev en legend*, Lars Hokerbergs Bokforlag, Stockholm, Sweden, n.d., (1958?), 192 pages, translated by Ella Wilcke.

Each chapter (except the "Introduction") - there are twelve of them - has received its own reference. Schnabel 6:84 would therefore indicate, Chapter 6, page 84, of the Swedish edition. Readers should be aware of faulty translations both with Schnabel's book and the so called "diary" of Anne Frank. As far as the "diary" is concerned only the original Dutch version is the authoritative version when it comes to printed matter. The use of an asterisk indicates probable source. A colon indicates page number.

### Front Cover (Figure 1)

Anne's father Mr. Otto Hans Frank holds the *Diary* in his hands. This picture appeared in *Söndags Expressen* of 10 October 1976, page 7. Notice that this *Diary* is neither "small" nor "little" nor does it resemble the *Diary* depicted in the AFFA brochure, page 5. This one has straight corners, the AFFA version has rounded corners. Also, notice the black border around the edge of the first page. Either Anne used a book of condolences as a diary or maybe these pages are photocopies bound into a proper book format?

Photo: Pressens Bild/Photoreporters.

## ABOUT ANNE FRANK AND THE "DIARY"

We are told that: "Attempts to have the diary published after the war were initially frustrated by the unwillingness of numerous publishers" (EJ, Vol.7:54). In spite of this, the first Dutch edition appeared as early as 1947 (BE, Vol.6:450 gives 1946) with the title *Het Achterhuis, Dagboekbrieven van 14 Juni 1942-1 Augustus 1944. Met een inleiding van Annie Romein Verschoor* (Contact, Amsterdam). In Swedish *het achterhuis* has been translated as "gardshuset:" It is reported that a Norwegian, Mr. Thilo Schoder from Kristiansand received the ORIGINAL manuscript from the Jewish writer Anneliese Schutz who was a former editor of the Berlin paper *Die Neue Zeit*. Shortly after Schoder had met Mr. Frank in Holland he went to Norway with the ORIGINAL manuscript in order to get it published but all publishers refused it. The report makes it out as if Schoder had got the original "diary" from Schutz (\*AB, 1957, Feb. 10). The first German translation or transcription (German: *übertragen*, hence not a real translation) came out in Heidelberg 1949 (BE, *op. cit.* gives the date of 1950, 6th ed: 1959) published by Lambert Schneider. The above A. Schutz transcribed it. Full title: *Das Tagebuch der Anne Frank, 14. Juni 1942-1. August 1944. Mit einer Einführung von Marie Braun.* The famous Jewish outfit Fischer Bucherei KG Frankfurt a.M. and Hamburg carried it afterward. In 1955 there is a Fischer Bücherei Nr. 77 edition of it with a foreword by Albrecht Goes. (*Mit einem Vorwort von Albrecht Goes*). This edition was also *übertragen* by Schutz.

EBM, Vol. 4:279 claims the girl was born on 12 June 1929 at Frankfurt am Main (Frankfort) and that the first English edition came out in 1953. However our Cardinal edition states that *Anne Frank: The Diary Of A Young Girl* came out in a "Doubleday edition published June, 1952." Notice how even on the question of dates, conflicting information is presented in standard reference works.

The first Cardinal printing appeared in October, 1953. Our copy (36th printing, August, 1963) has a "preface" by George Stevens and an "introduction" by Eleanor Roosevelt along with an "epilogue". The book has 240 pages in all. We know that along with Anneliese Schutz at least two other persons assisted Mr. Frank. They were: Isa Cauvern and Albert Cauvern. It is alleged that Anne Frank died at the Bergen Belsen concentration camp due to typhus in March 1945 (EJ, *op. cit.*:53). If the purpose was to exterminate all Jews as is alleged we find it most strange why this girl was first sent: "to Westerbork, and then (September 2,1944) to Auschwitz-Birkenau" and that "in December 1944 Anne arrived in Bergen-Belsen with her sister Margot" (EJ, *op. cit.*) a long distance from Auschwitz, not to die of "gassing" but of typhus. All this sort of shipping back and forth seems most incongruous to us if we are to believe the "extermination" stories. How anyone in a time of full scale war; where transportation and food supplies are severely hampered, can proceed in this manner to "exterminate" people is beyond our comprehension. The whole matter reaches the ultimate in silliness when we are further told that the father, instead of being gassed to death, as was the original purpose, ends up with being **hospitalized** at Auschwitz; surviving the ordeal (EBM, *op.cit.*) ! The logic of this would mean that the Germans wanted people to be **healthy** before

[2]

they were sent to the gas chambers ! Mr. Frank's wife died also. He remarried with "Fritzi."

The book has been translated into numerous languages. Some changes have been made from the original Dutch version. A Swedish edition by Lars Hokerbergs Bokforlag, Stockholm, appeared in 1953. A Danish edition appeared in 1956. The Norwegian edition *Anne Franks dagbok* came out in 1952. The Finnish edition *Nuoren tyton paivakirja* came out in 1955. An Estonian edition *Anne Franki paevik* came out in 1958 (ENE, Vol.2:352).

Meyer Levin, who had been a "correspondent" in Spain during the Civil War (1936-39) and later reported the Palestine disorders for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (1945-46) was, according to EJ the "first writer to dramatize *The Diary of Anne Frank* (1952)" (Vol.11:109). Whether the lawsuit brought against Mr. Frank by Levin concerned this matter still remains unknown and unless we can examine the complete, original, trial

records we are only left guessing. In a letter (BR-RH, Nr. 4, Fig. 6) of 27 April 1977, addressed to Mr. Frank where, amongst other things, this matter of Levin was brought up, the father told us (*Ibid.* Fig. 7) first that he would give his full assistance (*Ib.* Fig. 8) and then that he did not want to have anything to do with us in the future !




Fig. 6

The author wrote this polite letter to Mr. Frank and was sharply cut off; see figure 8




Figure 7

Fig. 7

The author wrote to Mr. Frank asking for proof of the *Diary's* authenticity. Mr. Frank wrote back on 22 April 1977 saying that he would do whatever he could to be of assistance.

This was how he signed off. The full letter is reproduced as figure 17.




Figure 8

Fig. 8

Even though Mr. Frank offered (in German) to answer any further questions (figures 7 and 17) he curtailed any further correspondence in this note of 4 June 1977.

In the USA it was made into a prize winning play by Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett. It was produced as a Broadway Play, October 5, 1955, under the title *The Diary of Anne Frank*.

"*THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK* was one of the most highly honored plays in Broadway history. It was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, the New York Drama Critics Circle Award and the Antoinette Perry Award." (Cardinal ed. back cover, see Fig. 3).




Fig. 3

Fig. 2 and 3. Front and back covers of the Cardinal edition of the *Diary*, 1963, New York.  
Observe here how leading personalities and newspapers endorse this fraud without questioning.

Albert Hackett was born in 1900 (OXAL:340). MWD explains:

"Hackett... American play wright, was a young New York actor in 1927 when he started collaborating on plays with a young New Jersey born actress, Frances Goodrich (1890 - 1984). She soon divorced her husband, the notable historian Hendrik Willem Van Loon, and married Hackett. Together the Hacketts wrote a number of popular film scripts... But their only memorable drama, on which they spent years of research and writing, is the skilful adaptation of Anne Frank The Diary of a Young Girl (1947), the moving account of an adolescent Jewish girl who was murdered in a Nazi concentration camp after hiding in an Amsterdam warehouse and office building for two years" (p. 329).

The same encyclopaedia reports further on the play:

"Diary of Anne Frank, The, a play in two acts... produced in 1955 and published in 1956. Setting: a warehouse and office building in Amsterdam, 1942-45... The play, like the diary, has moved audiences all over the world. Both works are bitter-sweet portrayals of a Jewish adolescent under stress, the more poignant because of audiences' awareness of the cataclysmic events outside the warehouse and the gruesome aftermath. Ready to leave Amsterdam after the war, Mr. Frank reveals his daughter's diary. The scene shifts to the hiding place the Franks occupied from July 1942 to August 1944. Arriving in their upstairs hideout, where they can make no noise whatever during the day, Anne decides to think of it as a strange summer resort. She is strongly attached to her father, argues incessantly with her mother, and has a youthful romance with the shy son of the family hiding them. There are joys and heartbreaks, festivals and fights. Just before the hideout is discovered by the Nazis, Anne describes to her young boyfriend the lovely day she sees through the skylight." (p. 207).

We observe two errors here. First, the diary itself does not confirm the state-

[3]

ment that "they can make no noise whatever." Second, the boyfriend, Peter Van Daan, was not the son of the "family hiding them" but the son of the family hiding with them. Another major source writing about this reckless play is the McWD (Vol. 2:222). On the 26th of October, 1956, the play had its premiere in Stockholm, Sweden, at Intima theatre. Some of the actors were: Anne Frank Harriet Andersson, Mr. Frank Hans Straat, Mrs. Frank Isa Quensel, Mr. Van Daan Sigge Furst, Mrs. Van Daan Marta Dorff, Peter Bo Samuelson, Dussel Gunnar Olsson (\*AB, 1956, Oct. 27:3, Saturday). In Denmark the play appeared at Allescenen in 1956 and at Aalborg Teater in 1957 (GSO, Vol. 2:252).

Literally thousands of people have been affected by the play, their tears flooding down their chins. The play is full of distortions where actual events have been faked. The Germans and everything with them are made out as being veritable beasts. The reckless manner in which the play went on in distorting actual events apparently went so far that even Schnabel was forced to give a correction to some of them in his book *Anne Frank Spur eines Kindes*. In October, 1960, students of the Moscow University gave their first performance of the play the Hacketts made. The stage manager was Ivan Solovjov, attached to the Moscow Yermolova theatre (AFFA:20).

George Stevens produced an expensive film in CinemaScope which starred Millie Perkins as Anne Frank. The Twentieth Century Fox brought out the movie *The Diary of Anne Frank* in 1959. The Swedish premiere was on 14-9-1959. According to a news report, G. Stevens invested one million kroner in reconstructing "authentic" settings in which the events took place. Some of the scenes were taken at Prinsengracht 263, Amsterdam, and in the warehouse. Stevens was "permitted to remake the building the way it was at the time," which by the way indicates to us that changes had been made. Most of the scenes however were taken at Hollywood where a copy of the warehouse was made resting on springs, which "enables the building to shake at bomb explosions" (\*ST, 1958, June 30). The film further enlarged on the hate propaganda spewed out by the Zionists against the Palestinians and Germans. It was argued that this little Jewish girl "becoming the symbol of the Persecuted

Jewish child" (EJ, *op. cit*; 54) gave sufficient reasons why the Palestinians must become the victims because of Hitler. Almost no criticism was voiced in the public media against such monstrous brain washing. It would be interesting to know how much money the father has made on these projects. Some have stated it runs into the millions. One estimate has been 20 million DM. (Heinz Roth, *Anne Frank's Tagebuch—Der Grosse Schwindel*). At least one school and a street have been named after Anne Frank (\*AB, 1956, Dec. 12). The Montessori school which she attended was renamed after her (Schnabel, 2:42; AFFA:5).

The AFFA booklet has an article by Henri F. Pommer where he writes of the girl:

*"The legend she founded is the kind her destroyers had tried to wipe out. She is a Jewess spoken of by Germans as a saint; she was an object of hatred, and has become a vehicle of love. In Frankfurt-am Main, a memorial plaque now marks the house where she lived from 1930 to '33, and in '57 her birthday was celebrated in St. Paul's Church .. and the house where she wrote the Diary has been turned into a museum by a group of Christians. In Vienna and Tel Aviv, money has been raised to plant an Anne*

[4]

*Frank forest near Jerusalem. In West-Berlin, a center for social work with young people has been named after her to symbolize racial and social tolerance. In the United States, Anne's twenty five months of hiding became the object of an extremely popular Pulitzer Prize play, and a costly, top notch film. The play, in its turn, produced a wave of philo-Semitism in Germany" (5,6).*

The same writer claims that "Anne has been the object of research leading to a CAREFUL BIOGRAPHY" obviously thereby meaning Schnabel's ludicrous book (6). All this must sound sickening to the readers when we now present evidence the "document" nothing else but a palpable fraud. In order to perpetuate the swindle an organization was created:

*"After World War II an organization in the name of Anne Frank was set up and maintained in the house where the family had hidden during the war. The Anne Frank House serves as a museum and meeting place for youth to further the aims of peace." (EJ, *op.cit*:54; compare \*AB, 1957, Aug. 7).*

A Swedish news report in ST of May 4, 1960\*, states the Anne Frank House will become an international house for youth:

*"As a worthy introduction to Holland's 15 year commemoration of her liberation the famous Anne Frank House at Prinsengracht in Amsterdam was opened on Tuesday after three years reverential restoration. Otto Frank, Anne's father, who partook in the ceremonies became so touched he was unable to complete his speech."*

Apparently not all were equally touched or enthused. The same report continues by stating that some years previously, confrontations erupted between German tourists where some even had the bad taste to sing Horst Wessel's song. To prevent a recurrence, the German customs gave out a circular informing the tourists not to be provocative, stating it would be best if they were to remain indoors on Wednesday and Thursday. A later report states that the Anne Frank Foundation resolved to found an Anne Frank Academy where youths from the whole world could meet to study what could be done to obliterate racial differences and "create better relations between mankind" (\*AB, 1965, Jan. 30). It is claimed by the father and his supporters that the "diary" stands as a living and truthful testimony and as a bulwark against fascism, Hitlerism and neo-nazism. How our exposure that the "document" is a fake will affect this claim remains to be seen. The official *Anne Frank Foundation* (no date) brochure (AFF) states:

*"The Anne Frank Foundation owns the houses at 263 and 265, Prinsengracht. Part of the admission fees, as well as gifts and donations from friends of the House all over the world, are used to maintain the houses... The board of trustees and managing board consist of Jews, Christians and representatives of nonreligious groups of various political convictions. But all of them are united in their vigilance against fascism and they condemn everything that is intolerable according to the Diary of Anne Frank and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."*

We would have hoped they had been equally vigilant against frauds and deceptions. A further reading of this folder clearly indicates that the purpose of the "Foundation" is to foist prejudices against certain groups and to operate as a propaganda tool for the Zionists. Those wanting further information about the "museum" should write: Anne Frank Foundation, 263-265, Prinsengracht, Amsterdam C, Holland, Phone 020 24 28 37 & 24 10 97.

[5]

Apparently not only the warehouse itself but the "entire complex" of surrounding houses was DONATED:

"Twelve years after Anne's death, when her Diary was already world famous, it became known that the owner of the house had decided to have it pulled down. It goes without saying that everything possible was done to prevent this. The owners of the leading Dutch Ladies Juvenile Coat Factory, H. Berghaus Ltd., then made the magnificent offer, that for the occasion of their 75th anniversary, they would donate the house to the "Anne Frank Foundation." But there was yet another danger. There had been talk of pulling down all the surrounding houses, to make room for modern office buildings. Should this have happened, the atmosphere of the house on the Prinsengracht would have been entirely altered. The owners were prepared to sell the group of houses that they had bought on the Prinsengracht, and on the Westermarkt for (350.000. The Mayor of Amsterdam was approached, and proved to be very understanding and helpful. He started a campaign to gather sufficient means to buy up the whole block of houses. In a personal letter and in public announcements, he pointed out that the ATMOSPHERE round the Anne Frank House must be saved, and that it could be made into an international place for young people. Thanks to contributions from all parts of the world, this became possible. Having acquired the entire complex, the Anne Frank Foundation was in a position to carry out structural alterations. The building no. 265 Prinsengracht next door to the Anne Frank House, was united with the original property. The old ground floor store room, mentioned by Anne in her Diary, was rebuilt as a hall where we can receive visitors and hold lectures and seminars. It is of course, a pity that as a result of these alterations staircase A has disappeared and staircase B (see plan of the secret annexe) can no longer be used. The loss of the latter, in particular, is regrettable: this staircase was used after office hours by the inmates of the Secret Annexe" (AFFA:28 9).

In this way the mayor, the Dutch people and a whole world were conned and thus created the Anne Frank Foundation monstrosity.

In a work of this nature where a young girl would reach from 13 to 15 years of age we would expect some stylistic changes to show up. For instance, in the 5th edition of the 38 page, official brochure called *Anne Frank Foundation Amsterdam* (AFFA) we are shown on pages 6 and 10 various photographs of the girl at different ages. Conspicuously we are not shown her handwriting at different ages. Instead the brochure concentrates on unimportant side issues. Surely, several examples of her own handwriting would be relevant here. At the end of the brochure on page 36 we finally are shown an excerpt purporting to belong to Anne Frank (Fig. 13), then 15 years old. Somehow this excerpt, the only one given in the brochure does not fit our conception of a girl at that age. It certainly has no relation to the handwriting found in *Life*, International ed., 1958 September 15 (BR-RH, Nr 4, Fig. 9).



Fig. 9

The cover of *Life* magazine 15 September 1958. This is supposed to be yet another

sample of Anne's handwriting. Compare with figures 5, 10, 12-15.

It appears much more genuine for a girl at that age. The entire Anne Frank case throws up series of questions, all of them becoming more and more suspicious as time moves on. We recall how the father is throwing a blanket of silence on the issue. Why for instance, instead of all these Zionist propaganda and atrocity stories appearing at the Anne Frank House, are we not shown the actual prime source material of Anne Frank? Why is not the actual "diary" exhibited at this center, a place much more fitting for a documentary of this sort than in an alleged bank safe in Switzerland?

[6]

The AFF folder states:

*"2. The Foundation regularly organizes exhibitions on topics which are related to the history of the House: oppression, persecution and discrimination. Examples of exhibitions held by the Foundation include: "Migrant Workers" and 2000 Years of Anti-Semitism". Here, too, guided tours are given to groups if requested."*

It is indeed passing strange why no exhibition has been made showing the actual documents and handwritings of Anne Frank. At least one should expect the "diary" exhibited. But also Anne Frank's other "documents" should be exhibited such as:

*"After the entry of March 29, Anne's expressed desires to be a journalist, and then a famous writer, grew more numerous. [Possibly an invention included in the diary to make it appear she was a competent writer and could have written the diary.] Writing would, she hoped, enable her to live after her death; [More likely the father's wish.] She wrote short stories, even wanting to submit them for publication. Do you Remember?, a collection of fables and little personal experiences, was published in Holland after the diary and has become "something of a minor children's classic." In 1959 its contents became available in English in The Works of Anne Frank" (AFFA:15).*

Why are none of these original documents exhibited? At Kungliga Biblioteket (Royal Library), Stockholm, Sweden, the priceless Devil's Bible of the 12th century is permanently exhibited to all visitors (without an entrance fee) and at Carolina rediviva at Uppsala numerous priceless documents can be seen by all visitors, the most unique perhaps being Ulfila's (311?-381 A.D.) "Silver Bible;" Codex argentius. Apparently Mr. Frank is so little concerned about his "documents" that he has not even bothered to display photocopies of them at the museum!

The Anne Frank Foundation is constantly begging for money. It should have no problem to encase the Anne Frank exhibits in proper display cases. Their refusal to do so should indicate to the careful investigator something is smelling. To further indicate the immensity of the hoax the EBM informs us that:

*"The hiding place on the Prinsengracht Canal has become a museum and SHRINE. In 1957, 2,000 young Germans marched in rain to the camp where Anne had died" (Vol. 4:279).*

If the Anne Frank case should turn out to be a hoax, a thing which we will conclusively prove, it must, in view of its vast undertaking and impact on world opinion, be one of the most flagrant literary hoaxes ever foisted on mankind.

## ACTUAL SIZE OF THE "DIARY"

A perplexing problem which the investigator is faced with is the question as to the actual size of the "diary." The aforementioned AFFA booklet purports to show a picture of it on page 5. Judging from this picture its appearance seems to be a rather tiny diary of modern design. That the "diary" was rather small can be further determined from the statement that she kept it, or it was found inside "exercise books." The folder a Brief Guide To The Anne Frank House (BG:3) states:

*"When Miep and Elly, the loyal friends of the family in hiding, were cleaning up they found the exercise books in which Anne had kept her diary." [Notice singular one diary here.]*

[7]

In order for a diary to be kept inside exercise books we would assume it to be, not only small in width and length but also rather thin. Apparently it was small enough so that she had few problems hiding it from, the surrounding eyes in their "cramped quarters" (AFFA: 9). The father in spite of the cramped living quarters never knew of it until after the war, at least so we are told by some sources. That it was of a smallish size can be further determined from George St evens' "preface" for he calls it "small" and "the little diary SEEN ONLY BY HERSELF" (Cardinal ed.). Another perplexing problem arises now. How can we square this with the fact that a work of this length, stretching to over 230 printed pages in the Cardinal edition, how can it be written in such a "little diary"? We should also remember here that according to the father's own admission not everything written in the diary has been printed (239; AFFA:6). Exactly how much was left out no one can determine unless we are allowed to examine the originals. In the "Gutachten" (expert opinion, Fig. 8) of Frau Minna Becker, an obscure person of Frau Minna Becker, an obscure person we have so far been unable to contact, she calls it "drei festen Tagebuchern I, II, and III," without giving their size. Apparently then from this "expert opinion" there were THREE solid diaries and not one as we are told elsewhere. In such a case there must have been three firm diaries which were enclosed inside the "exercise books" that Miep and Elly found on the floor. The official story given to the world has been that it concerned one diary, not three and indeed only one is shown in the official guide (AFFA:5). How three diaries could have been kept inside the exercise books poses some rather interesting questions. In view of that and for other reasons the one diary story continues to be used. "It took" the father "many weeks to finish reading the DIARY" (AFFA:6) not diaries thereby indicating it concerns one diary. Anne Frank writes herself about "this cardboard covered notebook" (singular) and calls it "a diary" (AFFA:14, Cardinal ed: 2,3). We now move on to a photograph found in the Swedish newspaper *Expressen*. (1976, Sunday, Oct. 10:7; Fig. 1). Mr. Frank is seen there holding the "diary" in his hands, a rather odd picture indeed as the father is holding a large book in his hands. Perhaps it is a photocopy of the original but even then, judging by the size of the replica it certainly was not a small and thin diary unless the pages have been enlarged and a heavy paper is used. It should further be noted that the diary in the brochure (5) has rounded corners whereas in the *Expressen* picture it has straight edges. We are simply left mystified by all these seeming discrepancies.

## THE "DIARY'S" MAKE UP

What sort of cover did the diary have? How many written and unwritten pages did it have? How were the pages fastened: sewn, stapled, taped or glued? What is its total weight? What structure did the paper have? What implement or implements were used to write with: pencil, fountain pen or something else? Was ink or aniline dye used? What color did the writing have? What was the color of the pages where the entries were made? Were the pages lined - if so how? Were things glued or fastened to the pages? Are any telltale marks left in it? Was there any string around the material? Were the corners straight or rounded, etc.? All these questions along with numerous other questions must be asked. Unfortunately, in spite of the fact that the book came out in 1947 we are

[8]

still left guessing and it seems like the father is determined to KEEP investigators guessing. We have already spoken about its size which remains unknown. The photograph in AFFA:5 depicts some sort of a chequered, perhaps plastic covered book, having some sort of key lock provision. Possibly it had a strap on the other side which could be fastened and locked with a key. It seems to resemble a modern diary for children. The corners of the cover are rounded. George Stevens in his "preface" describes it in this way: "Of all the remarkable things about Anne Frank, I believe the most important is the fact of her survival - a survival contained between the cover, of a small red chequered cloth-covered diary book" (Cardinal ed.). It seems that neither was G. Stevens fortunate enough to see the original diary and hi' information about the diary being "red-chequered" and "cloth covered" he likely obtained from the father.

Apparently then it must be a red-chequered, cloth covered diary. Indeed the photograph in the AFFA brochure fits this description nicely. An intriguing question at this moment is to ask not only if any such diaries were available at the store where the father is said to have bought it, if the book depicted is as old as it is claimed to be and whether the photograph is an actual picture of the original diary or some other diary. We can be sure of the fact that the picture has no resemblance to the one shown in *Expressen* which we previously mentioned. A rather peculiar statement can also be gleaned from the "diary" itself for Anne Frank is alleged to have said: "There is no doubt that paper is patient and as I don't intend to show this CARDBOARD COVERED NOTEBOOK bearing the proud name of 'diary' to anyone" (AFFA:14; Cardinal ed:2). Does the AFFA

photograph of a cloth or plastic covered diary with key-lock provision resemble a "cardboard-covered notebook"? Hardly.

The case became further mystified when we on one occasion were told by a Jewish man who claimed he personally knew those who had found the material of the diary SCATTERED on the floor. If this is true, these pages must later have been bound into a book by a bookbinder. The subject is indeed most difficult to unravel. Only by a thorough literal examination of ALL of Anne Frank's ORIGINAL works, a thorough photographic investigation and chemical analysis on the prime source material will we ever know anything at all. Scholars should have insisted on this long ago instead of passing the work off as genuine. Already at its initial stage so many obvious discrepancies are involved that we cannot help but wonder how anyone of any honesty could pass this work off as a genuine product of this girl. Obviously the literary market is virtually inundated by quacks of all kinds. All those experts involved with the case and who have kept quiet are nothing but quacks. The risk today is that Mr. Frank or someone else, being aware of the "document's" real character may rig up some way whereby all future investigations prove futile. Many of those involved at the inception of the hoax are no longer alive making it difficult to investigate vital points. Of course we recognize that even then it would have been a difficult thing to investigate as those involved most likely were in no hurry to talk. Those few critics who dared to voice their criticism were all singularly dismissed for being anti Semites.

## CRAMPED QUARTERS

The AFFA:9 brochure states of Anne Frank and her immediate surroundings:  
*"Often she was difficult to live with."*

[9]

*Tensions were almost inevitable for EIGHT PEOPLE living with SO MANY RESTRICTIONS in such CRAMPED QUARTERS."*

The above mentioned Expressen interview with the Franks confirms this point further by stating they were living "cramped" (vi bodde så tätt tillsammans, p. 6). Obviously this sort of surrounding with "cramped quarters" and "many restrictions" would be anything but a conducive place to secretly start working on a literary achievement of this sort. Another even more intriguing question is how no one, in spite of all these restrictions and cramped quarters knew a thing about her writing the diary, not even her own father? *The Expressen* article (6) states definitely that it was first in 1945, after the father had returned to Amsterdam, that he first read it. The AFFA:13 brochure states:

*"During the twenty five months in the Secret Annexe, the world of her thought WAS A SECRET within a SECRET a SECRET SO WELL KEPT that EVEN HER FATHER confessed, when the Diary was first published, 'I never realized my little Anna was so deep.'"*

Furthermore, George Stevens states in his "preface": "At the same time, Anne was quietly penning her words in the little diary SEEN ONLY BY HERSELF" (Cardinal eel.). Who but the father could have told him this? How can it be that a group of people living under "so many restrictions" and "in such cramped quarters" never knew or saw the diary, a diary filled with entries starting June 14, 1942 to August 1, 1944? The whole thing is preposterous.

## PREVIOUS LITERARY ACHIEVEMENTS

In view of the fact that we are left with a "diary" having the peculiar qualification, qualifying itself of its very existence and being published and as we are told other writings of the authoress have been assembled into a book, it would certainly not be improper to pose the question of her previous literary achievements. We cannot but smile and wonder whether those responsible for the production are trying to find a ready excuse when they state the following as found in the AFFA:13 brochure:

*"It was to BE EXPECTED that LITTLE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE of Anne's talent would be found. When she went into hiding, she was not a diarist worthy of much attention."*

However those responsible in assembling the concoction saw to it that this situation would be rectified. Likely it was also given as an excuse for the fact that so few witnesses could be found testifying her "literary talents." A better excuse could not have been given had it been invented.

## HOW MUCH LEFT OUT?

How much was actually left out from the original diary ? In addition, what was left out ? No one knows but those responsible. Let us quote the AFFA:6 brochure here:

*"It took him many weeks to finish reading the diary; the emotional strain of even a few pages would overcome him. Eventually HE COPIED OUT ALMOST THE ENTIRE WORK, OMITTING ONLY 'some passages which he felt to be too intimate or which might hurt other people's feelings.' He had NO THOUGHT OF PUBLISHING IT."*

Three outright lies are made in one breath here. First, if the father had not been interested in getting it published there would have been no reason for him to "copy out" the diary, much less show it to friends. We also wonder whether Isa and Albert Cauvern who were supposed to have assisted him in typing out the work used the original diary or diaries or whether they took it directly from Mr. Frank's "copied out" copy?

[10]

Second, it is obvious that Mr. Frank did NOT copy "out almost the ENTIRE WORK." Third, the world was astounded to hear several years after 1947, having been told only some intimate passages and those hurting people were excluded that the girl had left a whole selection of writings. The "epilogue" in the Cardinal edition states that: "Apart from A VERY FEW PASSAGES, which ARE OF LITTLE INTEREST TO THE READER, the ORIGINAL TEXT HAS BEEN PRINTED:" How is it then that if only a "very few passages" were left out that would be of "little interest to the reader" that the world later was given a whole book purporting to be her writings. Had the reader suddenly changed his mind, now wanting to read these passages of "little interest"? Margaretha Schwartz who had written the *Expressen* article of her interview with the Franks told us those parts were left out where the daughter talks about sex and her parents. However, the "diary" does contain portions of adolescent sex which no doubt did their part in making the diary popular. So why all the fuss? Unless we are to suspect that the girl in fact went into perverse sex details one wonders why these portions were not also included. The diary is filled with portions where Anne makes rude remarks hurting "other people's feelings" so neither would this be a cause for leaving them out. The important question remains: What was left out? Why was it left out? Why has no facsimile been made of the ENTIRE diary in view of all this time and of all the discrepancies?

## TEENAGE SEX

Another, matter which strikes a reader is that the diary is not the type of story one would want one's own child to write. It is not a KIND story. It is not the sign of a healthy child. Indeed it leaves the air of being a product of someone who tries to invent a child's mind but is unable to do so, sprinkling it with "sexy" portions to sell the story. We need not here go into the various stories circulating that those portions which were left out concerned advanced sex. We find it difficult to believe that this girl, living in such "cramped quarters" ever was involved with these things. We cannot make out why a girl living under these circumstances would be preoccupied with all these "love affairs" at such tender age. In today's promiscuous society it may be an ordinary thing but not during the war. It simply does not make sense to us. Some plausible logic could perhaps be found if viewed from a Jewish moral background where the teachings stem from Talmudic sources. Really WE don't "see the use of only cuddling each other" (17 April-44:188) as Anne is supposed to have written. Read for instance the entries made between 16 April-44 and 17 April-44. It does not give us the impression of being a story written by a young healthy girl but rather the work of some person or persons who are trying to make an issue out of something invented. The story smacks of being a work whose chief aim is to sell and to be used for propaganda purposes. Apparently the "sexy" portions were too much even for some Jews to stomach, and one of the first, if not only group, to voice their objections against the diary, were some Orthodox Jews who felt it gave the Jews a bad moral image. A proper girl would not act in such a way. Whether their objections were based on true moral grounds or for fear that the story was letting the cat out of the bag may be debatable. Talmudic sources are

certainly not foreign to perverse sex. In any case, here we have yet another indication telling us that Mr. Frank's mannerism of accusing all

[11]

doubters as anti-Semites is not based on facts. In this manner he has been able to stop critics from voicing their objections in the open. Some quotations from the AFFA brochure may enlighten us further on this subject of sex:

*"Anne was thirteen when she started her diary. Six months later she regretted not having had her first menstruation: 'Oh, I'm so longing to have one too; she wrote, it seems so important'"(9).*

Further down on the same page it states:

*"Bit by bit, however, these evidences of immaturity and of being difficult decreased. Mixed with them, yet gradually replacing them, came the actions and reactions of a more mature young woman. Probably the most striking measure of these changes is her LOVE AFFAIR with Peter Van Daan."*

We are told that: "Anne's need for a confidant of her own age greatly increased, and she had her first period" (10). Henri F. Pommer, the author of this article, first published in Judaism (A quarterly journal of Jewish Life and Thought, Vol. 9, No. 1, Winter Issue, 1960) assures us further that: "Any diary of a young girl who hid in Amsterdam during the Nazi occupation, who described her first PROTECTED LOVE AFFAIR... might well interest us" (12). He feels that "her AFFAIR WITH PETER is THE MOST STRIKING MEASURE OF HER CHANGE TOWARDS MATURITY" (14). It may be so for H.F. Pommer and his kind but we doubt whether it at all was relevant to the girl in her situation. Likely these "sexy" portions were included to make the product saleable.

## DATE ENTRIES

Perhaps not much information can be gathered by examining the various date entries but the following observations may still be of some help while striking some curious afterthoughts. Starting with June - 1942 we find 6 entries (plus one double entry). July also has 6. August has only 2 entries. It seems rather strange that she should have so few entries at the very time she so enthusiastically sets out to write a diary. One would expect she should have made an entry for almost every day. Seeing we are constantly reminded of "the young talented authoress" and about all her many ambitions to write and to become a great writer we certainly wonder why this "talented" girl made so few entries. It doesn't make sense.

September and October have 6 entries each while November has 8. Then follow 3 months with almost no entries at all. December has only 4 whereas January and February have even less having only 2 entries. We have now entered a new year: 1943. March has a mere total of 6 entries headed up by three more months which again have almost no entries: April has 3, May has 2 and June has also 2. No explanation is given for this most peculiar way of keeping a "diary." One would expect her to give us a hint, not only for the *few* days being entered and also the reason why she did not bother making more entries. We proceed. July has 7, August has 8, September has only 3. October has even less, only 2 entries. November has 5. Compare the last three with the ratio of 6-6-8 for the previous year. December has 4. We now enter into a new year: 1944. For the first time, starting with January we get more than 8 entries. This month has 10 and February has 10 followed up by the grand month of March which has a total of 19 entries, the most entries ever made. Compare this with the

[12]

previous year's identical months and the ratio is 2-2-6. Interestingly enough we now get more entries while the "talented" authoress at the same time advances in her "love affairs" with Peter Van Daan, who like Anne is supposed to be "Jewish" (16 Febr.-44:137). It almost appears as if the "authoress" is trying to make her story more interesting; i.e. more saleable. In April, the month she got so closely involved with "just cuddling each other" (17 April-44:188) and discussing "the most intimate things" (18 April-44:189) we find 15 entries. May has 17, June has 10 followed up by July's mere 4 entries finished off by August's 1 entry, the month she is supposed to have been taken away. Examining this list we are immediately struck by a few entries the talented, productive authoress made, especially in the beginning, while the month of March-44 has the most entries of all, a total of 19. Whether it is only a coincidence that the entries keep increasing as her "love affairs" become more intense we leave unsaid. Nevertheless, we are struck by the fact that so few entries are made and why no explanation is given for this. Just as a last thought before leaving this issue we want to mention a curious fact.

We do not want to quarrel with the authoress but permit us to quote her statement that:

*"At Whitsun, for instance, when it was so warm, [see: 31 May-44:215]. I stayed awake on purpose until half past eleven one evening in order to have a good look at the moon once by myself Alas, the sacrifice was all in vain, as THE MOON GAVE FAR TOO MUCH LIGHT and I didn't dare risk opening the window" (15 June-44:222).*

We must state here we feel this time was a most unwise choice for her to "have a good look at the moon for once." The moon had previously passed its new moon stage, entering into a half moon with the moon furthest away according to almanacs for 1944. We were not at Amsterdam in those days to know if the moon AT ALL WAS VISIBLE; nevertheless, the passage that "the moon gave far too much light" seems rather odd.

## USE OF NICKNAMES

The use of a constant barrage of nicknames may fit an American audience but hardly a polite, German family from which the Franks (German Jewish) came. That a child, and a girl at that, should go so far as to call her own father by a nickname would be worse than an insult to the father. Nevertheless, this American practice of being "cute" crops up continuously in the diary and the authoress calls her own father by his nickname "Pim" (Compare: 28 Sept.-42:30, 1 Oct.-42:33, 27 Feb.-43:59). Whether the nicknames are found in the original we do not know but if they do appear, they indicate the girl was a spoiled brat whose parents had neglected to inculcate common courtesy. No decently brought up child would have used these nick names. Possible they may be interpolations.

## THE GASSINGS

For many of us who were formerly staunch believers and propagators of the "Holocaust" and "gassing" stories it may be of interest to find out what the diary has to say on this subject. On Friday, 9 October-42:34-5 the entry was made:

[13]

*"Our many Jewish friends are being taken away by the dozen... We assume that most of them are murdered The English radio speaks of their being GASSED."*

We should observe here that none of the Franks were "gassed" or "murdered" but like thousands of Germans died of sickness. Anne herself is said to ' have died of typhus. Also, on 13 Dec.-42:54 she reports seeing "two Jews" walking by, indicating they moved freely in spite of her previous statement they were "being taken away by the dozen." Interestingly a Swedish news report of 1963 mentions that Karl Silberbauer, the man who had arrested the occupants, knew nothing about those he had arrested being sent to gas chambers (at German concentration camps. H, is alleged to have said: "We were rather surprised to learn that it was written in The Anne Frank Diary about Jews being gassed to death. How did the girl know about this secret?" (ST, 1963, Nov. 22). As we can see there is a logical explanation to this. The Franks were apparently constantly listening to the radio programs coming from England. Likely they had plenty of time to listen to the radio seeing they had little else to do. The English radio programs were constantly sending out gruesome propaganda stories about German atrocities being committed and seeing the Franks hated the Germans they took of course these fictitious stories to be the truth. A.R. Butz reports in his revealing book *The Hoax Of The Twentieth Century* that the rabble-rouser, Thomas Mann, had already in December 1941 on BBC broadcasted that: "In German hospitals the severely wounded, the old and feeble ARE KILLED WITH POISON GAS - in one single institution, two to three thousand, a German doctor said" (1977:174).

After further investigations most of us now recognize that we have been hoodwinked. The whole thing was a bluff concocted mainly by the Jewish propaganda machine. On Thursday, 3 February-44:133 another entry is made where those in the "Secret Annexe" (S.A.) are supposed to have said:

*"Out of the question, the English HAVE ALWAYS TOLD THE TRUTH over the wireless. And suppose they do exaggerate the news, the facts are bad enough because you can't deny that many millions of peace loving people were just simply MURDERED or GASSED in Poland and Russia."*

What better propaganda tool could the winning side ask for than *The Diary of Anne Frank!* Those wanting further information on the gas chamber, subject should consult: A.R. Butz, *op. cit.*, Institute for Historical Review; Richard Harwood, *Did Six Million Really Die? The Truth At Last*, also available in Swedish as *Dog Verkligen Sex Miljoner?*, ISBN 91 85560 50 2; Sionismen det Dolda Fortrykhet, ISBN 91 85560 510; Thomas Mann, Deutsche Horer! Fundundfunfzig Radiosendungen nach Deutschland, Bermann-Fischer Verlag, Stockholm, Sweden, Zweite, erweiterte Ausgabe, 1945. It was the Jewish, Bermann-Fischer Verlag who later brought out the Anne Frank "diary" in German and who succeeded in hoodwinking a whole world on it being an authentic document.

## DAVID'S STAR MAGEN DAVID

Apparently in order to make a big issue out of the wearing the "yellow six pointed star" the diary makes it out as if it was the Germans who originated the idea of the star and of Jews wearing it. A

[14]

footnote states after the statement "Jews must wear a yellow star" that: "To distinguish them from others, all Jews were forced by the Germans to wear, prominently displayed, a yellow six pointed star" (20 June-42:3). We are told "the gaudy yellow star spoke for itself" (9 July-42:14; compare: Dussel wearing it on his coat, 17 Nov.-42:45). The AFFA brochure has three pictures on page 18 where the star is displayed. Observe however the first picture on the left and you will find in the center of the picture the Magen David prominently displayed in a "Jewish" religious service. The truth is of course that the Magen David has for a long time been; besides the Menorah - a candelabrum having seven (or nine) branches - the most prominent Jewish symbol. In fact it was the Jewish leaders themselves who demanded that Jews wear it prominently and proudly. More than six years before Jews were forced to wear the star by law the editor of the Zionist weekly *Juedische Rundschau* was the first to coin and make popular the slogan about the yellow star which Jews were later forced to wear: "Wear it proudly, the yellow badge" (*Tragt ihn mit Stolz, den gelben Fleck*; compare EJ, Vol. 7:493, 10:463. The same encyclop. has six pages of Magen David.) If the Red Cross could display a cross, the Nazis their swastika, the Salvation Army their emblems, etc., there seems little reason why Jews could not wear their most cherished emblem without being hurt. Indeed, the very first issue of *Die Welt*, Herzl's Zionist journal, bore it as its emblem. "Israel's" national flag (formerly Zionist) maintains the Magen David as its symbol. At a huge gathering and pageant "The Romance of a People" in Chicago, July 3-4, 1933, the six pointed star and the white flag of Palestine with the two blue bars and this same star in between was most prominently exhibited (Inquire Within, *Trail of the Serpent*, The Christian Book Club of America, Calif., USA, 1969: 114-16.). Seeing most people are unaware of these facts the Zionists have used it as evidence of their cruel persecution. The Jehovah's Witnesses who had never stated they would proudly wear a sign were forced to wear one. In their case it may be said they were punished in wearing a sign but certainly not the Jews who themselves wanted to wear it. Had Hitler meant to shame the Jews he could have forced them to wear the traditional dunce's hat. He would hardly ask them to wear their most cherished symbol if he had meant to punish them by wearing it. Possibly these parts about the "yellow star" are interpolations or at least some of them.

## HATEMONGERS AND WARMONGERS

We learn a lot about the diary's real intention when we observe how it looks at those who lost the war. The diary has been heralded as the most truthful document coming out of the Second World War showing the cruelties of the German people under Hitler. Obviously one of Mr. Frank's and his cohorts' chief aims was to perpetuate hate against the Germans; make it out as if the Jews were the only real sufferers of these tragic events while giving an excuse to the world for the Jews' to barbarically evict the Palestinians from their homeland. The main reason why a world stood quietly by, abetting, encouraging or fence watching the Jews as they invaded Palestine in the greatest

[15]

racket and insidious scheme ever perpetrated on mankind, was because they were constantly being reminded (through Jewish propaganda who *ruled*, and still rule, who owned, and still own, the mass media) about such cases - the pivotal example being Anne Frank. Through books, newspaper articles, condensed articles in magazines, movies, dramas, school plays, records, tourism and other schemes the world got brainwashed hearing about Anne Frank, and still keeps hearing about her. That is why the "legend" of Anne Frank must never die. If it falls and dies the whole Zionist conspiracy will fall with it. "If you don't support us," they remind us, "you are just as cruel and guilty as those blasted Germans who railroaded, Anne Frank to her death and six million other Jews." The shout never dies. It must never die. And which sensible person would want that to happen to anyone, much less a child !

When these points are recognized the entire machination behind the Anne Frank diary takes the pro portion of one gigantic, sickening 'example of how the "God's chosen people" take revenge on their critics. In this spirit the diary says the "English have always told the truth" (3 Feb.-44:133) whereas the Finns are "silly fools" (27 June-44:224). The "Internationale" is heralded with enthusiasm (10 Sept.-43:97). So are the "extra" communiqués "from Stalin" (31 March-44:171). No less so is the knowledge that the "Bolsheviks really are on the way" (27 June-44:224). As can be expected the worst lot are the Germans, those who made Jews wealthy in the first place. The Franks had themselves made their wealth in Germany. Possibly they came from poor Khazar background, whose family later moved into Poland, Galicia, Hungary or Austria. The name Frank (also Franck) is an Ashkenazi name meaning "Franconian" (Rottenberg: 218). Like so many a poor Khazar they soon recognized that Germany was their "Promised Land." They just were not satisfied with part of the "milk and honey" until ALL was theirs. Possibly most of Mr. Frank's hate against the Germans could be explained by the fact that unless some people get all the cake they start screeching to the high heavens blasting out they are being unjustly treated. MEY and DGD under "Frank" report that he was a banker. The diary is quite revealing on the fact that the Franks were wallowing in wealth while in Germany:

*"Dear Kitty, Have I ever really told you anything about our family? I don't think I have, so I will begin now. My father's parents WERE VERY RICH His father had worked himself right up and his mother CAME FROM A PROMINENT FAMILY, who were ALSO RICH So in his youth Daddy had A REAL LITTLE RICH BOY'S UPBRINGING, parties every week, balls, festivities, beautiful girls, dinners, a large home, etc., etc. After Grandpa's death all the money was lost during the World War and the inflation that followed Daddy was therefore EXTREMELY WELL BROUGHT UP and he laughed very much yesterday when, for the first time in his fifty-five years, he scraped out the frying pan at table MUMMY'S PARENTS WERE RICH TOO and we often listen open-mouthed to stories of engagement parties of two hundred and fifty people, private balls and dinners One certainly could not call us rich now, but ALL MY HOPES ARE PINNED ON AFTER THE WAR" (8 May-44:202; compare: 20 June-42:3).*

[16]

Anne's big wish about getting rich was realized in her father who in unison with the Zionist cause had long before decided that after Germany's fall they should not only relentlessly smear the Germans but that they at the same time should make money out of it. And what a gold mine it proved to be. Anti-German films are still big incomes to the warmongers and hatemongers. We are told that Anne is glad for that Hitler "*took away our nationality long ago*" (9 Oct.-42:35) and she reminds us that "*In fact, Germans and Jews are the greatest enemies in the world*" (*Ibid.*). "*The justly famous Diary*" (AFFA:2) has other examples of hate against the Germans: "*It would be much easier and more advantageous to the Allies if the impeccable Germans kill each other off*" she is claimed to have said (21 July-44:234). She feels that "*Only a small percentage of Dutch people are on the wrong side*" (29 March-44:171). The one good thing when food gets worse is "*so sabotage against the authorities steadily increases*" (*Ibid.*). "*Speak softly at all times, by order! ALL CIVILIZED LANGUAGES ARE PERMITTED, THEREFORE NOT GERMAN!*" (17 Nov.-42:46)!

In any case, the Germans are "*THE CRUELEST BRUTES THAT WALK THE EARTH*" (19 Nov.-42:48). In typical priestly hypocrisy this diary and its created Foundation will help and teach mankind "to attain the humility which alone can make us want to listen to our fellowman" (AFFA:3). We find it exceedingly difficult to believe that a healthy girl at her age can be so possessed with hate and apparently even worse portions of this kind can be found in the uncensored material seeing we are told some passages were excluded by Mr. Frank which he felt "might hurt other people's feelings" (AFFA: 6). We are willing of course to concede that a young child, having been thoroughly brainwashed by Talmudic ideals may end up with numerous aberrations of which these are some examples but even then this seems a bit farfetched. An investigation of the prime source material may shed some light on whether these portions are mere concoctions of some other author or authors or whether she in fact wrote them.

## A QUIET RACKET

One of the most peculiar contradictions in the book is the matter of noise. On the one hand we are led to believe that the group of eight Jews are under constant danger, risking their lives. Quietness was an absolute requisite for the group to survive. On the other hand we note from the diary the constant racket they made and the boisterous atmosphere. It was by no means extraordinary but seems to have been the order of the day. The "Van Daan Product" (17 Nov.-42:45) called "Prospectus And Guide To The 'Secret Annexe'" informs that those residing there must "speak softly" (46); yet, the real culprits of the lot when it came to causing a racket were the Van Daans themselves. Here is another example from the diary which does not tolerate noise:

*"Continuation of the 'Secret Annexe' daily timetable. As the clock strikes half past eight in the morning, Margot and Mummy are jittery: 'Ssh... Daddy, Quiet, Otto, ssh... Pim. 'It is half past eight, come back here, you can't run any more water; walk quietly!... Not a drop of water, no lavatory, no walking about, everything quiet. As long as none of the office staff are there, everything can be heard in the warehouse" (23 Aug.-43:95)*

[17]

Clearly then: "everything can be heard in the warehouse." However we do not go far to find that the very opposite is the order of the day; the Van Daans apparently taking the lead:

*"Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan have had a TERRIFIC QUARREL. I'VE NEVER SEEN ANYTHING LIKE IT BEFORE. Mummy and Daddy would never dream of SHOUTING AT EACH OTHER" (2 Sept.-42:22).*

The diary is replete with the constant quarrelling between the Jews. In another place Anne states:

*"There have been RESOUNDING ROWS between Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan... The YELLS and SCREAMS, STAMPING and ABUSE YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY IMAGINE IT WAS FRIGHTENING. My family stood at the bottom of the stairs, holding their breath, READY IF NECESSARY TO DRAG THEM APART. ALL THIS SHOUTING AND WEEPING and nervous tension are so unsettling and such a strain, that in the evening I drop into my bed crying, thanking heaven that I sometimes have half an hour to myself" (29 Oct-43:100).*

It seems as if the biggest problem was the Jews themselves and not the Nazis. The matter is so bad that Anne is made to say some pages after:

*"We are all getting on well together FOR A CHANGE!... we haven't had such peace in the home for AT LEAST HALF A YEAR" (22 Dec.-43:109).*

Unfortunately the problem persists. On Saturday, 15 January-44:122 she reports:

*"There is no point in telling you EVERY TIME the exact details of OUR ROWS AND ARGUMENTS."*

Apparently she is no better herself for she says:

*"I... throw my weight about the place, am NOISY AND BOISTEROUS, so that everyone wishes that I was out of the way" (27 Feb.-44:142).*

We are left wondering. If the group of Jews was in such a danger, how is it that they never got detected and how could they be so boisterous ? Perhaps the most peculiar piece of information we can gather from the diary is when we are told that the girl has a "craze for dancing and ballet at the moment" and that she "practices dance steps every evening diligently" This was as late as 12 January 1944 120-1. Equally peculiar is the information that, Peter chops wood and performs "acrobatics round the room with his cat" (10 Dec.-42:52). We would believe that under the circumstances, if the story is to be believed at all, these sorts of activities should be totally prohibited at any time. Likely they do give us some insight into the actual circumstances, indicating to us

that the story about a group of Jews in hiding for the very lives is an exaggeration.

## BURGLARS COMING

In view of the fact that we are being led to believe the Germans were constantly searching the houses and making razzias all over Holland it may come as a surprise for readers to know how little the diary mentions actual German raids in their own home. In fact the diary itself contains no specific instance of Germans plundering their home. We first hear of Germans (Austrians ?) searching their home on August 4-1944 (239). Even then, the house itself was never plundered but only certain documents may have been searched for and confiscated and as the story indicates, the diary, along with a pile of other material was left unconfiscated. The major problem was not the Germans

[18]

nor those Dutch who had sided with the Germans, but the indigenous (possibly also Jewish) Dutch groups and individuals who were constantly committing burglaries, stealing from the homes. (Compare 10 March-43:61, 25 March43:65, 16 July-43:79, 4 Aug.-43:86, 1 March-44:143, 11 April-44:177-9, 15 June-44:222). Anne's statement that "it is not the Dutch people's fault that WE are having such a miserable time" (AFFA:8) seems rather strange. If the burglars who came to their home were not Dutch they may have been Jews which would hardly make the case more sympathetic.

## SOME FURTHER PECULIARITIES

It is clear that those responsible for the "diary" are from the outset hoping that the readers are qualified idiots. We have already shown how the readers are expected, without any hesitation, to swallow its contents no matter how absurd the story may sound. In this respect those responsible seem to have been fully satisfied. Countless simpletons have swallowed its "message" as a dry sponge sucks up water. We shall continue to give more examples of this fact but before we do so let us get some background of Mr. O.H. Frank's business activities. In her "convincing" attempt to explain to us "why" the "diary" was written, Anne gives the following details about her father:

*"My father was thirty-six when he married my mother, who was then twenty-five. My sister Margot was born in 1926 in Frankfort on Main, I followed on June 12, 1929, and, as we are Jewish, we emigrated to Holland in 1933, where my father was appointed Managing Director of Travies N. V. This firm is in close relationship with the firm of Kolen & CO. in the same building, of which my father is a partner. In 1938 after the pogroms, my two uncles (my mother's brothers) escaped to the U.S.A. (20 June 42:3).*

We detect obvious interpolations in this quotation. Nothing will convince us unless we are allowed to examine the original records, that young Anne, under this date, should have written an historical genealogy of her family. The swindle is far too apparent. Let us examine another point more closely. The diary makes out as a matter of fact, that as they were Jewish, they "emigrated to Holland:" The statement is absurd for several reasons. First, if it was a matter of fact that Jews already as early as 1933 should emigrate why did not all Jews do so? We would expect that at least the wealthy should have taken this opportunity particularly in view of the fact they had the freedom to do so. Often it was the poor Jew who emigrated, not the wealthy. Second, why did the "two uncles" remain in Germany? Not until 1938 did they escape to the USA. Third, why did not the Franks also escape to the USA? Having escaped Germany before the uncles they seemingly should have been more aware of the risks that the uncles who remained in Germany up to 1938. Fourth, we know that even after Hitler took power, 10,000 Jews immigrated to Germany between 1933 37. In 1937, of 1,200 immigrants, 97 came from Palestine! The story now becomes rather interesting when we know this fact. First, the reason given for their immigration to Holland in 1933 "as we are Jewish" becomes foolish in view of this fact. Second, we must now ask the question, why did the Franks emigrate? Mr. Frank is preciously silent about himself and about the details we would want him to explain before we would accept his story. What really were his activities and how exactly did he, his family and relatives acquire their huge

[19]

wealth? It is pity Mr. Frank has not let us know more about himself. After coming to Holland the family was still well off. Anne writes:

*"Yes, WE ARE LUCKIER THAN MILLIONS OF PEOPLE. It is quite safe here, and we are, so to speak LIVING ON CAPITAL"* (13 Jan.-43:56, compare 8 May-44:202).

Perhaps this explains why the family did not bother to "flee" to the USA, Switzerland or elsewhere. About the business Anne informs us that:

*"Daddy has been at home a lot lately, as there is nothing for him to do at business; it must be rotten to feel so superfluous. Mr. Koophuis has taken over Travies and Mr. Kraler the firm Kolen & Co."* (5 July-42:11)

The big concern for the father was to avoid their private belongings being seized by the Germans, for as Anne tells us:

*"We don't want our belongings to be seized by the Germans."* (11).

If it is true that the Germans were incessantly hunting for JEWISH belongings we start to wonder. Along with the Franks there were four other people. Why, of all places did the father choose to make a "hiding place" out of the very same building where he had his own business office (9 July-42:14)? The building was also supposed to have been a storage place for spices. The place was therefore not only an office but also a warehouse for Mr. Frank's spices for as the AFFA brochure itself wants to remind us: "It is important to know that Mr. Frank was trading in spices at the time, and that the SPICES WERE STORED IN THE WAREHOUSE" (27). The argument that may be brought up that others were now running the business explains nothing as Jews were allowed to work; the "Jewish chemist and dispenser" who worked at their business proves this fact. The whole story about the "Secret Annexe" reaches the point of absurdity when we remember the above facts. How could the Germans, who were after the Franks and others, and whom, we are told, so meticulously searched out all secrets leaving nothing undone, have missed the "Secret Annexe" or even the whole house for that matter? What glories are left of this "document" are smothered when we examine these points. If the SS had "sent a call up notice for Daddy" (8 July-42:12) as Margot said; why would Daddy decide to move into HIS OWN OFFICE? He could hardly have chosen a more unsuitable place. While at this point, not even from their own Jewish people could they feel safe for it is reported:

*"The days are becoming very quiet here. LEWIN, a small JEWISH chemist and dispenser, works for Mr. Kraler in the kitchen. He knows the whole building well and therefore we are always afraid that he'll take it into his head to have a peep in the old laboratory. We are as quiet as mice. Who, three months ago, would ever have guessed that quicksilver Anne would have to sit still for hours and, what's more could?"* (1 Oct.-42:33).

Could it be that Jewish Lewin was peacefully working at the warehouse for the same reason that thousands of Jews were left untouched also in Germany during the entire war? The fact that this Jewish person worked there makes the whole story the more fantastic. May not the fact the Franks chose their own office and warehouse as their "hiding place" indicate to us how lenient the Germans in fact were about the Jewish questions at the time? We may just as well believe that Frank's real reason for not moving to the warehouse was not on account of the Germans but so that they could prevent burglaries

[20]

which according to the diary constantly occurred. It may also be that Mr. Frank wanted to keep an eye on the new storekeepers, Mr. Kraler and Mr. Koophuis. Thus the story about the "Secret Annexe" may just prove to be an invention for the real underlying cause: In order that they could keep an eye on their business. However, it is not enough that we are to accept this drivel about the "Secret Annex" story.

Please bear with us now as we unravel yet another fabulous tale from our "document:" The following is reported:

*"You'd never guess what has happened to us now. The owner of these premises has sold the house without informing Kraler and Koophuis. One morning the new owner arrived with an architect to have a look at the house. Luckily, Mr. Koophuis was present and SHOWED THE GENTLEMEN EVERYTHING EXCEPT THE "SECRET ANNEXE. "He professed to have forgotten THE KEY OF*

*THE COMMUNICATING DOOR. THE NEW OWNER DIDN'T QUESTION ANY FURTHER. It will be all right as long as he doesn't come back and want to see the "Secret Annexe" ; because then it won't look too good for us. (27 Feb:-43:60).*

First we are to believe that the owner sold the house without prior inspection of the premises he was selling, then, that he had not informed those renting the warehouse about it being for sale and later sold. We are further expected to believe that the new owner buying the house did not inspect it before buying it. If that isn't asking the readers too much they are now on top of it all supposed to swallow the notion that neither the architect, who should have seen the blueprints of the house, nor the new owner was interested in inspecting the entire warehouse! Why for instance, did they not get suspicious about the "cupboard" in front of the door (21 Aug:-42:21) and that the step in front of it had been removed (21)? More of this in our next heading. That the new owner should be so disinterested in an entire section of his newly bought warehouse seems incredible even if we were to accept that he shortly afterwards would see to it that keys were available so he could enter the place. Several more questions should be asked. What about cigarette odors? The males inside the "Secret Annexe" smoked (except Peter). Plenty of food was stored in the attic like peas, beans and 150 cans of vegetables (Nov:-42:42). Sausages were also stored there (10 March-43:61). Would not the new owner wonder why all this food was stored there? Even if the original diary did contain this section we still must question the story's credibility. While we may believe in "God's providence" we still feel the "document" seems a bit farfetched.

## THE MYSTERIOUS DOOR

We now come to another rather puzzling matter; that about the entrance, the door that leads into the "Secret Annexe." All visitors to the Anne Frank House are constantly reminded about the ingenious "swinging bookcase" which constituted the actual entrance. The "mystery door" no doubt puts an air of suspense and excitement over it. We are in no position to know whether this is but a story that was made up afterwards and whether it at all existed during their alleged confinement. But in view of all these discrepancies some observations are relevant. The first time we meet it, it is described as "that plain grey door":

[21]

*"A wooden staircase leads from the downstairs passage to the next floor (B). There is a small landing at the top. There is A DOOR AT EACH END OF THE LANDING, the left one leading to a storeroom at the front of the house and to the attics. One of those really steep Dutch staircases runs from the side to the other door opening on to the street (C). The RIGHT-HAND DOOR leads to our "Secret Annexe." NO ONE WOULD EVER GUESS that there would be so many rooms hidden behind THAT PLAIN GRAY DOOR. There's a little STEP IN FRONT OF THE DOOR and then you are inside" (9 July-42:15).*

Let us pause here for a moment before we move on. Why would a girl who had left to go to Holland from Germany in 1933 (20 June-42:3) and who was then ONLY ABOUT FOUR YEARS OLD talk about "one of those really steep Dutch staircases"? Let us not talk about the fact that a girl would hardly speak in this way but the statement becomes rather ludicrous when we remember that she hardly would have had a chance (and interest) to compare the Dutch staircases with other countries'. Furthermore, why improve the entrance door seeing that "no one would ever guess that there would be so many rooms" hidden behind "that plain grey door"? Would then not an alteration of it only bring forth some real causes for suspicion? We will go more into this point as we move on. Let us however continue on with the next description; the alteration of the actual entrance into the "Secret Annexe" which was supposed to be an improvement in spite of the above objections we have raised:

*"THE ENTRANCE TO OUR HIDING PLACE HAS NOW BEEN PROPERLY CONCEALED. Mr. Kraler thought it would be better to put a CUPBOARD IN FRONT OF OUR DOOR (because a lot of houses are being searched [observe not for Jews but stolen goods, Anne's own bicycle had previously been stolen: 24 June-42:7] for hidden bicycles), but OF COURSE [why of course in view of the above?] IT HAD TO BE A MOVEABLE CUPBOARD THAT CAN OPEN LIKE A DOOR. Mr. Vossen made the whole thing. We had already let him into the secret and he can't do enough to help. If*

*we want to go downstairs, we have to first bend down and then jump, because THE STEP HAS GONE. The first three days we were all going about with masses of lumps on our foreheads, because we all knocked ourselves against the low doorway. Now we have nailed a cloth filled with wool against the low doorway. Let's see if that helps!" (21 Aug:-42:21).*

Bear in mind now what our previous quotation stated. When the new owner along with his architect inspected the premises they were shown EVERYTHING except the "Secret Annexe." We were told that Mr. Koophuis "PROFESSED TO HAVE FORGOTTEN THE KEY OF THE COMMUNICATING DOOR." But not only had the actual door gone, having been replaced by a "cupboard" but the knowledge that such a door existed was supposed to have been a secret. In spite of this, if we are to believe this story, the two gentlemen had no difficulties in observing "the secret hiding place"! Two photographs of the contraption with the "swinging bookcase" are shown in the AFFA brochure (27). The fact remains that we were told that this improvement was made specifically TO HIDE THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A DOOR! So how could Koophuis have told them he had forgotten the key to a door where there was no door? The whole nonsense becomes apparently ludicrous when we remember the point, that what Koophuis was doing, was, that he in fact is supposed to have said that he had no key for an *open*

[22]

"bookcase" to be opened, which bookcase in the beginning never had a keyhole but could only be opened from the inside! (BG:2). Let Mr. Frank and his likes try to untangle the dilemma. This information makes us wonder whether there at all was such a "secret entrance door." It may have come up afterwards to make the story more dramatic and credible. It would place an air of mystery and excitement over the story.

This is not all by a long stretch. Mr. Vossen, Elli Vossen's father (9 July-42:15) who by this time is supposed to have been let in on the secret is allegedly the one who "made the whole thing." Would not an awful racket have been caused in making such an alteration? Remember the girl admits that:

*"There are some large business premises on the right of us, and on the left a furniture workshop; there is no one there after working hours BUT EVEN SO, SOUNDS COULD TRAVEL THROUGH THE WALLS. We have FORBIDDEN MARGOT TO COUGH AT NIGHT, although she has a bad cold . . It is the SILENCE that frightens me SO IN THE EVENINGS AND AT NIGHT ... We have to WHISPER AND TREAD LIGHTLY during the day, otherwise the people in the warehouse might HEAR US."*

Ironically in the next sentence the girl says: "Someone is *CALLING ME*" (11 July-42:19). Now, someone may object Mr. Vossen did his carpentry work in the evening or at night. But note the above citation of the noise problems that "even so" after working hours the noise could travel through the walls. When Margot, in spite of her having a "bad cold" was not allowed to cough even AT NIGHT we are indeed left confounded. The story's fabric simply does not make sense. Alterations were apparently also made by making the entrance smaller. We must now ask ourselves about the owner of the house. The warehouse had not yet been sold to the new owner so the alterations were made prior to the house being sold. What would the owner think if he saw this contraption? Had he not been suspicious before he certainly should have wondered where his former door had gone, not to speak about an entire part of his warehouse. What he now would see was only a "cupboard" in front of him. What about the "Jewish chemist and dispenser," Mr. Lewin, who knew "the whole building" (1 Oct.-42:33)? Would he not have wondered about where the door had disappeared? Where the "step" had gone? And what about all the others who did know the house, who were working there or paid the house a visit? What about all the repairs that went on with the house, the repairs that went on with the toilet inside the "Secret Annexe"? What about the fire department and others who had a right to inspect the premises? In view of all these facts it would seem that this "secret door," instead of helping them, would have been one of the silliest inventions they could have made. They would have run the risk of being even more easily detected (if that really was of any importance to them). On this premise and on relevant points we may safely dismiss the "secret door" story. It may simply have been conjured up by those wanting to capitalize on a story. If part of the story is true we must say they only have to blame themselves for being caught having made such a foolish invention that could do nothing else but throw suspicion

## FURTHER DOOR DIFFICULTIES

Seeing that the story about the "hidden door" has an important bearing on the amount of fabric of truth

[23]

in the story we would benefit by examining this problem a little further. It is claimed in the BG:3 leaflet: "From the day of arrest until now the ANNEX HAS BEEN LEFT UNCHANGED." However, there are plenty of evidences indicating the citation is a bald faced lie. If the entrance has been altered, then the perpetrators of the hoax have tampered with the *most* important part of the "Secret Annexe" story. In their twisted mass of lies and half truths the perpetrators of the hoax may argue that what has not been changed concerns, not the entrance, but what was behind the entrance. If so, they only prove their own impudence. Besides, we have no reason to believe that what was behind the entrance has not also been altered to a greater or lesser degree. In a news report in \*ST, 1958, June 30 ("Anne Frank Pa Film"), it is stated that George Stevens who produced the film *The Diary Of Anne Frank* for Twentieth Century Fox was "permitted to bring the building back to its previous condition" at the time they lived there. Clearly then the building, including the "Secret Annexe" has been ALTERED. Schnabel reports that when he visited the premises the bookcase had been removed. Where it was he does not state. In fact he leaves all important questions out or tries to excuse them. He states that only the warped hinges remained (5:78). Again, another testimony (for what it is worth), showing alterations had been made. Really this tells us nothing. His observation that the warped hinges were the only things left, is no proof that they belonged to a moveable bookcase. They may just as well have belonged to that "plain grey door."

Let us continue now with the GB leaflet. It states about the door:

*"THE DOOR LEADING INTO THE ANNEX WAS SO CLEVERLY CONCEALED FROM THE OUTSIDE BY THE BOOKCASE which Anne describes in her Diary that NO ONE COULD SUSPECT THAT IT EXISTED. The door was HELD IN PLACE FROM THE INSIDE BY A HOOK which could ONLY BE UNFASTENED BY THE INMATES OF THE ANNEX. It is beyond this door that the annex really begins." (2).*

Here we have an official description of the contraption. However as already stated, the door was so easily detected by the new owner (apparently he did not even ask if there was a door there) for he had asked that the door be opened even though it had no keyhole and could be opened only from the inside!

Even the "carpenter, or whatever you call him" who came to "fill" the "five fire extinguishers in the house" (20 Oct.-42:37) apparently knew there was a door there. The carpenter who had "knocked at our door," the story tells, thus indicating there was a DOOR there, was unable to get in. Later Mr. Koophuis came and said:

*"Open the door, it's only me." Our story continues: "We opened it immediately. THE HOOK WHICH HOLDS THE CUPBOARD, WHICH CAN BE UNDONE BY PEOPLE WHO KNOW THE SECRET, had got jammed That was why no one had been able to warn us about the carpenter. The maid had now gone downstairs and Koophuis wanted to fetch Elli, BUT COULDNT OPEN THE CUPBOARD AGAIN" (Ibid.).*

The story is indeed confusing to say the least for here it seems to indicate that the door could in fact be opened from the OUTSIDE by those who knew the secret. Possibly by some type of contraption the cupboard was fastened to the door. By removing the cupboard the door could be opened from the outside

[24]

outside. This seems to be a logical explanation. However, if so, the door to the annex has not "been left unchanged." Today it is a whole, swinging unit. That the door could be opened from the outside maybe further indicated from the following:

*"Then Miep went upstairs with Dussel under the pretext that the private office was needed for something, OPENED THE SWINGING CUPBOARD, and stepped inside before the eyes of the dumbfounded Dussel." (17 Nov.-42:45).*

Likewise the following may indicate this:

*"Kraler comes helter-skelter up stairs - a short, firm knock ON THE DOOR and in he comes rubbing his hands" (Aug.5-43:88; regarding the "swinging cupboard" compare April 11-44:178 and July 8-44:228).*

The preceding indicates also it may have been a "plain grey door" (9 July-42:15) and nothing more. Compare also the remark that "the police rattled the cupboard door" (11 April-44:180; compare 183). Here is confusion galore!

Frankly the story of the Franks does not convince us and we want to be frank with Mr. Frank that unless he comes up with some real sound explanations that can be tested and verified the whole story of "Anne Frank" seems most suspicious. Why for instance did the carpenter who was to fill the five fire extinguishers not demand to get into the annex? It happened on 20 Oct.-42. Not before 4 Aug.-1944, were they detected yet we are to believe no more inspections were made after this. It seems only reasonable to conclude that at least one of the inspectors came inside the annex. The fact that an entire part of the building was completely closed to them should have brought questions in their or his mind. The man or men, we should not forget, may very well have seen the place before. If so, would not the alterations have seemed most strange? An investigation into the actual handwriting may give us additional clues. Until then we must regard the story as pure fantasy, mingled with whatever bits and pieces of truth there are.

The AFFA:27 brochure states that: "The 'Secret Annexe' BEHIND the bookcase is just as it was" thereby perhaps giving them a safeguard, indicating the thing IN FRONT; i.e. the door itself has been altered to make a dramatic thing out of something quite ordinary. Two more points should be considered before we leave. If Schnabel is right in his assumption it seems as if the bookcase was supported by hinges for he reports that when the "corporal" pushed the bookcase it gave way, stating (he is citing Kraler's letter to him) "perhaps the hook had not been properly fastened" (8:125). This is contradicted again by the very same "corporal" in an article we have before us where the corporal is quoted as having said that one of the men pushed away the bookcase. No mention is made of it being on any hinges. Interestingly enough the article also mentions that Karl Silberbauer, the name of the "corporal" termed it a *high* bookcase placed in front of the opening (\*ST,1963, Nov. 22). Possibly then the entrance had not been made smaller and the bookcase which is there today is an altered product. No honest person can put credence in these constantly shifting stores besides it would be impossible with all the numerous factors contradicting each other. The swindle is obvious. It is up to us to try and join the pieces together so we can determine where the truth possibly may lie. Much more we cannot do under the circumstances and in view of all the

[25]

alterations that have been made.

## THE SECRET ANNEXE

Another invention seems to be the explanation: "why the German police could not see the house lying at the back, through the warehouse windows." It is claimed that the Germans got so bewildered and confused due to the "topography of the house" and so they missed it. They claim: "The Germans must have felt the same, especially as this type of building was quite unknown to them" (AFFA:27). The essence of the assumption is that we are made to believe the police were Germans and being Germans and unused to Dutch homes they missed the "Secret Annexe" of the warehouse. Apparently Mr. Frank had made George Stevens believe that the Gestapo, "Sergeant Silverbauer, of the Green Police, and four subordinates" were Germans and "Nazi soldiers" whose "mission was to destroy" (Cardinal ed: preface). The information Schnabel gives in his book flatly contradicts this. There, no mention is made that their "mission was to destroy" and it is evident by reading his book that nothing in the warehouse got destroyed. Rather we are told the group was quietly allowed to take their belongings with them. The leader told them: "You got plenty of time" (8:130). Kraler was even allowed to fetch his sandwiches while Miep was allowed to telephone (8:130 1). The information the AFFA brochure gives of the Germans being so confused on account of the warehouse topography is neither convincing nor is it supported by other information the Foundation and Mr. Frank have given out. What would indicate to us that only the GERMAN police would search the homes? The explanation they give was likely invented so they could stifle sound objections. In almost every instance the diary refers to the POLICE it refers to the DUTCH police, not the German Gestapo (Compare 29 March-44:171, 11 April-44:179 81, 6 May-44:200). The indigenous Dutchman was the main group of the police. Outsiders did of course supervise investigations but it was still the Dutch themselves who carried out the search.

Apparently Anne could equate the Gestapo with the Dutch police. She writes that she "could see us all being taken away by the Gestapo" (11 April-44:179) and being "questioned by the Gestapo" (Ibid: 180).

However she recognizes these to be Dutch people for she writes:

*"I prepared myself for the return of the POLICE, then we'd have to say that we were hiding; THEY WOULD EITHER BE GOOD DUTCH PEOPLE, then we'd be saved, or N.S.B.-ers, then we'd have to bribe them." (Ibid.)*

Hence the AFFA's argument becomes ludicrous. The Franks knew most of the police were Dutch and the Dutch people were well aware of these types of houses (Compare Schnabel 8:128). Even Schnabel confirms the fact that the police were Dutch. In Kraler's letter to Schnabel he mentions four policemen only one of which was "Green" police.

Schnabel calls the "Green" policeman "Silberthaler." George Stevens in his "preface" calls him for "Silverbauer:" A news report in \*SI, 1963, Nov. 22, calls him "Karl Silverbauer," an Austrian, hence not a German (Compare Schnabel 6:96). The article states further that Silverbauer took 8 DUTCH police with him. Surely then, to Dutch people there was nothing unusual at all about this particular house. The BG leaflet states definitely that:

[26]

*"The house as it stands today was built in 1635 IN THE STYLE OF THAT PERIOD. In view of the transportation facilities existing at the time, IT WAS BUILT LIKE MANY OF THE AMSTERDAM MERCHANTS' HOUSES, beside a canal so goods could be brought by boat to the doorsteps" (1).*

Does this not indicate there was nothing unusual about the construction? We have already mentioned it seems farfetched how an entire part of the house on the second and third floor can disappear. On the third floor the kitchen and laboratory were located. Inside the "Secret Annexe" was also located a toilet which pipes went down to the toilet below; another reason indicating to us that fictitious inventions have been given to "explain" the story. Far from the construction being anything unusual, *The Christian Science Monitor's* (1977, July 4:23) article "Amsterdam: where the Frank family hid from the Gestapo" states:

*"The Anne Frank House at 263 Prinsengracht... Nor is it a house, really. Their hiding place was the back section of a canal bank building where Anne's father, Otto Frank, had operated a spice import business. (MANY CANAL BANK STRUCTURES ARE LONG AND NARROW, WITH A FRONT SECTION OVERLOOKING THE CANAL AND AN "ACHTERHUIS" BACKHOUSE fronting on a court yard or street.) From the outside, the Anne Frank House LOOKS LIKE HUNDREDS OF OTHER STRUCTURES THAT LINE AMSTERDAM'S 70 MILES OF CANALS."*

The "explanation" therefore which the official booklet gives does not support known facts. Rather it seems to be given as a smoke screen for gullible believers.

## COVERED WINDOWS

We have brought up several objections that have completely shattered the veracity of the Anne Frank story. The "document" is clearly a swindle and it rests on a hodgepodge of confusion and conflicting claims. But we need not end here. Let us investigate another most perplexing issue. It is related to what we just previously have written. The issue concerns the argument that the "Secret Annexe" could not be seen "through the warehouse windows" and so the "German police could not see the house lying at the back." The point is emphasized that the windows "from the little landing" were covered with "paper with a chequered pattern" which "had been stuck onto the window panes, to keep out the daylight." Let us quote the important place exactly as it appears in the official AFFA brochure:

*"Perhaps a few extra explanations would be helpful at this stage. You may be wondering now perhaps, why the German police could not see the house lying at the back, through the warehouse windows. Everyone knows that the entrance to the "Secret Annexe" from the little landing was hidden behind a swinging bookcase. But even so, why couldn't the Annexe be seen through the windows? It is important to know that Mr. Frank was trading in spices at the time, and that the spices were stored in the warehouse. Spices must be kept in the dark and to save hanging curtains, paper with a chequered pattern had been stuck onto the window panes, to keep out the daylight. Therefore, although you saw*

*windows, you could not see through them, and everyone took it for granted that they overlooked the garden. Perhaps this does not strike you, looking at the plan, but as you wander through the house, with all its passages, steps, doors and stairs, you will have soon lost your idea of the topography of the house."*

A similar claim is made in the BG leaflet:

[27]

*"Leaving the documentation rooms you enter A SMALL RECESS which is, in fact, the connecting passage between front house and backhouse. (See Plan fig. 3). On the right hand side you will see the window which looks onto the inner courtyard. THE PANES STILL BEAR TRACES OF THE PAPER WHICH WAS PASTED ON TO PREVENT LIGHT FROM SPOILING THE SPICES. THIS MEANT, OF COURSE, THAT THE ANNEX WAS HIDDEN FROM THE PRYING EYES OF UN AUTHORIZED VISITORS" (2).*

Several problems arise however with this explanation. The "little landing" (AFFA:27), "small landing" (9 July-42:15) or "small recess" (BG:2) was hardly the place used where Mr. Frank would store his spices, therefore, there was no reason to cover the panes with anything. Spices are usually kept in drawers, wooden containers, jars or cans, thereby protecting them not so much from light as from giving out odors and absorbing odors. That the "little landing" was used as a storage place is ludicrous, to say the least, as very little could be stored there. Fire regulations would further require that nothing be stored there and that the place should be kept clear and bright. It would hardly be advisable to keep these panes covered as the spot was generally well shaded due to the surrounding high walls. Covering the panes would only necessitate that artificial light would be used. In turn, that would throw suspicion, for people on the outside could then see the light. Keeping the windows uncovered would have been best. We will also point out that if Mr. Frank stored his spices there, the only place apparently where the windows were covered in this way, he would have gone broke as an importer of spices or he would have to receive his income from other sources. There are other arguments in favor of our conclusion. Why, for instance, were not the windows in "the large office" which was "very big, VERY LIGHT, AND VERY FULL" (9 July-42:15) covered with paper? If darkness was of so much importance to Frank why did he not cover those windows where the spices were located instead of covering windows where they were not located? If he really was worried about the light why then did he not keep his spices in the: "small DARK ROOM containing the safe, a wardrobe, and a LARGE CUPBOARD leads to a small somewhat DARK SECOND OFFICE" (*Ibid.*)? Would these places not have been more appropriate? No mention is made that any spices were kept here (Compare 7 Dec.-42:51). If so, the introduction on pp. 14 17 would have been an excellent place to tell about it. No mention is made in this introduction that even one spice was kept at the "little landing." The photographs in the AFFA booklet (27) show office files. Seeing no spices were kept there why cover the panes? Why were just the panes at the "small landing" covered? Anne says:

*"We are very nervous in other ways, too, that neighbors might HEAR us or SEE SOMETHING GOING ON." (11 July-42:19; compare this with Schnabel 6:101 where he says "suddenly the tree outside rattled by a wind gust and a distant car was heard." If noises penetrated the walls of the warehouse so easily it would have been suicidal to move in there.)*

In other words, the windows could hardly have been covered with papers. They let the sun shine in "through an open window in the attic" (21 Aug.-42:22) where food was stored. Schnabel says that from the attic one could watch into the rooms on the other side (5:82). If one could do so then those people could also look into the windows of the warehouse. The "front office" where apparently most spices were kept was,

[28]

as we have already indicated, a "very light" room. Margot and Anne had later chosen the "front office" for their scrubs and Anne says:

*"The curtains there are DRAWN ON SATURDAY AFTERNOONS, so we wash ourselves in semi darkness" (29 Sept.-42:32). She wrote later. "I'm sitting cosily in the MAIN OFFICE, LOOKING OUTSIDE through a slit in the curtain. It is dusk but STILL JUST LIGHT ENOUGH TO WRITE TO YOU" (13 Dec.-42:53).*

We shall go further into the windows being covered afterwards but sufficient is to say that the above information is rather peculiar if Frank really was so concerned about his spices being protected from light. Could

it be that the explanation about the panes at the "little landing" being covered came up in order to make the story more credible and dramatic about the "Secret Annexe"? It seems to us, if Frank really was so worried about his spices he ought to have been much more concerned about cigarette smoke which really affects spices. Yet he never did anything about that and he himself smoked. It becomes clear that Frank's reason why the German police could not see the "Secret Annexe" does not make sense. It does however give us another important clue that the story is a conglomeration of fact and fiction, mostly fiction. Likely the story about the panes being covered was invented afterwards to throw action and suspense on it and to ward off possible objections. The real reason of course why the German police could not find the "Secret Annexe" was simply due to the fact they hadn't bothered to search the place. If you don't search for a thing it is logical you don't find it. When at last they did look for it, they also found it. So simple may the truth be. So simple in fact that few people have thought about it.

## SOMETHING MORE THAN SMOKE SCREENS

Another devastating blow to the story is our knowledge that the adults apparently were heavy smokers. Some points that may be touched on are: Odor the risk of detection, visible signs of smoke, fire risks, police finding a storage of tobacco, telltales, and the fact that people starving would hardly spend their money on tobacco. Before we briefly touch on these points and the risks they entail let us see how the family were standing on the matter of tobacco.

*2 March-44:145, Peter "told me how often his parent quarrel over politics, cigarettes, and all kinds of things." 14 March-44:154: "Mr. Van Daan: 'I must smoke and smoke and smoke...? ... But if he hasn't anything to smoke, then nothing is right."*

That Van Daan seems to have been a chain smoker is quite obvious. However, even Mrs. Frank smoked for Anne reports of her mother saying:

*"If I were Mrs. Van Daan I would have put a stop to Mr. Van Daan's EVERLASTING SMOKING a long time ago. But now I MUST definitely HAVE A CIGARETTE, because my nerves are getting the better of me."*

Apparently all the adult male members smoked. Anne reports of Dussel, Mr. Van Daan and her father that these "gentlemen puff at their pipes" (27 March-44:168). Later on she writes: "The men smoked non stop" (11 April-44:180). Under the same date she writes Miep and Henk brought them "cigarettes, tobacco, an ash tray" (182, compare 8 May-44:203). On June 16 -44 she reports that Mrs. Van Daan was *afraid that her husband is*

[29]

*smoking all the fur coat money away" (223).*

Above citations settle the issue. Heavy smoking went on inside the house. Let us now reflect for a moment. The issue of "odor" brings up the question why Mr. Frank, being so concerned about the light and his spices at a place where no spices were stored; why he was not equally concerned about his spices being affected by tobacco odor and smoke. And what about the odor leaving a telltale sign of people being there? Surely, if hiding was the great issue involved, the smell of tobacco would give them away sooner or later. Why did Mr. Frank choose Mr. Van Daan and Dussel as co dwellers knowing they smoked? The house could be raided at any moment. The "Prospectus and Guide To The Secret Annexe" stated that "Alcoholic Beverages" were allowed "only with doctor's prescription" (17 Nov.-42:46). No mention is made of tobacco being prohibited. All smokers and conscious non smokers are aware that tobacco smoke causes quite a lot of visible smoke. Here we have another reason indicating to us the inmates were not particularly bothered about being detected. The noise of tobacco coughs is obvious. Telltale signs of ashes, ash trays, cigarette butts, matches etc. would indicate people were living there. The fire risk is obvious, particular in a warehouse which had a laboratory. The risk of the police finding a storage of tobacco is equally obvious. Why people who really are in need and risking their very lives would spend their money on tobacco is equally strange. Their sufferings seem most luxurious. Indeed the "Secret Annexe" story appears positively unconvincing. No thinking persons in danger of their lives would take such obvious risks.

## WINDOW, WINDOW, ON THE WALL WHAT IS BEHIND YOU ALL?

Here we shall ponder over the points why only the panes at the "little landing" were covered with paper, where no spices were stored, whereas apparently, all other windows were never covered with paper in spite of spices likely being stored there. We will also ponder over how people, especially the police, could avoid noticing them living there. The credibility of the story receives further blows when we consider the fact that it would have been simply impossible to avoid noticing them. We shall make some quotations from the diary, interrupting here and there with brief comments. The quotations speak for themselves.

20 Oct.-42:378: "*There was only one small interruption. Daddy's lamp blew a fuse, and all of a sudden we were sitting in darkness.*"

Would not outsiders have noticed the lamp?

*"Miep and Henk Van Santen stayed over for the night."*

Could not observers have noticed they had entered the house but never left it?

*"Peter was given a "lighter" on his birthday." (9 Nov.-42:42).*

Would that have been a wise choice in view of the light causing attraction; besides the fire hazard?

28 Nov.-42:49: "*We have used TOO MUCH ELECTRICITY, MORE THAN OUR RATION. Result: the utmost economy and the prospect of having it cut off. No light for a fortnight; a pleasant thought, that, but who knows, perhaps it won't happen after all ! It's too dark to read*

[30]

*in the afternoons after four or half past. We pass the time in all sorts of crazy ways... Yesterday evening I discovered something new: to peer through a powerful pair of field glasses into the LIGHTED ROOMS of the houses at the back. In the daytime we can't allow even as much as a centimetre's chink to appear between our curtains, but it can't do any harm after dark. I never knew before that neighbors could be such interesting people. At any rate, ours are. I found one couple having a meal, one family was in the act of showing a home movie; and the dentist opposite was just attending to an old lady, who was awfully scared."*

This can be compared with Schnabel where he mentions about the same thing and says that one can look from the attic into the rooms on the other side (5:82).

7 Dec.-42:50-1 we learn that for Chanuka, candles were lit. Observe what Anne writes:

*"Because of the shortage of candles we only had them alight for ten minutes, but it is all right as long as you have the song."*

Would lighting candles and SINGING A SONG be wise if they were hunted like animals?

10 Dec.-42:52: "*Pim, who was sitting on a chair in a beam of sunlight that shone through the window... Peter was doing acrobatics round the room with his cat... Mummy was ironing.*"

Besides the fact that the window panes were clear we notice the noise of Peter performing "acrobatics" while his mother was ironing, perhaps using an old fashioned iron that had to be heated over the fire.

About Dussel, Anne writes:

*"He makes me furious, on Sundays especially, when he turns the light on early to do his EXERCISES. It seems to take simply hours." (22 Dec.-42:55).*

10 March-43:61: "A short circuit" interrupted the family "last evening." Candles were instead used. However the shooting outside provoked the father to extinguish it. The mother felt otherwise:

"Mummy jumped out of bed and, to Pim's annoyance, lit the candle. When he complained her answer was firm: 'After all, Anne's not exactly a veteran soldier.' And that was the end of it."

Further down on the same page it says:

"Peter went up to the attic with a torch."

18 May-43:72: "Mummy shut the window last night because of all the banging... Pim turned on the lamp."

Would not the opening and closing of windows at nights when no one was supposed to be inside the warehouse attract suspicion?

4 Aug.-43:86: "Half past eleven. The bathroom door CREAKS. A narrow strip of LIGHT falls into the room."

Peter offers himself to look into the "main office" where most of the spices were kept and Anne writes:

"He crouches in front of the door to make himself as small as possible and crawls towards the steel lockers on hands and knees, SO AS NOT TO BE SEEN FROM OUTSIDE" (20 Aug.-43:95).

An almost similar happening is reported by Schnabel, only that it was Anne who crouched so that no one COULD SEE HER FROM THE ROAD (6:102). He reports also that Elli's father later looked into the warehouse through the windows but he could see no one inside (8:139). Clearly the windows were not covered to protect the spices.

[31]

23 Feb-44:141, Anne "looked outside right into the depth of Nature. 19 March-44:159: "After the dishes were done, I stood by the window in his parent's room awhile for the look of things, but it wasn't long before I went to Peter. He was standing on the left side of the OPEN WINDOW, I went and stood on the right side, AND WE TALKED. It was much easier to talk beside the open window in the semidarkness than in bright light, and I believe Peter felt the same."

Would standing by an open window and talking be a wise thing to do?

20 March-44:161, Peter said: "Then we'll go downstairs," he answered, 'and look at the moon from there. " 11 April-44:183: "Peter isn't allowed to have his window open at nights any more."

18 April-44:189: "Our chestnut tree is already quite greenish and you can even SEE little blooms here and there."

27 April-44:191: "Next, it's... that we can't look out of the windows."

Clearly the windows WERE NOT COVERED with paper.

27 April-44:193: "At half past eight I stood up and went to the window, where we always say good bye. . . And what do I have to face, when I reach the bottom of the staircase? BRIGHT LIGHTS, questions, and laughter."

Staying beside windows and bright lights doesn't seem fitting for people in hiding.

31 May-44:215 it says at a time of heat wave: "on Tuesday the windows could be opened again at last... in the afternoon when the windows had to be closed... windows can't be opened, and we, wretched outcasts, sit here suffocating."

Windows were thus opened and closed at will. The trouble was not the police but the temperature.

15 June-44:222: "as the moon gave far too much light and I didn't dare risk opening the window... I went downstairs all by myself and LOOKED OUTSIDE THROUGH THE WINDOWS in the kitchen aced the private office... Alas, it has had to be that I am only able except on a few rare occasions to LOOK at nature THROUGH dirty net curtains hanging before very dusty windows."

After reading all this, we must like Anne ask ourselves the question: Are these people really supposed to be hiding?

She writes on July 8-44:227: "*People can't see in from outside because of the net curtains, [hence not because the windows were covered with paper] but, even so, the LOUD VOICES AND BANGING DOORS positively gave me the jitters. ARE WE REALLY SUPPOSED TO BE IN HIDING?"*

Anne asks herself this question in her fourth. last entry. We ask ourselves the same question.

## WHAT ABOUT THE BLACKOUTS?

We shall here briefly consider the "blackouts" at the premises. We have already observed that not only could one look OUT through the windows but people from the outside could also look IN. Blackouts were usually set up to conceal lights that might be visible to enemy air raiders at night. Warehouses of the sort that the Franks lived at were not in need of blackouts as people left the premises before the night came. Blackouts would have indicated to others there were people living at the premises. Anne writes that "*Daddy improved*

[32]

the poor blackout" (10 July-42:18), thereby suggesting to us that warehouses of this sort did not need blackouts and if they had they were poorly made, perhaps only used for special emergencies.

On August 4-43:85 Anne writes that before the Van Daans went to bed, Mrs. Van Daan's bed

*"is shifted to the window... in order to give Her Majesty in the pink bed jacket fresh air to tickle her dainty nostrils!"*

Apparently Van Daan's large window did not have a blackout. It seems however that they were put up inside Mr. Frank and Anne's room for Anne's room had also a window (Compare Schnabel 5:79). The blackouts were put up at ten o'clock p.m. (4 Aug.-43:85; Compare 10 Aug.-43:91, 11 April -44: 181). We are now faced pondering on two problems.

First, the lights at the Van Daan's would have been observed from the outside. Opening and closing the windows at will would be further indications that people were living there. Their kitchen stove, throwing out light would be another clue to outsiders. Peter had a flashlight If artificial light were not used, which by the way they had used above their quota (28 Nov.-42:49); candles were used.

Second, the "Secret Annexe" had windows on all sides. If the blackouts were put up at such a late time the neighbors must have seen the lights previous to them setting up the blackouts. It is impossible to believe that no people would observe the light coming from their windows. We remember that Anne got hold of a pair of binoculars and was able to see a "*couple having a meal, one family was in the act of showing a home movie; and the dentist opposite was just attending to an old lady, who was awful scared!*" (28 Nov.-42:49). What tells us that these people could not have had binoculars and look into their windows? The dwellers at the warehouse may also have shown movies. We read for instance of that their "projector" had "disappeared from the cupboard" (1 March-44:143). We have evidence, for whatever the "evidence" is worth in the "diary," that films were shown in Anne's home. On 25 June -42:1, Anne writes: "*We showed a film The Lighthouse Keeper with Rin Tin Tin, which my school friends thoroughly enjoyed.*" This was prior to their moving into the "Secret Annexe" but even after moving into the warehouse, films may have been shown. The putting up and down of the "blackouts" must sooner or later have been observed by the people. They should have seen that lights were no longer visible from the place or visible in a different way. How could their neighbors, noticing all these activities, possibly miss observing there were people living in the warehouse? It seems next to incredible. In view of all these observations it is obvious that the "Secret Annexe" story simply doesn't fit facts. Evidently the story has been highly dramatized for what otherwise would have been a most dull and ordinary diary. What the family underwent was no different; and in several ways as the diary itself indicates they had it a lot better, than any ordinary Dutch family in Holland who also may have written diaries. Even if the story was not stripped of all its fertile exaggerations one wonders how it could reach such fame and world wide acclaim. Only through an unscrupulous, uncritical mass media in the hands of certain clannish people using their willing henchmen as

tools could it have reached such fame.

## CARPENTERS AT WORK

In view of the fact we are told even the

[33]

slightest noise could be heard (remember Margot was even forbidden to cough at night although she had "a bad cold" 11 July -42:19) all over the house, through the walls, into the next buildings on both sides, one wonders how carpentry work and chopping wood could be possible. The blackouts were made of wood: "In the evenings ALL THE WINDOWS were blacked out; the visitor can still see the BOARDS which were used for this purpose" (BG:3). *"On Tuesday morning we went on where we left off the day before"* Anne reports, and adds: *"Daddy improved the poor blackout; we scrubbed the kitchen floor."* (10 July-42:17,18).

That would certainly have involved making a noise. We further learn that Peter usually did carpentry work: *"Peter... does a bit of carpentry."* (21 Aug.-42:22). About one and a half years later it is still reported he does carpentry: *"Peter didn't come to me in the attic. He went up to the loft instead and did some carpentry."* (28 Feb.-44:142).

It even reported that Peter chops wood:

*"NEARLY EVERY MORNING I go to the attic where Peter WORKS... From my favorite spot on the floor I look up at the blue sky and the bare chestnut tree, on whose branches little raindrops shine, appearing like silver, and the seagulls arid the other birds as they glide on the wind ... We remained like this for a long time, and when he had to go up to the loft to CHOP WOOD... then he CHOPPED WOOD for about a quarter of an boon... I watched him from where I stood, he was obviously doing his best to show off his strength. But I looked out of the OPEN WINDOW."* (23 Feb.-44:140).

Now, if Peter perhaps daily chops wood, with the window open one would expect the noise carried not only to their own buildings on the sides but also onto the street outside. Likely the wood was used for their stoves) and perhaps "wood shavings" were used for Mouschi - the cat (10 May-44:205). Mr. Vossen had done the carpentry of the "secret door" to their "Annexe" (21 Aug.-42:21). It should not be necessary for us to point out that carpentry work, the chopping of wood etc., involves no mere whispering noises but a racket. If they truly were in hiding and so concerned about noise, how is it they could have allowed all this racket occurring nearly every day?

## THERE IS NO FIRE WITHOUT SMOKE

Another perplexing question is how this group of eight people managed keeping themselves so out of sight for over two years in spite of the fact that we are told the Gestapo and their henchmen were constantly looking for suspects while this group continued on with daily routine chores in a most ordinary way. There were for instance several stoves in the warehouse. One of the reasons for the "five fire extinguishers in the house" (20 Oct.-42:37) was probably for precautions against stove fires. Besides heating, the stoves would be used for cooking, baking, frying and burning refuse. They had to be lit for these purposes and kept burning which in turn would throw off possible lights besides keeping a chimney smoking. Van Daans' stove in particular was used for cooking, frying and baking. Fried potatoes were apparently much enjoyed for Anne tells us that, "we," thereby meaning her family and not the Van Daans, "fry our own potatoes" (15 Jan.-44:123). Seemingly they had "fried potatoes" daily (25 May-44:213). Besides causing smoke from the stoves, cooked and fried foods cause noises, smoke and odors. Even when it was

[34]

warm outside they lit fires. Perhaps Anne speaks of their own stove when she writes:

"Although it is FAIRLY WARM, WE HAVE TO LIGHT OUR FIRES EVERY OTHER DAY, IN ORDER TO BURN VEGETABLE PEELINGS AND REFUSE. We can't put anything in the garbage pails, because we must always think of the warehouse boy. How easily one could be betrayed by being a little careless." (18 May-43:72).

However "being a little careless" is indeed stating it lightly when it comes to this group. Boys are usually by nature very inquisitive and one would think the warehouse boy would have wondered even more how it came that the "plain grey door" suddenly disappeared. For instead of a door he would now see a bookcase! Fire produces ashes. We presume the ashes were not stored inside the house over two years. Fire causes smoke, which someone, if not the warehouse boy, sooner or later would have noticed. The above quotation seems also strange when we remember fires were lit not "every other day" but every day for making food and in the winter time we assume also for keeping their rooms warm. The group was often sick - keeping the rooms cold would only worsen the situation. The above quotation, or part of it, may not be the original text. "*Porridge*" (25 May-44:213) we suppose necessitates cooking and a fire. "*Corn*" must be cooked (3 Feb.-44:131). "*In the evening we always have potatoes with gravy substitute.*" Anne writes, and they even made "dumplings" (3 April-44: 173-4). They baked. (*Ibid.* 174) How could they make all this without fire? Anne says they "*have sufficient coal and firewood in the house, also candles.*" (3 Feb.-44:132). We do not of course mean by this that the gas stove was not also used in making food (Compare 20 Aug.-43:95). Eight people is quite a number however to be fed by just a "gas ring."

Now there is no fire without smoke. Not only would the smoke have been noticed but also the keeping of plenty of firewood and coal. Possibly in order to avert some of the above objections an answer is given which to us seems rather invented. This is how they explain it:

*"This room served a threefold purpose: it was Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan's bedroom... and kitchen. The STOVE which we can still see here was used for COOKING and for BURNING REFUSE. The STOVE COULD BE SAFELY used by the inmates of the annex BECAUSE THE NEIGHBORS KNEW THAT THERE WAS A SMALL LABORATORY SOMEWHERE IN THE BUILDING."* (BG:3)

In examining their answer we notice it does not fit known facts. Anne reports herself it was the "gas stove" which was used in the laboratory. No mention is made here of another stove using coal or fire even existed (9 July-42:16-7). A gas stove in a small laboratory would hardly cause all that smoke. In any case it seems fairly certain the small laboratory was seldom used. A well used laboratory would certainly have been reported to the authorities who were afraid of partisans making ammunition and fire bombs. We also wonder what neighbors thought when seeing a chimney smoking at the most odd hours and at times when people were not supposed to be even present in the laboratory. The answer they give above does not convince us. It seems like pure fabrication. This matter about the laboratory, supposedly well known with the neighbors, makes one also wonder why the group chose this place for their "hiding." A place where a laboratory is located seems to us to be a very stupid

[35]

place to choose for a hiding place in war times if "hiding" really was the matter that troubled them. Likely this was not their prime motive; hence they felt they could choose staying at a laboratory even though they knew it may be raided and searched at any given moment. Another stove may have existed inside the "Secret Annexe" besides the one that the Van Daans had. It may have been this one Anne wrote about when she says:

*"Tomorrow we are going to light the fire for the first time. I expect we shall be suffocated with SMOKE. The chimney hasn't been swept for ages, let's hope the thing draws."* (29 Oct.-42:39).

If she meant Van Daan's stove then the above quotation does not make sense for then the refuse would not have been burned and the warehouse boy would have noticed it seeing it was reported as late as Oct. 29 and by this time they had lived there for over three months. Likely it was their own stove which she tells about when she wrote of "*Daddy's bedroom slippers warming in front of the fire*" as "*in bygone days*" (28 Jan.-44:129). At that time the winter was on. The stove where her father was to throw her discourteous letter may have been their own stove (7 May-44:201). The same may be for the case when the wood shavings were burned which Mouschi had urinated on (10 May-44:205). The contents of her entry of Nov. 11, 1943:104 when she reports of her fountain pen being thrown into the fire along with other refuse definitely makes it appear they had a stove in the father's room. From all this contradictory writing it is not easy to make out how things really were at the time.

The fire and smoke issues do give us additional evidence that the story is greatly exaggerated with many portions being outright fakes.

## SOMETHING MORE THAN JUST GETTING MAIL

We suppose, after having read all this from the diary and related sources, that the readers wonder, in view of the Dutch police and the German Gestapo's total inability to notice the group of eight people, how they could catch anyone at all. It would seem that they would not even be capable of catching a fly if the story is true. We will now further enlarge on our reasons for believing it to be a hoax.

If we are to believe the diary we are supposed to accept the fact that the group of eight people received and expected mail during the week. It is reported that Mr. Van Daan at "Quarter to six" is downstairs in "Kraler's room" where "Van Daan is looking in all the drawers and portfolios to find the DAY'S POST." (20 Aug.-43:94). Strangely enough under the same date, although mentioning Elli going upstairs with Anne to do the shorthand course, no mention is made of Eli bringing up the mail to them. Instead we find Van Daan downstairs looking for the day's post. Elli had previously "written to some secretarial school or other and ordered a correspondence course in shorthand for Margot, Peter and me." Anne reports (1 Oct.-42:33 4; about shorthand compare 17 Nov.-42:46, 27 March-43:66, 11 July-43:75, 13 July-43:78, 19 March-44:159).

Here is how they allege that Margot's Latin lessons were handled: "The Latin lessons MARGOT SENDSIN are corrected by a teacher and returned, Margot writing in Elli's name." (17 Nov.-43:105). How the shorthand lessons were handled we are not told. Perhaps Elli Vossen, "a twenty-three years old typist." (9 July-42:15) who later "worried . . over her engagement, which" was "not al-




Fig. 2




Fig. 4

Extracted from the Cardinal edition, 1963. What would first arouse any investigator's curiosity is the bit about "Apart from a very few passages... the original text has been printed." How do we know ? Will Mr. Frank produce the original manuscript so that we can check out this claim ?




Fig. 10

Yet another example of Anne's handwriting; this time from the German edition of the *Diary*. Compare with the other styles.




Fig. 11-1




Fig. 11-2

This flyer is given out to visitors at the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam.




Figure 12

Fig. 12

From Kindlers Literatur Lexikon, Kindler Publishers, Zurich, 1965, volum 1, page 64. This is

supposed to be a reproduction of the very first page of Anne's original *Diary*. If this was the size of Anne's writing, is it possible that a "little (handwritten) diary" could contain the same amount of material as a 237 page printed book ? Also, look at the corrections and alterations in another handwriting. Whose is it ? Why were these corrections made ?  
(Author's arrows.)





Fig. 14

Extracted from the British edition: Pan Books, London, 32<sup>nd</sup> printing, 1975. This same excerpt appears in the American Cardinal edition, as shown in figure 5 [see below]. But notice the line which appears here under "Frank". This does not appear on the American edition. Who removed it ? Also, why does this 12 June 1942 entry not appear in the printed edition/s ? Who deleted it and why ?



210

Fig. 15

Extracted from the British Pan Books edition of 1975. It does not appear in the American Cardinal edition of 1963. It is interesting in that it shows how Anne was keen on plagiarizing other works.




Fig. 16

Another "example" of Anne's handwriting; this time from *Das Grosse Dudenlexikon*, Mannheim. How does it compare with other "samples" ?




Fig. 17

After our initial inquiry, Mr. Frank sent us this informative letter by registered mail. He enclosed what he called "proof" of the *Diary's* authenticity (figures 18, 19, 21). He says (in German), that it is only neo-Nazis who dispute the *Diary's* authenticity. In 1961, he had a court case against the "Studienrat Stielau" in Lübeck. In the process, two expert opinions were obtained and submitted to court ("Gutachtens"). There was a literary one by A. Hübner, (figures 19 and 21) and a graphological one by M. Becker (figure 18). He had enclosed photocopies. He says Anne's original diaries (note plural) and papers are kept in a bank safe in Basel and they were used by the two "experts." He offers whatever further help he can, and will be pleased to answer further questions. This author took him at his word, and asked to examine the originals of the diary personally (figure 6). But Mr. Frank declined rather curtly (figure 8) — this time in English, for some reason. Maybe it sounds more austere ?




Fig. 18

This is a photocopy Mr. Frank sent this author with his letter of 22 April 1977 (figures 17 and 7). It is a letter from a firm of Hamburg attorney to Mr. Frank in Switzerland. The attorney says that he has on file Frau Becker's authentication of the *Diary*, but it runs to 131 pages, so therefore he cannot send a photocopy of it ! See text "Frau Minna Becker" for a further comment by us.

✓  
durchgesetzt

Dr. Annemarie Hübner  
Germanisches Seminar  
der Universität Hamburg  
Hamburg 13  
Bornplatz 2 / Telefon: 44107 1 Ap. 1251.

Gutachten

in der Voruntersuchungssache  
gegen 1. den Studienrat Lothar Stielau  
2. den Landwirt Heinrich Buddeberg

gemäß dem mir durch den Untersuchungsrichter  
des Landgerichtes in Lübeck vom 13. Oktober 59  
(Bd. 2, Bl. 52 ff der Akten) erteilten Auftrag,  
sowie der mündlich erteilten Ergänzung die-  
ses Auftrages,

// nebst Anlagen B - E //

Fig. 19

Another one of Mr. Frank's enclosures of 22 April 1977. This he described as a "very detailed proof of authenticity." It is supposed to have been written by a Dr. Annemarie Hübner of Hamburg University. It continues as figure 21. She appears to have submitted this "expert literary opinion" for use in the court case where Mr. Frank sued Stielau and Buddeberg for saying the *Diary* was faked. Contrary to Mr. Frank's description, the "Gutachten" is not detailed at all, and is merely a statement about the preliminary studies of this law suit.



Fig. 20

This is the registered envelope in which Mr. Frank sent this author his letter of 22 April 1977 (figures 17 and 7) together with his so-called "proofs" of the *Diary's* authenticity (figures 18, 19, 21).

29

Beurteilung des Druckmanuskriptes in Hinblick  
auf die Frage des Gutachtens.

tors

- a) Die Haltung des Herausgebers, wie des Redak-  
tors des Textes gegenüber muss als sachlich und ver-  
antwortungsbewusst bezeichnet werden.
- b) Das Verfahren der Ausgabe, bei der es sich  
um keine kritische Ausgabe handelt, muss  
auf Grund der komplizierten Quellenverhält-  
nisse nicht nur als vertretbare, sondern als  
die unter solchen Umständen gegebene Lösung  
bezeichnet werden.
- c) Die Auslassungen sind im Sinne des vom Her-  
ausgeber stammenden "Nachwortes" als solche  
zu bezeichnen, die "für den Leser wertlos"  
sind. Die Schmälerung des Textbestandes bedeu-  
tet für den Leser keine Inhaltliche Ein-  
busse, noch entstehen hiervon irgendwel-  
che falschen Vorstellungen über Sinn und  
Charakter des Tagebuches.
- d) Der Wortlaut des Textes, Sprache und Stil  
sind im Rahmen des für eine Veröffentli-  
chung Notwendigen überarbeitet, in ihrer  
Eigenart jedoch nicht angestastet.
- e) Fremde Bestandteile, inhaltlicher oder ge-  
danklicher Art, sind im Text nicht vorhan-  
den, die Zusätze des Herausgebers beschrän-  
ken sich auf das aus technischen oder in-  
haltlichen Gründen Erforderliche, bzw. Zu-  
lässige.  
Kenntlichmachung von Auslassungen oder Zu-  
sätzen ist im Rahmen dieser Ausgabe, bei  
der es sich um keine kritische Ausgabe han-  
det, nicht erforderlich.

Der Text des Druckmanuskriptes muss nach Inhalt,  
Gedankengehalt und Form als autentisch bezeich-  
net werden.

Fig. 21

This is the second page of Dr. Hübner's "Gutachten". The first page of it is figure 19. It appears that someone has pencilled in the fainter parts of the letter. The last paragraph was highlighted in red ink (arrowed) when we received it.

[52]

*together rosy*" (26 May-44:213 14) may have been the receiver of the shorthand courses which were sent to Prinsengracht. The reason why this seems to have been the case only for Margot may have been because it was Margot they were worried about:

*"On Sunday, July 5, 1942, the S.S. sent a notice that Margot Frank must report for forced labor. Early the next day, the entire family went into hiding"* (AFFA:7).

Seeing that many of the members took courses it would not seem logical that Elli sent in all these IN HER OWN NAME. That she could have sent in Margot's lessons, IN HER OWN NAME is probable but she hardly would have sent, IN HER OWN NAME, all the other courses. First, the teachers at the school would wonder how it was that the same person sends in the same lessons, perhaps one being more advanced than the other. Second, they would have noticed the different handwriting.

Additional confirmation that mail was sent to the members can be gathered from the 3 Nov.-43:101 entry. It says:

*"In order to give us something to do, which is also educational, DADDY APPLIED FOR A prospectus from the Teachers' Institute in Leiden. Margot nosed through the thick book at least three times without finding anything to her liking or to suit her purse. Daddy was quicker, arid wants a letter written to the Institute asking for a trial lesson in 'Elementary Latin.' "Later "Margot and Daddy" went to 'practice their Latin"* (11 Nov.-43:104).

Now, don't start asking us how anyone that is supposed to be in hiding and out of the country can start asking for courses by mail and even receive mail, addressed to their alleged "hiding place" at Prinsengracht, but with the Franks, the Van Daans and Dussel', apparently everything IS possible. "Truth" is indeed stranger than "fiction."

## DRUG ADDICT AT A TENDER AGE

Anne appears to have been a habitual drug addict while hiding. She informs us: "*I swallow Valerian pills EVERY DAY against worry arid depression, but it doesn't prevent me from being even more miserable the next day*" (16 Sept.-43:97). The drug from the Valerian was made from the roots of plants and used as a sedative and antispasmodic. Anne's worry wasn't about their "hiding place" being exposed but due to the fact that the "*Relations between us here are getting worse all the time*" (*Ibid.*). Later on however she does admit that to look up at the sky is "*a better medicine than either Valerian or bromine*" (15 June-44:222). How she was able to look up at the sky to cure her problem we cannot tell. The Jewish writer, Margit Vinberg, informs us, after her personal interview with the Franks at Basel in August, \*1956, that the roller blinds upstairs were AL, WAYS KEPT DOWN and windows were NEVER OPENED (*Vecko Journalen*, Nr. 35, 1956\*). How the Valerian pills were obtained we are not told.

## WHY NOT RADIOS ?

By this time we should not feel stupefied to learn that the group were loyal radio listeners, even, though Margot was not allowed to cough at night. Music kept the family in tune while heated arguments raged over certain programs. Under the same

[53]

entry where we are told "*sounds could travel through the walls*" and that Margot was not allowed "*to cough at night*" we are at the same time told that: "*The four of us went to the private office yesterday evening and turned on the radio.*" Besides this, Anne was very happy over the fact that once the Van Daans would arrive "*it will be much more fun AND NOT SO QUIET*" (11 July-42:19; compare 11 April-44:180). Very strange indeed, we must say.

The "wireless," a big Phillips (15 June-43:74) was located downstairs at the "private office." It was a "first-class" radio (9 July-42:15). At "seven-thirty in the evening then everyone was in the private office listening to the radio" (2 Sept.-42:24). Often it was tuned on England, in fact German stations were "only listened to in special cases such as classical music and the like" (17 Nov.-42:46). Listening to England was worth the risk of the whole group being caught:

*"Mrs. Van Daan came upstairs, she'd been listening to the wireless in the private office. She told us that Pim had asked her to turn off the wireless... Now it was UNFORTUNATE that the wireless down stairs was still tuned to England, and that the chairs were neatly arranged round it. If the door had been forced, and the AIR RAID WARDENS had noticed and warned the police, then the results might have been very unpleasant"* (25 March-43:65).

The interesting point is made here that AIR RAID WARDENS search the homes making this story all the more impossible. About a year after first reporting about the radio, Anne lets us know "our big Phillips" will be handed in "next month." Instead they "shall have a little radio upstairs" (15 June-43:74). Their own regulations about the radio were apparently rarely followed:

*"Own radio center, direct communication with London, New York, Tel Aviv, curd numerous other stations. This appliance is only for residents' USE AFTER SIX O'CLOCK IN THE EVENING. No stations are forbidden, on the understanding that German stations are only listened to in special cases, such as CLASSICAL MUSIC AND THE LIKE"* (17 Nov.-42:46). It is not known whether or not the references to inter continental radio communication are meant to be a joke. Alongside some of the other ludicrous claims in the book, differentiation does become somewhat difficult.

The fear seems to have lingered not over being caught, but listening to the German LANGUAGE, the country where the Franks had become wealthy in the first place. Instead of fighting over the listening restrictions which we expect would be a logical step for them to; as the dangers of being caught increased they became EVEN LESS restrictive:

*"ONE O'CLOCK. We're all sitting listening to the B.B.C., seated around the baby wireless."* This was in the daytime. Under the same entry, at HALF PAST TWELVE; half an hour earlier, Mrs. Van Daan decides to vacuum and Anne reports that "one CAN THE NOISE of Mrs. Van Daan's VACUUM CLEANER" (5 Aug.-43:88).

Anne further reports that she could follow "the English Home Service quite well on the wireless" (27 Jan.-44:127).

The Germans get little consolation from the group but their music was much loved: *"On Sunday evening EVERYONE, except Pim and me, was sitting beside the wireless in order to listen to the 'Immortal*

[54]

*Music of the German Masters*" (14 Feb.-44:135).

Instead of the radio noise decreasing it steadily worsens. On March 27-44 Anne reports:

*"THE RADIO therefore GOES ON EARLY IN THE MORNING AND IS LISTENED TO A TALL HOURS OF THE DAY, UNTIL NINE, TEN, AND OFTEN ELEVEN O'CLOCK IN THE EVENING"* (27 March-44:167). Why then all this fuss about the "Secret Annexe" we may ask? And "if they are not eating or sleeping, then they are sitting around the radio and discussing food, sleep and politics. "They can "hardly wait till the end of the speech, STAMPING THEIR FEET... they EGG EACH OTHER ON until the arguments lead to discord and quarrels" (168).

At this stage we wonder whether the group would not have been safer making their hiding place at Amsterdam's Gestapo HQ !

Under Anne's entry of April 11-44:176 7 she reports:

*"There was a beautiful Mozart concert on the radio from six o'clock until a quarter past seven. I enjoyed it all very much, but especially the 'Kleine Nachtmusik.'"*

In her entry of May 26-44 we hear still: "*everyone... listening to the radio*" (26 May-44:214). Her entries

about hearing Bolkestein and Gerbrandy over the radio, telling the Dutch people to make a collection of diaries and letters after the war is most interesting and may give us a clue why, when and how, the Anne Frank Diary matter started, even though we wonder how it came that a boring story like that became the only real, international remembrance of that suggestion (29 March-44:170; 14 April-44:186) ? In any case, the biggest trouble the group had was to keep their mouths shut. As we have already noticed, making a racket was the order of the day. How they were able to keep themselves in hiding for over two years under these circumstances seems to be more than a miracle. Needless to say, no reviewer of the Anne Frank Diary has in any of our major papers gone into these glaring discrepancies but have taken the story at face value lauding it as one of the greatest documents ever written.

## AT THE DENTIST

It appears that Albert Dussel kept a dental service at the premises. Once he treated Mrs. Van Daan. Unfortunately the operation was less successful. She uttered "*INCOHERENT CRIES OF PAIN*" while the group looked on ROARING "*WITH LAUGHTER*" resulting in that she "*SCREAMED EVEN LOUDER . . . AFTER MUCH TURNING, KICKING, SCREAMING, AND CALLING OUT*" she got the instrument free, at last (10 Dec.-42:53).

This noisy and unfortunate experience did not result in that Dussel gave up further dental treatment but must have inspired him to renewed efforts. He now "*received an old-fashioned foot operated dentist's drill.*" Anne expected "*he'll soon give me a thorough check over*" (19 March-43:64). Where and how this contraption later was used and kept we are not told but dental services do seem a bit odd for anyone to be engaged in that is supposed to be in hiding. A warehouse for spices seems hardly to be a good place to keep a dental drill which, by the way, must have been a tool in high demand. If "*a lot of houses are being searched for hidden bicycles*" (21 Aug.-42:21) one wonders what the searchers would have felt had they found a dentist drill at a spice ware-

[55]

house. Dussel must have been in contact with other persons in one way or another to buy the drill and it must have been brought there somehow. What Dussel did in the office downstairs we are not told (25 April 14:190-1). Perhaps he was keeping a dental service, fixing teeth!

## LIVING A HOG'S LIFE

The group seems to have weltered in wealth and in spite of the fact that:

*"Against the background of the mass murder of European Jewry, the book presents a vivid picture of a group of HUNTED PEOPLE FORCED TO LIVE AND SURVIVE TOGETHER IN ALMOST INTOLERABLE PROXIMITY"* (RE, Vol. 1:365); they decided to make the quarters even more intolerable by moving their belongings with them which "*belongings*" they did not want to be "*seized by the Germans*" (5 July-42:11).

In moving in, Anne writes that:

*"Our living room and all other rooms were CHOCK FULL of rubbish, INDESCRIBABLY SO... The LITTLE ROOM WAS FILLED TO THE CEILING WITH BED CLOTHES"* (10 July-42:17).

How they, under these INTOLERABLE cramped circumstances could breathe at all, and if they, besides their dental drill, had respirators to help them along we do not know even less how they could vacuum clean, dance and perform acrobatics. Evidently their bodies were highly gymnastically tuned. Anne frankly admits:

*"And as FOR US, we are FORTUNATE. Yes, WE ARE LUCKIER THAN MILLIONS OF PEOPLE. It is QUIET and SAFE HERE, and we are, so to speak, LIVING ON CAPITAL. We are even*

*so selfish as to talk about after the war"* (13 Jan.-43:56).

That was, before the group moved in. After that it was QUIET no longer. Comparatively speaking they lived in a paradise:

*"If I just think of how we live here, I usually come to the conclusion that it is a paradise with how other Jews who are not in hiding must be living"* (1 May-43:70). It is a pity then that not more Jews decided to HIDE and live under such "intolerable" conditions. Fruit cost "next to nothing" and at a time when millions were starving in Germany and other places they had plenty of it (23 July-43:80). No wonder Anne felt: "*how lucky we are here compared with other Jewish children*" (24 Dec.-43:109). It was while she was in "hiding" that Anne for the first time received something on Christmas, "Friday evening." Indeed something for us to think about who were living on egg shells at the time, if at all available. There was plenty of money and she could "*HEAR NO THING BUT THIS SORT OF TALK THE WHOLE DAY LONG.*" They talked about making "*little moneybags, which could easily be hidden in our clothing, IN CASE WE WANT TO TAKE MONEY WITH US*" (3 Feb.-44:132). Seeing we are being told it was the gas chambers they were waiting for in case they got discovered one wonders what purpose they could have to make moneybags. In spite of all these open admissions a whole world has been led to believe few families, if any, suffered more than the Franks and their company. In reality their big problem was, what to do with all their plenty.

## FOOD GALORE

Although the affluent little Jewish society at Prinsengracht may not have

[56]

had the best French Cuisine, they certainly had little to complain about as regards the necessities and EXTRAS of life which may explain the group's constant bickering and why Anne has so little to write about, except her love affairs and the families' continuous quarrelling over trivialities. While Anne seems to have had some compassion over dirty children with running noses she wouldn't "*want to touch them with a barge pole.*" Anne gives Margot the suggestion that they should clean the children, to which Margot interrupted: "*By tomorrow they would look just as filthy and ragged as before*" (13 Dec.-43:54). A rather interesting moral nicety coming from the "oppressed" whose rooms were filled to the brim with goods.

Food and other things had been taken to other people "*for more than a year*" (5 July-42:11). Evidently they had also been taken to their "hiding place" for a lengthy time suggesting to us the whole thing had been planned long before 6 July 1942.

The popular myth which has been spun around Anne Frank that the group lived under starvation and utterly destitute circumstances finds interestingly little support in the "diary" itself. It is quite evident that at the time the group lived better than most people in Germany and elsewhere and as we have seen this is also admitted by Anne herself. For instance, they had, apart from other food, 150 cans of vegetables and 270 pounds of dried peas and beans besides potatoes (9 Nov.-42:42). After one furious quarrel Dussel left the room: "*his COAT STUFFED WITH FOOD*" (13 July-43:78). Exactly where he was heading for we are not told. They ordered "*some extra corn in addition to*" their "*Sixty pounds.*" Anne writes in 3 Feb.-44:132): "*Our stock's not too bad*" (132). Notwithstanding the fact that baking causes a racket, they baked biscuits, cakes (22 Dec.-42:55), and dumplings (3 April-44:174). "*A LOT OF MEAT*" was bought under the counter whereby sausages were made (10 Dec.-42:52 2). Later Mrs. Van Daan worries that burglars "*have taken the sausages and all our peas and beans*" from the attic (10 March-43:61). How exactly they could have done so without passing their "secret door" we are not told. Coffee was still available, so was butter, eggs, tea and tobacco (6 May-44:200). Even up to 8 July-44 strawberries were available to them which they ate and made jam out of (227-8). Of course even our affluent group could be troubled with rotten food (Compare 3 April-44:173, 3 May-44:197, 23 June-44:223). We notice however that even under these circumstances the meals were certainly sufficient. The rationing of potatoes (23 June-44:223) seems a good choice in view of that Mr. Van Daan "*takes a lot*" (9 Aug.-43:89). The son, after having eaten "*the heartiest meal*" declared calmly that "*he could have eaten double*" (90). Peter we are told enjoyed talking "*about food*" (14 June-44:221). As late as July 8-44:229 she talks about an enamel pan "*filled to the brim*" with peas. Tobacco as we have noticed was available. So was coffee and tea. Cognac was served (17

Nov:42:45), also beer (13 May-44:207) and wine (2 May-44:196). The main problem and trouble again, seems to have been themselves and how to get enough room in their stomachs so they could stuff down all their food.

## ANNE'S CHARACTER NOT EVEN A NICE GIRL

From what we can gather from her own diary it is quite obvious the parents seem to have neglected giving the child a proper parental love and direction. In

[57]

s spite of her young age, Anne's main ambition was to make money and ALL her "*hopes are pinned on after the war*" (8 May-44:202) to make lots of it. She was a spoiled child, a bore and a brat, hot headed, nervous, rude and filled with egomania (Compare Schnabel 1:15). She was rude and even at the coffee table she could tell a visitor he had cat eyes (*Ibid 17*). Although Anne wants to shift the blame onto her parents, she no doubt was herself responsible in stirring up trouble over trivialities. She is an incredibly spoiled child. Anne writes:

*"Daddy wishes that I would sometimes volunteer to help Mummy, when she doesn't feel well or has a headache; BUT I SHAN'T"* (3 Oct.-42:34).

She admits being "*spoiled from top to toe by Mummy and Daddy*" and that she gets "*lots of sweets, enough pocket money*." Anne asks: "*what more could one want?*" Only very wealthy parents would in those days have given their children pocket money not to speak about ENOUGH pocket money. That apparently was Anne's problem she got all she wanted. Anne tells us further she was "*a terrible flirt*" (7 March-44:149). She consumed Valerian pills making one wonder if she suffered under periodic psychosis, which may either have been a functional or organic type, or both (16 Sept.-43:97).

Anne's family and immediate surrounding may therefore have contributed severely to her problems; at least, they hardly seem fitting company for a healthy child let alone someone sick. Their constant disputes would be destructive to any child. Perhaps the father knew about his daughter's troubles which he had contributed to and so he tried to paint up his own image by concocting a diary. Anne's great hope to get wealthy was probably the hope her father shared. Apparently the money he had was not enough. Mr. Frank does not seem overly disturbed, that in spite of his wealth; the baker to whom they owed money paid Mr. Frank's bills out of his own pocket (Schnabel 6:85).

Anne also seems to suffer from lavatory, excremental and sex neuroses. We will deal more with this further on. She feels pretty high about herself:

*"I'm not going to take all these insults lying down, I'll show them that Anne Frank wasn't born yesterday. Then they'll be surprised and perhaps they'll keep their MOUTHS SHUT when I let them see that I am going to start EDUCATING THEM. Shall I take up that attitude? Plain barbarism! I'm simply amazed again and again over THEIR AWFUL MANNERS and especially. . . stupidity, (Mrs. Van Daan's), but as soon as I get used to this and it won't be long then I'll give them some of their own back, and no half measures. Then they'll change their tune!"* (28 Sept.-42:29).

On 7 May-4 she writes:

*"It's right that for once I've been taken down from my inaccessible pedestal, that my pride has been shaken a bit, for I was becoming much too taken up with myself again"* (201).

Anne's rudeness knows no bounds for she feels:

*"Even if people are still very young, they shouldn't be prevented from saying what they think"* (2 March-44:144).

We notice here the lack of parental love and direction. Little wonder she hurts her mother bitterly bringing "*tears in her eyes*" (2 April-43:69).

The mother had merely invited her

[58]

daughter to pray with her. Anne's rude Anne says: letter to her father can be explained in the same spirit (5 May-44:199-200, 6 & 7 May-44:200-1). Even if we take into consideration the unhealthy and destructive surroundings which Anne lived under we still have our doubts if Anne ever uttered many of the things which allegedly are placed in her mouth and pen. They may not have been in the original and may be interpolations. They give the tinge of Jewish Americanism as if some journalistic hands have given them a work over. It would be interesting indeed to find out if they are in Anne's original diary. Let us give here some examples. She writes she was furious with "*Master Dussel*" and thought "*In a minute I'LL GIVE HIM SUCH A SMACK IN THE FACE THAT HE'LL FLY UP THE CEILING TOGETHER WITH HIS LIES*" (13 July-43:78). She is furious over the Van Daans (and perhaps with good reasons) who had claimed on the matter of sex that she was

*"already proficient in the theory, IT'S ONLY THE PRACTICE THAT YOU STILL LACK." Anne wished she "COULD HAVE SLAPPED BOTH THEIR FACES AT THAT MOMENT as they stood there making a fool of me. I was beside myself with rage and I'm just counting the days until I'm rid of 'those' people"* (29 July-43:83).

Further on she writes:

*"I used to have a bad habit; I wish I still had it now. If I was angry with anyone, rather than argue it out I WOULD GO TO WORK ON HIM WITH MY FISTS"* (14 Feb.-44:135).

Of her Algebra book she writes: *"If I'm ever in a really VERY WICKED MOOD, I'LL TEAR THE EBLASTED THING TO PIECES!"* (20 May-44:210).

The unfortunate Mrs. Van Daan gets continuously blasted. In one place Anne says:

*"Everyone knows that Mrs. Van Daart, one of my chief accusers, is unintelligent. I might as well put it plainly and say 'stupid' Stupid people usually can't take it if others do better than they do"* (14 June-44:220).

However, she reminds us she is not prejudiced (29 July-43:84, 17 March-44:159). When we are aware that the father claims "some passages which he felt to be too intimate or which might hurt other peoples feelings" (AFFA:6) were OMITTED, we wonder what other things Anne could have written, seeing the above rude passages WERE INCLUDED. We feel however that the above quotations raise strong doubts as to their having ever existed in the original or they may have been altered. They may be interpolations. They do not sound like coming from a young girl. We are entirely sympathetic to those Orthodox Jews who have raised their voices and said that the diary is an obnoxious story. An examination of the original records would indicate whether they are genuine uttering made by Anne herself. If so, her parents must be blamed for neglecting to give the child proper love and affection.

## QUARRELS, QUARRELS, QUARRELS

What makes the Anne Frank Diary so boring to healthy minds is without a doubt its repetitious grinding over trivialities - its constant sordid telling of family quarrels. Indeed we wonder how Mr. Frank could have picked such an inharmonious crowd to live with him in hiding seeing his own family would have given him troubles enough. The diary seems to have contained even more examples of quarrels for Mr. Frank, as noted, has said parts were

[59]

omitted which "might hurt other peoples feelings." If we would elide all the family rows and quarrels along with Anne's sex adventures and dreams the diary would become a mere skeleton.

She feels downhearted over her monotonous cluttering "*and silently wishes that Anne would occasionally dig up something new*" (28 Jan.-44:128) which we on our part heartily agree with. However, even though she tries hard she finds "*it is impossible for anything in the conversation here to be fresh and new*" (129). Being unable to do so we are forced to read about all their rows over money, clothing, food, lavatory and excremental

intricacies and her own self importance. The biggest problem the group seems to have had was their own existence. Their continuous quarrels put the German problem completely on the sideline. After having moved to their new home in 1942 she was unable to understand "the quarrels, the bickering." The way she "could keep up some bearing was by being impertinent" (7 March-44:150). Already in her second entry after the Van Daans had arrived she writes:

*"It is not all honey between Mummy and Mrs. Van Daan; there is plenty of cause for unpleasantries. To give a small example, I will tell you that Mrs. Van Daan has taken all three of her sheets out of the common linen cupboard. She takes it for granted that mummy's sheets will do for all of us" (2 Sept.-42:22 3).*

The Van Daans were gluttonous:

*"In my opinion the Van Daans don't divide it at all fairly. However, my parents are much too afraid of a row to say anything about it" (27 Feb.-43:60). She calls the Van Daans: "some real greedy PIGS on the top floor" (9 Nov.-42:42, compare 9 Aug.-43:89). Again: "Mrs. Van Daan had another tantrum. She is terribly moody" (27 Sept.-42:27). Previous to that she writes: "Mrs. Van Daan is unbearable. I get nothing but 'blowups' from her for my continuous chatter. She is always pestering us in some way or other." About the leftovers she continues: "This is the latest: she doesn't want to wash-up the pans if there is a fragment left; instead of putting it into a glass dish, as we've always done until now, she leaves it in the pan to go bad" (21 Sept.-42:25).*

On 27 April, 1943, she writes:

*"SUCH QUARRELS THAT THE WHOLE HOUSE THUNDERS! Mummy and I, the Van Daans and Daddy, Mummy and Mrs. Van Daan, everyone is angry with everyone else" (69). 26 July, 1943: "Nothing but tumult and uproar yesterday, we are still very het up about it all. You might really ask, does a day go by without some excitement?" (81). On 3 August, 1943, Mr. Van Daan had "just made it up after a week's squabbling" (84). Even in her dreams she thinks about a "quarrel upstairs" (4 Aug.-43:87) and says of 'Madame' Van Daan: "one could perhaps call her the 'kindler.' Stirring up trouble, that's fun. Mrs. Frank against Anne; Margot against Daddy doesn't go quite so easily" (9 Aug.-43:89).*

Plenty of problems exist also between Anne and her mother. "Just had a big bust up with Mummy for the umpteenth time" (27 Sept.-42:27, compare 3 Oct.-42:34). The reason why Anne makes so few entries in her diary may perhaps also be explained by the following. "Every time I write to you something special seems to have happened, but they are more often unpleasant than pleasant things" (10 Sept.-43:96-7) and the

[60]

only "wonderful thing going on" she can think of is the war (97). But not for long. In her next entry, conditions are back to NORMAL:

*"Relations between us here ARE GETTING WORSE ALL THE TIME. At mealtimes, NO ONE DARES TO OPEN THEIR MOUTHS (EXCEPT TO ALLOW A MOUTHFUL OF FOOD TO SLIP IN) because whatever is said you either annoy someone or it is misunderstood."*

To help her in her cause she swallows Valerian pills "every day" (16 Sept.-43:97). The entry after situation still the same:

*"If only I wasn't mixed up so much with all these rows! If I could only get away! They'll drive us crazy before long!" (29 Sept.-43:99). So is the next entry: "They've had A TERRIFIC ROW UPSTAIRS... I am dazed by all the abusive exchanges that have taken place in this virtuous house during the past month" (17 Oct.-43:99).*

Next entry no difference:

*"There have been RESOUNDING ROWS AGAIN... THE YELL SAND SCREAMS, STAMPING AND ABUSE YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY IMAGINE IT! It was frightening. My family stood at the bottom*

*of the stairs, holding their breath, ready if necessary to drag them apart! All this shouting and weeping and nervous tension are so unsettling and such a strain, that in the evening I drop into my bed crying, thanking heaven that I sometimes have half an hour to myself" (29 Oct.-43:100).*

This may explain Anne's few entries. It was upsetting to experience it, let alone, write about it. If Albert Dussel is not in trouble he is causing trouble (17 Nov.-43:105). Finally on 22 Dec., 1943, just before Christmas she can report:

*"There is not much news to tell you. We are all getting on well together FOR A CHANGE! There's no quarrelling we haven't had such peace in the home FOR AT LEAST HALF A YEAR" (109). However, gathering from her entry, the peace seems to have been the result of her having a "bad attack of flu" (108). Then follows her entries about sex and family troubles until 15 Jan., 1944, when we again hear her telling: "There is no point in telling you every time the exact details of our rows and arguments... unkind words, and angry out-bursts... whether or not we choose to quarrel" (122-3). She feels it is hard for her and she writes: "you can never really confide in people even in those who are nearest you" (22 Jan.-44:123). She admits Mrs. Van Daan isn't to blame for all the quarrels her mother and family is also (124-5). Mr. Dussel enjoys talking about "his wife's extensive wardrobe" and "beautiful race horses" (28 Jan.-44:128). On 2 March-4, a new crisis point is reached:*

*"Only great love and devotion can help Elli, Margot, Peter and me, AND NONE OF US GETS IT. And no one, especially the stupid 'know-all's' here, can understand us, because we are much more sensitive and much more advanced in our thoughts than anyone here would ever imagine in their wildest dreams."*

She says Peter often tells her "his parents quarrel over politics" (145). She confides in Peter about "the quarrels" (19 March-44:160) and tries to help "him over his parent's quarrels" (22 March-44:163). However the group continues to "egg each other on until the arguments lead to discord and quarrels." They get

[61]

so impatient they are "stamping their feet" (27 March-44:168) and there is "no one here that sets a good example" (14 April-44:185). Little wonder she feels "so miserable" (26 May-44:213).

"Dr." Dussel enters again into the picture; "Fresh 'Secret Annexe' troubles, a quarrel between Dussel and the Franks over something very trivial: the sharing of the butter" (5 June-44:216). Mrs. Van Daan is "offended that Dussel doesn't enter INTO HER FLIRTATIONS. . . she quarrels, uses ABUSIVE LANGUAGE, cries, pities herself, laughs, and then starts a fresh quarrel again" (16 June-44:223).

In one of her last entries she says something we must surely agree with after having gone through the group's dramatic and chaotic quarrelling:

*"People can't see in from outside because of the net curtains, (about the net curtains, compare 11 July-42:19, 15 June-44:222) but, even so, the LOUD VOICES and BANGING DOORS positively gave me the jitters. ARE WE REALLY SUPPOSED TO BE IN HIDING?" (8 July-44:227).*

We have wondered about the same thing for the whole time. Anne's reports about all the rows, fights, quarrels, arguments and chaotic conditions are precisely the atmosphere we should expect exist amongst such a lot. One is surely astounded that such a sordid story could be pandered to world wide, making out of it not only a diary, a movie, a play but also a Foundation. To us the whole business, for business it indeed is, appears sickening the product of warped minds who can stoop so low to use a daughter and a young girl's personal problems for commercial gains and propagandistic purposes.

Only "wonderful going on" she can think of is the war (97). But not for long. In her next entry, conditions are back to NORMAL:

*"Relations between us here ARE GETTING WORSE ALL THE TIME. At mealtimes, NO ONE DARES TO OPEN THEIR MOUTHS (EXCEPT TO ALLOW A MOUTHFUL OF FOOD TO SLIP IN) because whatever is said you either annoy someone or it is misunderstood."*

To help her in her cause she swallows Valerian pills "every day" (16 Sept.-43:97). The entry after - situation still the same:

"If only I wasn't mixed up so much with all these rows! If I could only get away! They'll drive us crazy before long." (27 Sept.-43:99). So is the next entry: "They've had A TERRIFIC ROW UPSTAIRS... I am dazed by all the abusive exchanges that have taken place in this virtuous house during the past month" (17 Oct.-43:99).

## THE ANAL COMPLEX

We feel that another forceful reason why the Anne Frank Diary cannot be entirely dismissed as a fictitious story is its preoccupation with the anus and excrements, a trait typical of many Jews. Pornography and excretal fantasies have always fascinated many of them and they have therefore also been the greatest exploiters of these things. There is something real about it when Anne tells of her dear pottie, their lavatory and excremental problems, the passing of intestinal gases and her love affairs with Peter. Of course, it may be argued that Jews write about it even in fiction; so the diary could still be fictitious and therefore this point proves nothing. He is simply jotting down what he fancies. However, we feel, that in part, the story is telling us about things which ACTUALLY TRANSPired. There appears something

[62]

genuine behind all the excremental chitchat. Jewish writings have been infused with stories about the reproductive and excremental functions.

Two persons in sharp contrast, yet strikingly identical, have made eminent contributions to the world in this field. The comedian Charlie Chaplin became famous by wagging his rear end at the audience, scratching frantically at his buttocks, and exhibiting the usual run of the mill, age old preoccupations with the reproductive and excretory organs. For this, and other things, he has been hailed in the mass media as one of our greatest comedians ever to appear. So much respect was lavished upon him, that one saw fit he should play the part of Hitler in one film. He has been warmly loved ever since.

In his own right, Sigmund Freud is an even greater comedian than Charlie Chaplin. His outstanding contribution to the world is the "anal complex," the theory that an obsession with the anus is the principal influence in our emotional development. Feud is today the patron saint of the "science" of psychiatry. Many millions of words have been written on the subject of the reproductive and excretory habits and learned speeches about the anal compulsion are delivered by scholars before the world's learned bodies of distinguished men. "Anal eroticism," the stage in pregenital libido in which pleasurable sensations are supposed to be experienced in the anal regions continue to intrigue our most learned professors. It is indeed odd that no Nobel Prize has until now been instituted in this field.

The above information will explain a lot of things in Anne's diary which to the uninitiated otherwise may be hard to understand. Anne and her family were greatly amused over that Mrs. Van Daan brought a large pottie in her hat box (14 Aug.-42:20).

*"During the plumber's visit, nature's offerings were deposited in these jars in the sitting room during the day." Anne feels: "I'm not such a prude that I can't talk about these things" (29 Sept.-42:32).*

There was much discussion over, when one was "allowed to use the lavatory?" (19 Nov.-42:47). For doctor Dussel in particular this must have been quite a problem or he caused plenty of problems for others as "his favorite spot" was the lavatory:

*"Three, four, five times a day someone stands impatiently in front of the door and wriggles, hopping from one foot to the other, hardly able to contain himself: Does it disturb him? Not a bit! From quarter past seven till half past, from half past twelve till one o'clock, from two till quarter past, from four till quarter past, from six till quarter past, and from half past eleven until twelve. One can make a note of it these are the regular 'sitting times.' He won't come off or pay any heed to an imploring voice at the door, giving warning of approaching disaster!" (9 Aug.-43:90-1).*

Whether the distinguished "doctor" was learning Feud in the lavatory we do not know nor do we know how the lavatory could be used so frequently without making noises and in view of the fact that Anne reports the lavatory was not used after "half past eight." Perhaps "nature's offerings" were deposited in these "glass jars"

after this time limit.

Anne was much thrilled when she could report:

[63]

*"One afternoon we couldn't go to the lavatory because there were visitors in the office; however, Peter had to pay an urgent call. So he didn't pull the plug. He put a notice up on the lavatory door to warn us, with 'S.V.P. gas' on it. Of course he meant to put 'Beware of gas'; but he thought the other looked more genteel"* (5 Feb.-43:59). At another instance she reports that: "We arranged that we would not draw any water or pull the plug in the lavatory. But as the excitement had affected most of our tummies, you can imagine what the atmosphere was like when we had each paid a visit in succession" (25 March43:65).

Now and then the lavatory could give out "suspicious noises" (4 Aug.-43:86) and when the lavatory could not be used there was of course great excitement. She claims that after "half past eight" there was "no lavatory" but this seems odd in view of "Dr." Dussel's constant visits as we already have noted (23 Aug.-43:95; compare 14 April-44:185, 26 May44:214). At times the odors must have been repulsive even for this brave lot of people. How the excremental odors can square with the splices is another question which captivates us. Indeed, on 11 April-4, Anne tells us how five of them took turns excreting into a waste paper can, and that "*the tin smelled ghastly... the smell wasn't so bad when one was on the floor... stink, flatulation, and always someone on the pot.*" Along with the odors of expelled gases was the noise factor: the flatus being expelled, for Anne writes: "*the food lies heavily on everybody's tummy, CAUSING THUNDEROUS NOISES ON ALL SIDES.*" Apparently little was done to prevent the noises. It wasn't Anne's job to clean the potties. Her dad and Peter did it (11 April-44:182). To cure a troublesome "Mrs. B." it was suggested that they put "*a good laxative in her coffee*" (9 May-44:204). Although we cannot dismiss the argument that these excremental preoccupations are mere fancies on the part of the author or authors there are good reasons to believe the stories are genuine and are in part reflecting some of the foremost intellectual thoughts of the occupants. Even if they were invented they nevertheless splendidly depict the anal complex, of an ancient, cultural people.

## FLIRTATIONS AND JEALOUSY

As can be expected with any miserable, unhappy crowd, especially one that is grounded on such shaky morals as our group was, there erupted plenty of ill feelings and jealousy. Although Anne seems a little disturbed over flirtations falling in the wrong direction they can likely be viewed as survival hatches for an otherwise boring life. Anne was particularly annoyed over Mrs. Van Daan's flirtations with her father:

*"I must tell you that her attempts to flirt with Daddy are a source of continual irritation for me. SHE STROKES HIS FACE AND HAIR, PULLS HER SKIRT RIGHT UP, and makes so called witty remarks, trying in this way to attract Pim's attention."*

Anne told Mrs. Van Daan off, right in her "face" (1 Oct.-42:33). However as we have seen, Anne was quite a flirt herself. It seems Mrs. Van Daan WAS quite a flirt for she boasts about being one (5 Feb.-43:59). As time went on, her son Peter also learned the art (19 March44:160). Dussel who was so thrilled over fur coats and race horses soon got the tune and fell in line. He was *beginning to get longings for women.*" Flirtations started between him and Mrs. Van Daan (5 June-44:216). Mrs. Van Daan is later offended "*that Dussel doesn't enter into her flirtations*" (16 June-44:223). Perhaps at this time he was thinking again about his fur coats and race horses. Also we wonder how he could, seeing he spent most of his time in the lavatory or on the "glass jar." Jealousy enters also into the picture. Anne's mother is jealous over her taking too much to Mrs. Van Daan (2 March-44:145) while Mrs. Van Daan in turn is jealous at Anne for liking her son (28 March-44:169).

[64]

*enter into her flirtations*" (16 June-44:223). Perhaps at this time he was thinking again about his fur coats and race horses. Also we wonder how he could, seeing he spent most of his time in the lavatory or on the "glass jar." Jealousy enters also into the picture. Anne's mother is jealous over her taking too much to Mrs. Van Daan (2 March-44:145) while Mrs. Van Daan in turn is jealous at Anne for liking her son (28 March-44:169).

## SEXUAL EXTRAVAGANZA

Anne's "love affair" (so indeed does Henri F. Pommer call it in the AFFA brochure, pp.9, 12, 14) with Peter Van Daan occupies lengthy portions in the diary, giving the impression someone is trying to fill in on the story which otherwise would bore people to death. In some respects the diary can be claimed to be the first paedophile pornographic work to come out after World War II and sold on the open market. In fact, the descriptions by a teenage girl over her sex affairs may likely be the first child porno ever to come out. At least we do not know of any other work which can claim this "distinguished" honor. It no doubt paved the way for future works of this kind and played a powerful role in our present moral decadence. A few Orthodox Jews were amongst the first to voice their opinions against the diary claiming it to be immoral and presenting Jews in a bad light. The sex portions may of course be fictitious, included merely to "sell" the book but without them the diary would likely have remained amongst Otto Frank's private memorabilia. It is a frightening thought however to think that a father would use his daughter in such a filthy manner but we are reminded of parents prostituting their children, so why could literary prostitution not be possible? If numerous interpolations were made, which we believe is the case, how and where were these adulterations made? We are certain that were we allowed to examine the original diary or diaries we would find numerous portions that have both been inserted and elided. This brings up the question: Who was the guilty person or persons doing the falsifications? Who really are behind this obvious swindle? Obviously the father would be the MAIN culprit but it is only reasonable to expect he had the assistance of others. Likely it was not a one man's job. It may have been a job of two, three or even a team work. If we are to believe the story, little Anne became infatuated early with boys. She brags about her amorous cortège and being the center of attraction. She writes:

*"WHAT A SILL Y ASS I AM! I am quite forgetting that I have never told you the history of myself and ALL MY BOYFRIENDS. When I WAS QUITE SMALL - I WAS STILL AT A KINDERGARTEN - I became attached to Karel Samson... One of Karel's cousins, Robby, was a slender, good looking dark boy, who aroused more admiration than the little, humorous fellow, Karel. But looks did not count with me... Then Peter crossed my path, and in my CHILDISH WAY I REALL Y FELL IN LOVE... we were inseparable for one whole summer. I can still remember us walking hand in hand through the streets together... I was mad about his laugh... he looked so mischievous and naughty... if I kept on running after him I should soon get the name of being boy mad... I went to the Jewish Secondary School. Lots of boys in our class were keen on*

[65]

*me I thought it was fun, felt honored... Harry was mad about me... I am completely upset by the dream. When Daddy kissed me this morning, I could have cried out: 'Oh Petel, darling Petel ....!' Who can help me now... Old Petel, Petel, how will I ever free myself of your image?... I love you, and with such a great love that it can't grow in my heart any more but has to leap out into the open and suddenly manifest itself in such a devastating way!" (7 Jan.-44:118 20).*

Already in her second entry she tells about Peter Wessel whom she wants to marry (15 June-42:2). Again in her third entry she writes: "*I have strings of boy friends anxious to catch a glimpse of me and who, failing that, peep at me through mirrors in class*" (20 June-42:2). In her fourth entry she herself asks the question to which we ourselves would like an answer when she says: "*I expect you will be rather surprised at the fact that I should talk of boy friends at my age. Alas, one simply can't seem to avoid it at our school.*" A boy, you can be sure, Anne writes "*fall head over heels in love immediately and simply won't allow me out of sight*" (20 June-42:5). These entries sound queer indeed to us, to say the least. In her very last entry she exclaims: "*As I've already said... I've acquired the name of chaser of boys, flirt, know all, reader of love stories*" (1 Aug.-44:236). Having read Nico van Suchtelen's book Eva's Youth, Anne hopes that she will never sell herself "*to unknown men in back streets*" and wishes: "*Also it says Eva has a monthly period Oh, I'm so longing to have it too; it seems so important*" (29 Oct.-42:38).

As Henri F. Pommer stated before making the previous quotation: "*Anne was thirteen when she started her diary. Six months later she regretted not having had her first menstruation*" (AFFA:9). About twelve months after, her wish was fulfilled:

*"I think what is happening to me is so wonderful, and not only what can be soon on my body, but all that is taking place inside. I never discuss myself or any of these things with anybody; that is why I have to talk to myself about them. Each time I have a period - and that has only been three times I have the feeling that in spite of all the pain, unpleasantness, and nastiness, I have a sweet secret, and*

*that is why, although it is nothing but a nuisance to me in a way, I always long for the time that I shall feel that secret within me again.*" We are also told that "*Margot who is much more shy than I am, isn't at all embarrassed*" (5 Jan.-44:115 16).

Later, in spite of wanting to keep the secret for herself, she discussed it with Peter only: "*We were talking, for instance, about blood via the subject we began talking about menstruation. He thinks women are pretty tough*" (31 March-44:172). On 13 June-4 she writes: "*I hadn't had a period for over two months, but it finally started again on Saturday. Still, in spite of all unpleasaness and bother, I'm glad it hasn't failed me any longer*" (220). As the portions about Anne's love affairs with Peter are quite lengthy we shall only cull some excerpts which have a bearing on our doubts that these portions are genuine and may in fact have been altered, or even worse, be completely fictitious. How anyone can carry on in this manner with noise, quarrels, light, food troubles, toilet problems and sex seems indeed strange, especially

[66]

when we remember what The Reader's Encyclopaedia so pointedly observed about the group: "Against the background of the mass murder of European Jewry, the book presents a VIVID PICTURE OF A GROUP OF HUNTED PEOPLE FORCED TO LIVE AND SURVIVE TOGETHER IN ALMOST INTOLERABLE PROXIMITY" (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, USA, 1965, Vol. 1:365). There are, and have been hundreds of thousands of families living under REAL "intolerable proximity" but they certainly didn't carry on in the manner that this lot did. This may further indicate to us that the diary is not a true diary, much less a "document," but a hodgepodge of a variety of sources. It seems indeed difficult to accept that a teenage girl in those days would write such things, let alone a girl that is supposed to be in hiding, knowing that at any given moment their secret may be discovered and the whole group carried away to certain death.

Likely no girl in the whole of Amsterdam carried on in the way Anne did. We wonder how anyone under the threat of death could think of writing her first love story! If so, this may be the first attempt ever. Anne gets confronted reading about prostitution (29 Oct.-42:38). Mr. Dussel "*thought he'd play doctor, and came and lay on my NAKED CHEST with his greasy head*" (22 Dec.-43:108). A rather peculiar bit of information about Anne's lesbian attraction:

*"Sometimes when I lie in bed at night, I have a terrible desire to feel my breast and to listen to the quiet rhythmic beat of my heart. I already had these kinds of feelings subconsciously before I came here, because I remember that once when I slept with a girl friend I had a strong desire to kiss her, and that I did do so. I COULD NOT HELP BEING TERRIBLE INQUISITIVE OVER HER BODY, for she had always kept it hidden from me. I ASKED HER WHETHER, AS A PROOF OF OUR FRIENDSHIP, WE SHOULD FEEL ONE AN OTHER'S BREASTS, but she refused. I GO INTO ECSTASIES EVERY TIME I SEE THE NAKED FIGURE OF A WOMAN, such as Venus, for example. It strikes me... that I have difficulty in stopping the tears rolling down my cheeks If only I had a girlfriend"* (5 Jan.-44:116).

The *Encyclop. Judaica* mentions about Meyer Levin, that: "In 1958 he settled in Israel, which was the setting for his erotic extravaganza, Gore and Igor (1968)" (1971, Vol. 11:109). The above quotations, supposedly coming from a young girl, sound to us to come from some other source. Likely they were included to sell the book and they may never have been in the original diary.

In her next entry she tells about having a dream where Peter Wessel touched her: "*And after that I felt a soft, and oh, such a cool kind cheek against mine and it felt so good, so good*" (6 Jan.-44:117). When her father spoke to her about sex, stating she "*possibly*" could not "*understand the longing yet*" she exclaims: "*I always knew that I did understand it and now I understand it fully. Nothing is so beloved to me now as he, my Peter*" (7 Jan.-44:120). This by the way was her next entry. On 24 January, 1944, she writes: "*Whenever anyone used to speak of sexual problems... it was something either mysterious or revolting. Words which had any bearing on the subject were whispered.*"

However the matter soon got

[67]

straightened out for she says next in the same entry that Peter showed her Boche, the cat's sex organs:

*"Boche stood on the packing table playing with Peter, who had just put him on the scales to weigh him. 'Hello, do you want to see him?' He didn't make any lengthy preparations, but picked up the animal, turned him over on to his back, deftly held his head and paws together, and the lessons*

*began. 'There are the male organs, these are just a few stray hairs, and that is his bottom' " (24 Jan.-44:125 6).*

Evidently Mrs. Van Daan's statement about Anne that she was "already proficient in the theory" of sex and it was "only the practice" she lacked was an understatement (29 July-43:83).

Having learned a cat's sex anatomy she had now acquired the necessary skills. Joyfully she noticed Peter "kept looking" at her (13 Feb.-44:134). We wonder what otherwise he could have done seeing they were living in "intolerable proximity." Anne now sensed "*a real feeling of fellowship, such as*" she could "*only remember having with*" her "*girl friends*" (14 Feb.-44:136). "*Whenever*" she goes "*upstairs*" she keeps "*on hoping that*" she "*shall see 'him.'* *Because my life now has an object, and I have something to look forward to*" (18 Feb.-44:138). Nearly every morning" she goes to the attic to meet Peter (23 Feb.-44:140). But even Peter can be disinterested, preferring carpentry rather than love (28 Feb.-44:142). Mrs. Van Daan gets a little anxious and asks: "*Can I really trust you two up there together?*" (4 March-44:147). According to Anne, her mother feels that Mrs. Van Daan is getting jealous at Anne (28 March-44:169). Anne admits that it "*is all I was - a terrible flirt, coquettish and amusing*" (7 March 44:149). Anne's flirtations with Peter continue (19 March 44:160) but feels her "*style is not up to standard*" that day (161). Things however improve. She feels she yet may have "*a real great lone in the 'Secret Annexe,'*" and adds: "*Don't worry, I'm not thinking of marrying him*" (22 March 44:163). Her sister Margot whom we for some odd reason hear so precious little about is not jealous. The attic gets called "*Anne's second home*" (23 March-44:165). Anne is "*longing for a kiss*" (1 April-44:172).

On April 11, 1944, matters improve further. She tells us that they were "so close together that we could feel each other's bodies quivering" (181). Further progress is made. Peter asks: "*'Do you still dare to go to the front attic?... I nodded, fetched my pillow, and we went up to the attic... Peter put his arm around my shoulder, and I put mine around his and so we remained, our arms around each other, quietly waiting until Margot came to fetch us'*" (183). How more serenely could they have lived? Progress is still made: "*Peter and I are sitting... together... our arms around each other's shoulders, and very close, he with one of my curls in his hand*" (14 April-44:185). Whether she includes herself in stating "*There's no one here that sets a good example*" (185) we do not know. Finally she could report about a very important day in her life the first kiss she had been waiting for so long. She writes about the happenings that transpired during this eventful occasion (16 April-44:186-7). The day after she can not "*see the use of*

[68]

*only just cuddling each other*" (17 April-44:188). The CUDDLING however continues on the next day: "*Yesterday Peter and I finally got down to our talk, which had already been put off for at least ten days. I explained everything about girls to him and DIDN'T HESITATE TO DISCUSS THE MOST INTIMATE THINGS. The evening ended by each giving the other a kiss, just about beside my mouth, it's really a lovely feeling*" (18 April-44:189). They continue to talk "*about the most private things*" (15 July 44:232). The drama gets more involved: "*He came towards me, I flung my arms around his neck and gave him a kiss on his left cheek, and was about to kiss the other cheek, when my lips met his and we pressed them together. In a whirl we were clasped in each other's arms, again and again, never to leave off*" (28 April-44:193). We presume that by this time she must have "advanced" quite a lot. It surely must have been something different from her looking at Rin Tin Tin films (15 June-42:1). Quite understandable in view of all the foregoing she takes no "*offense at a flirtation, a kiss, an embrace, a dirty joke*" (1 Aug.-44:235). Whether anyone believes the foregoing was in fact written by a girl experiencing indescribable persecutions or whether they are interpolations; whatever may be said, we feel quite sure, those responsible knew how to SELL a story. Likely they also knew that the story would be boring without these portions. Seeing we are told portions of advanced sex were elided we can only visualize what they may have contained. At any rate: How many families had the time, strength and health during the war to carry on with such amorous activities and speculations ? Yet she, along with her group, has become the symbol of the most terrible of persecutions that anyone experienced under the Nazis. This is. a disgrace for all those people who were unjustly persecuted and who did experience REAL hardships. The whole Anne Frank story is sickening !

## NO STRICT CONFINEMENT

The nature of this colossal swindle may be further ascertained by recognizing that the people in reality were NOT confined to their so called "hiding place." The impression that sales gimmicks of various types have

given is however to the contrary. They claim that the group was strictly confined, hardly even able to either move or breathe. Absolutely never do we hear of anyone leaving the attic for fear of being immediately discovered. The back cover of the 1963 Cardinal edition states: "Her diary reveals the life of this group of Jews waiting in fear of being discovered by the Nazis." EJ states: "ITS GREAT IMPORTANCE LIES IN THE OPPRESSING DESCRIPTION OF THE ALL PERVADING FEAR AND THE DESOLATE LIFE OF THE INCARCERATED JEWS" (Vo1.7:54). The EJ claims Anne "unsuccessfully attempted to elude the Nazis during occupation of her native Holland" (Vo1.5:581). Storm Jameson in the "Pan" edition of the diary says:

*"Her father had been preparing for months a place to hide in the two upper back floors of an old building. . . Here Anne, her sixteen year old sister Margot, and her parents now took refuge, HUNTED ANIMALS BURROWING OUT OF SIGHT... THEY HAD TO TAKE ENDLESS CARE, ALL DAY,*

[69]

*NOT TO BE SEEN OR HEARD, and for an energetic spirited little girl the life must often have been as maddening as the punishment of being sent to bed on a fine afternoon" (5,6).*

Eleanor Roosevelt tells us: "Anne Frank's account of the changes wrought upon eight people HIDING OUT FROM THE NAZIS FOR TWO YEARS... LIVING IN CONSTANT FEAR AND ISOLATION, IM PRISONED... a young girl LIVING UNDER EXTRAORDINARY CONDITIONS" (Cardinal ed., "introduction."). We have already had plenty of examples what these "extraordinary conditions" were. The back cover of the Swedish Anne Frank Diary (1953) clearly advertises: "Her description about her outer life also grips us, how eight people lived in a pair of attics obviously wrong] for two years, WITHOUT EVER DARING TO GO OUTSIDE, not daring to talk loudly, under constant fear of being discovered:" Again we get disappointed when we start to investigate. We have already mentioned about "Dr." Dussel putting on his coat stuffed with food. Where was he heading for? At least one person, Peter, actually went around the building TWICE DAILY! Obviously those people writing about the diary have never bothered to READ it. They have just glanced through it and so they have made their opinions without bothering to rally read it. The fact that Peter went AROUND the building further confirms our opinion that the family moved to the warehouse, not primarily for hiding, for if so they would have chosen another more suitable place, BUT TO PROTECT THEIR PROPERTY AGAINST DUTCH THIEVES and likely because they wanted to keep watchful eyes on those who were now running the business (Compare 29 March-44:170). Once this is kept in mind the entire riddle of the Anne Frank confusion starts to make sense. Let us give some examples of the fact it was thieves they actually were concerned about. When their premises were broken into we are told:

*"They were in the act of breaking into the warehouse. Daddy, Van Daan, Dussel, and Peter WERE DOWNSTAIRS IN A FLASH" (11 Apr.-44:177).*

Were they truly in fear of being discovered they would not have acted in this way. How, for instance, could they know it was not the police or the Gestapo who were entering? Mr. Van Daan *"beat on the ground with a chopper."* (178) hardly a wise thing to do were they truly in fear of being discovered. To discourage future thievery arrangements were made whereby *"PETER GOES ROUND THE HOUSE FOR A CHECKUP at half past eight and half past nine"* (183). We are also reminded about Peter *"roaring with laughter"* (9 Nov.-42:43), about him doing carpentry work and chopping wood and his *"doing acrobatics round the room with his cat"* (10 Dec.-42:52). In spite of all this we have been told by such Jewish writers as Margit Vinberg, who has had personal interviews with the Franks and who states her information is absolutely correct, that the roller curtains never went up and that the windows were never opened on the top floors. Somebody must be lying. Clearly then, no strict confinement was necessary or wanted for the PRIME MOTIVE in moving into the warehouse seems to have been to protect their belongings and to keep an eye on the workers in the warehouse. The story loses all its credibility when these facts are known and when it is scrutinized under the searchlight. One portion is the

[70]

sales gimmicks by which the public have been brainwashed, the other portion is the real portion which none but those who read the story carefully will understand. Most people never read their books carefully, much less literary critics who often get their "reviews" from paid public relations firms. The Frank family had probably less of a dramatic life (except of course their constant quarrels, if we ought to call this "dramatic") than many a Dutch family in Amsterdam at the time but who never ventured to make money out of their and other people's miseries like Mr. Frank and his lot did.

## VISITORS OVERNIGHT

The so called "Secret Annexe" was frequently visited by various people during the day. They even shared meals together. A startling observation the investigator makes is the knowledge that people went to the "Secret Annexe" to OVERNIGHT. For instance in one place Anne reports:

*"Well! Well! Luckily everything was okay this time. Meanwhile WE HAD GREAT FUN ON MONDAY. Miep and Henk SPENT THE NIGHT HERE. Margot and I went in Mom my and Daddy's room for the night, [but where did "Dr." Dussel go?] so that the Van Santens could have our room. The meal tasted divine... I got up early this morning. Henk had to leave at half past eight. After a cosy breakfast Miep went downstairs... Next week Elli is coming to stay for a night" (20 Oct.-42:37,38).*

Schnabel reports that Elli overnighted there also (6:101). Now we ask: What sane people would under the threat of death consider inviting guests for dinner and even letting them overnight? The hazards of people entering the premises at odd hours and never leaving a warehouse for a whole night would certainly invite suspicion, to say the least. Instead of blaming themselves, a certain Mr. "M" is blamed for exposing them! (Schnabel, Introduction: 10, 6:84, 7:117, 8:135, 9:143, 146, 12:189). With some people impudence knows no bounds. The entire Anne Frank story is one nightmare of contradiction and hypocrisy. How rubbish of this sort can be foisted on people is hardly any credit to mankind's intelligence.

## ONE DIARY ONLY

There obviously is a difference between one cookbook, two cookbooks or several cookbooks. They all may be called cookbooks showing the culinary art from various perspectives yet there is as much difference from one cookbook to another cookbook to more than one cookbook as there is in the fact that one plus one makes two - not one. The original impression we have been given by Mr. Frank is that it was ONE diary, a gift he had bought for Anne's birthday at a bookstore. Schnabel informs us about him seeing the bookstore: "the same store where Otto Frank fifteen years ago bought the diary with a red chequered cover" (2:32). The information that it concerns only ONE diary is so prevalent, not only in written articles but also amongst the general public, that we may consider it to be the official STANDARD VERSION. Anyone can make his own test by asking someone about the diary. Invariably he will find that people think of one diary - not many. We shall cull extracts from written sources which verify this fact further. It is important to do so as it has a heavy bearing on the truthfulness of the story. From it we notice an evolution of the product. It indicates to us how it became a myth; how it was exploited for

[71]

sales purposes, used as a tool to present distorted impressions about the German people and as a tool to peddle Zionism. *Gyldendals store Opslagsbog*, Copenhagen, 1967, Vol. 2:252: "Frank left ONE diary." *Focus*, Stockholm, Vol. 2:959: "Anne's DIARY." *Aschehougs Konversasjonsleksikon*, Oslo, 1969, Vol. 7:94: "who left ONE diary." *Bra Böckers Lexikon*, Sweden, Vol. 8:203: "world famous by her surviving DIARY." *Katalog Över Böcker För Folk - Och Skolbibliotek*, Grundkatalog 2, Tillägg 30, Stockholm, 1955:23, an authoritative work used by Swedish librarians and in school libraries says: "Anne's diary was found." The back cover of the 1953 Swedish edition of the diary says: "A DIARY was given to her as a birthday gift when she became thirteen." *Das Tagebuch Der Anne Frank*, Svenska Bokforlaget Norstedts, Stockholm, 1964: "The DIARY by Anne Frank was written in Dutch" (Forord). *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Micropaedia*, 1975, Vol.-44:279: "On the hiding place floor [contradicted by other sources but supported by Simon Wiesenthal: 176; by the play and *The Christian Science Monitor*, etc.] he found STORIES Anne had written about elves, bears, and old dwarf and the diary. [observe here that when it was later told that Anne was supposed to have written other stories it came as a complete surprise to many people] He had it published in 1947 as *Het Achterhuis*." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, Vol. 7:52: "teen age author of A DIARY... Her name became famous... as a result of the DIARY." Cecil Roth & Geoffrey Wigoder, *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1975:697: "While in hiding during the Nazi occupation of Holland, she wrote... A remarkable 'Journal' displaying great literary ability and psychological

insight. This was discovered after her death." *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon*, Mannheim, 1973, Vol. 9:231 says she kept "ONE DIARY." Wiesenthal and Margit Vinberg make the same claim that it concerns one diary. Encyclopaedic works and other information material all create the impression it was one diary. Not one hint is given that more than one diary was involved. No less did the famous drama, a play in two acts by Albert Hackett and his wife Frances Goodrich; which play by the way is claimed by some to have been purloined from Meyer Levin, create the impression it concerned only one diary. One source says the authors "spent years of research and writing" the drama. The same source explains how the play begins: "Ready to leave Amsterdam after the war, Mr. Frank reveals his daughter's diary" (MWD: 207). Thousands have seen this play where they are left with the impression that it was one diary, besides of course being left with the thought the Germans were brutes. What about the printed diary itself? Our Cardinal edition does not give us one hint there was more than one diary. George Stevens clearly seems to have been under the impression there was only one diary. He speaks of "A small red chequered cloth covered book," of the "little diary seen only by herself." He asks the father: "how was it they did not find and destroy the diary?" He tells how the diary was thrown on the floor and how it was discovered. In the same edition, Eleanor Roosevelt likewise speaks of only one diary. The back cover speaks also of one diary. The "Epilogue" mentions that "Anne's diary ends here... Among a pile of old books, magazines, and newspapers which were left lying on the floor, Miep and Elli found Anne's diary." In Anne's third last entry she speaks of:

[72]

*"These things have made me never mention my views on life nor my well considered theories to anyone but my diary and, occasionally, to Margot, I concealed from Daddy everything"* (15 July-44:231).

To "conceal" one diary under "intolerable proximity" would be a master job in itself but to conceal several diaries under such condition seems to us to be more than a miracle. Obviously it was the same "my diary" and "a diary" Anne had spoken to on 20 June-42:2,3. In moving to her new home Anne writes:

*"The first thing I put in was this diary." She put it into her "school satchel"* (8 July42:13).

On 2 Jan.-44:113 she makes the following entry:

*"This morning when I had nothing to do I turned over some of the pages of my diary... This diary is of great value to me, because IT has become A BOOK of memoirs in many places, but on a good many pages I could certainly put past and done with.*

Our later, English Pan Books (1975) edition continues to maintain the myth there was one diary in spite of what others, like Schnabel had previously written. "Storm Jameson" (an obvious pseudonym; more on this later) writes in his foreword: "Among the presents Anne Frank received on her thirteenth birthday, the one that pleased her most was A BOOK with stiff covers in which she began to keep a journal: she had never tried to write before" (5). It seems that he also is confused over what kind of book it really was. He continues: "the first thing Anne packs to take with her is her journal... she kept her journal, telling it everything she might have told an intimate friend... Found later in the disorder left by the Gestapo, Anne's dear journal was given to her Dutch friends... She was not counting on her journal to lend" (5,6). He proceeds: "And as the last entry in the journal shows plainly"(9). It is obvious he is under the impression that this little diary contained in full the complete printed edition!

The "Epilogue" in the Pan Books edition gives the readers the same impression as does its back cover. How ingrained this notion has become in people's minds that it concerns ONE DIARY may be shown by the experiences we had after people had seen the recent TV show about the diary which we shall talk more about further on. Although many felt the TV show was very confusing they still maintained it concerned ONE DIARY even though they had seen several books, etc., on that show.

The official AFFA brochure continues to promulgate the impression of ONE DIARY. There not even a hint is given to us it may be otherwise. It speaks of the "diary of Anne Frank, WRITTEN IN PRIVACY of an annexe" (4) making us wonder how "private" that could have been seeing they were supposed to have lived in such "intolerable proximity." A picture is shown of a diary on page 5 purporting to be the one she wrote in. We are told that the advantage of Anne over Antigone to St Therese is "that she left a diary" and that her "legend lacks the support of patriotic and ecclesiastical power, but it has the STRENGTH of her AUTHENTIC, self drawn portrait" (5). How "authentic" this work really may be we have already touched on. We are further told that "It took" the father "many weeks to finish reading the diary" (6).

The celebrities like Pope John XXIII, President John F. Kennedy (16) and Father Dominique Pire (17) were apparently all under the impression it concerned one diary. As can be expected the BG:2 claims the same thing: "It was

[73]

in this room that Anne's Diary was found" and on page 3 it says: "When Miep and Elly... were cleaning up they found the exercise books in which Anne had kept her diary... It was then that he was handed the diary of his youngest daughter." What happened to Margot's diary ? We do not know. We shall go into this question further but before we do so let us begin our next heading by asking the question: Could there have been more than one diary ? Or should we turn the question around: Could there possibly have been only ONE diary ?

## MORE THAN ONE DIARY EMERGING

As we have previously observed, the printed entries give us no hint of there being more than one diary. Anne's statement that: "*At thirteen the fountain pen came with us to the 'Secret Annexe,' where it has raced through countless diaries and compositions for me*" (11 Nov.-43:104) should be so understood that she is writing about her countless entries in her diary. Possibly the Dutch original makes this more clear. We have already mentioned that the various translations do vary and it is many times difficult to get the proper sense because of the differences in translation.

Officially they maintained (and still do unless expediency calls for otherwise) that there was just one diary. Likely because of the doubts that have been aired that there even was ONE authentic diary, the original propaganda had to be softened up. The legal action which the father later brought against a student group brought further difficulties in maintaining the original story. When the investigators checked the material they found several diaries. The information however never came out in public. Possibly the death of Anneliese Schutz, the Jewish journalist, a good friend of the Franks from the time they lived in Frankfort on Main, helped Mr. Frank to soften up his original stories. It does not seem that any information was brought out to the public about the startling fact that there MUST have been more than one diary. If we are to believe the Dutch publishers who brought out *Verhalen rondom net Achterhuis* (German: *Geschichten und Ereignisse aus dem Hinterhaus*; English: *Works of Anne Frank*, 1959), even they seemed perplexed to find out that other written material by Anne had been left behind; indeed a rather precarious bit of news seeing they themselves had previously propagated that the ruthless Germans were so thorough in plundering the house so as to leave no telltale signs to indicate the people were taken to be exterminated. The impression the sale gimmickers have created was that by some mysterious chance Anne's diary had escaped their ruthless attention (*Anne Frank Berättelser*, "Efterskrift", Stockholm, 1960:169-71). Seemingly Mr. Frank had difficulties enough to explain to George Stevens how it was that the thorough Gestapo could have missed ONE diary - BUT SEVERAL DIARIES ALONG WITH OTHER DOCUMENTS, how they could have been missed, would certainly make the whole story most peculiar if not idiotic. The allegation that the premises were plundered would also have to be abandoned. The story of how Elli and Miep had found a diary along with a host of other stories would have to be altered or revised. Already by this time the story was one mishmash of confusion so that further alterations would be insane. The dilemma, a fact which for instance can be observed from Ernst Schnabel's silly book *The*

[74]

*Footsteps of Anne Frank* (1961), was simply solved by ignoring all logical objections altogether, possibly the wisest course they could have taken besides the only choice left open to them.

Ernst Schnabel's puerile book, purporting to be an "authentic" story about Anne's life and diary was one of the first printed sources the world received hinting that facts may be otherwise, even though they are carefully couched so as not to draw too much attention. In the midst of informing us there may have been more than one diary involved we are still given the opposite impression. For instance he states: "Later on, in one of her notebooks Anne had besides her diary" (2:28; compare p. 37, 3:51, 6:94). He mentions of her father having bought one diary (2:32). The father is said to have stated about Anne: "Perhaps she also knew that by now everything was lost, that's why she walked back and forth and PACKED and did not give the diary even a sight" (8:134, seeing he was not supposed to have known about it according to some sources how would he know?). If there was more than one diary the father should have said diaries.

Another variation is given by George Stevens in the preface of the Cardinal edition (also supported by

Simon Wiesenthal, 176): that the Diary was in Mr. Frank's brief case, and that the Germans tossed the contents onto the floor. They used the empty brief case to make off with the family menorah (naturally!) and left the "papers and diary" on the floor where Miep later picked them up. How the diary got into Frank's brief case in the first place, when it was supposed to be a secret diary, is not explained. Another one claims it lay in "Anne's briefcase" (AFFA:8) and so forth. This may also suggest to us she may have wanted to take the diary with her and it may in fact have been taken with her. Also, all these various stories coming out make us wonder whether these people in fact *lived* the story or had just *read* about it.

At the same time that Schnabel suggests one diary he makes it quite clear in more than one instance that there was more than one diary involved. He mentions Miep having discovered Anne writing "in one of these CASHBOOKS we kept in our office. I could recognize it" (6:93). This may have been her diary. He mentions about the story "Katrientje" that Anne is supposed to have read to Koophuis. Surely this would mean there was more to it than just that "little diary" where not enough space would be found even for the printed version of her diary let alone other stories (6:94). However, the most revealing portion which proves the original one diary story to be a lie is when he informs us that: "Anne's papers and notebooks lay protected in a metal box in an old, green safety box in Amsterdam. I have seen it. Inside the box lies the book with the red chequered covers which Anne started to write in the CASHBOOKS from the office WHICH SHE CONTINUED TO WRITE IN. Finally. There lies also the bundle of 312 sheets of silk paper, completely filled with her tight, beautiful handwriting" (12:186; we should observe here that by the time "Frau Minna Becker" had investigated the material the amount of silk papers had increased to 338 !). The myth of the one-diary story should be abandoned once and for all. It has no support whatsoever as far as actual facts concern. It was invented at the outset to help in peddling an otherwise worthless product. Once it is abandoned the whole Anne Frank story loses whatever dramatic effect it had. It merely had

[75]

private and Zionist interests. It was used to further the product onto a gullible public and literary "critics" who were nothing else but pawns in their hands. It was used as a financial gimmick. The whole invention is one mass of pragmatism.

We notice an evolutionary process in the diary. Stripped from all its emotions the story of the diary becomes one hideous outline of a group of unscrupulous people, callously using a young girl to further their own aims. Could it be that Anne, contrary to what is stated, did keep a diary prior to 14 June, 1942 ? May the red chequered diary be one she had written in before that time ? Unless the father once and for all comes out in the open and tells the WHOLE truth, the WHOLE story will continue to be a mystery, even though at this stage it must be viewed as one of the most hideous literary falsifications ever foisted upon mankind. The public has a right to know. The father has gone out to the world presenting it as an authentic document. If so, he is the one that must produce the goods. We have produced the evidence showing there is something radically wrong with his story or rather stories. It is now up to him to show us his cards. Most of us bought the book and accepted the stories they gave out believing they were true. We could not dream that anyone would try to fool us in this manner. Now we want to know the WHOLE truth. Half truths are often worse than lies. The time has come for him to get into action and let us investigate the originals ourselves. Nothing else would satisfy us. That it is a swindle is obvious. What we want to find out is how this swindle could have been foisted upon us for so long.

## ONE FILM TOO MUCH

In connection with the above presentation we would like to give further evidence, not only on the fact that more than one diary was involved but also that there are different handwritings. On Friday, December 2, 1977, at 18:05 in the evening, the Swedish Television (TV 1) showed a film of the Anne Frank Foundation. It started off by showing the father heading for a bank, a man opening a safety box and the father taking several items from it. Other sequences showed not only a variety of items but also what appeared to be different handwritings. Whenever the handwritings were shown they were either kept out of focus or the sequences went by so quickly it was most difficult to follow. The only portion that was at close range and in focus was when they showed completely EMPTY pages, the LINES could be clearly seen. At the end of the film the father coolly tells the audience this was a living document. We were not shown what he was holding in his hands. It seems more correct to call it a living lie. True documents speak for themselves and need no gimmicks in trying to explain them. The film left the impression of confusion. Perhaps after all about the only true thing of the whole story. People we had asked said it was a most confusing presentation. Likely it was made in a desperate attempt by the

father to quieten critics and fool the public once more.

## WHY THE ONE-DIARY-STORY?

Why was the one diary story invented? Why must the myth be maintained? Would it not have been even more significant if the public had been informed at the very outset the girl had written several diaries along with other stories ? Have we not been told about her literary genius and would this

[76]

not have given support to the claim ? The reason is obvious. Thousands of other Dutch girls and boys kept diaries. Diaries were sold all over Holland. Likely their stories were more dramatic than Anne's and showed much more talent than her fabricated material. Therefore something more dramatic was needed to sell the story. But in order to sell it, it had to be changed. Some believe there is not even one diary existing purporting to belong to Anne that is genuine. We believe there is. We need not go so far and this may precisely be Mr. Frank's big problem. There is a diary or diaries existing but not all may have been written by Anne and the one that she wrote has been severely altered. Her PRINTED version is different from her handwritten version. Having changed the genuine version by making numerous interpolations in order to sell the story the swindlers created certain psychological soft-spots. To any big lie there is needed an element of truth. The Anne Frank story has just got all the ingredients to make the swindle work.

Furthermore, the story needed an air of PERSECUTION so that inquisitive people would be embarrassed to ask questions for who in his right mind would partake in persecuting the name and memory of a defenseless girl? It would also create soft spots in people's hearts. Once the proper atmosphere had been created by various juggling around of events the story was ready to go to the world. Quite possibly some of it was already made up prior to the war by Mr. Frank and his most dear friend, Anneliese Schutz, a Jewish journalist. The one diary story was necessary for the "Secret Annexe" concoction. The impression was given that their purpose in hiding there was not so that they should be able to keep a close watch on their business; even more necessary now as the business had been given over to gentiles and furthermore: TO PROTECT IT FROM BURGLARS; but that they were "hiding" from ruthless Germans who ceaselessly searched Dutch and Jewish homes, meticulously erasing all traces of their wanton plunders. By it, the suspense was created how a whole family's possessions were confiscated, how their home was thoroughly searched so as to leave no trace to the world as the group was shipped away for extermination - BUT BY SOME MIRACLE the thorough Gestapo had missed the very evidence which would expose them to the world. It would reveal to the world about their terrible persecutions and sufferings. The only trouble was that even in this respect, as we have seen, the story is a poor one. The hoaxers have been too quick in giving it out. "Fortunately for us," Storm Jameson writes in his "foreword" to the Pan Books edition (1975:6), "it is a marvellously clear image which comes towards us, SMILING, from these pages which CLUMSY MURDEROUS HANDS did not take the trouble to destroy." However to maintain that in spite of the Gestapo's thoroughness they could have missed even ONE diary, as "clumsy" they yet may have been required some explanation. George Stevens was perplexed and asked himself this question:

*"This destiny to survive was illustrated dramatically in the conversation I had with Mr. Otto Frank in 1957. We were sitting in a cramped attic in Amsterdam and I was holding in my hand a printed edition of The Diary of A Young Girl. It was in this building that Mr. Frank had sheltered his little group while they hid from the Nazis. AFTER SERIOUS HESITATION, I asked Mr. Frank a question to which I felt I MUST HAVE THE ANSWER - 'Can you tell me something about what occurred when the*

[77]

*Gestapo broke into this room? THEIR MISSION WAS TO DESTROY HOW WAS IT THEY DID NOT FIND AND DESTROY THE DIARY?: . . Their mission was to remove the Jews from Holland. While so doing, they WERE TO LOOT AND TO PLUNDER and, MOST IMPORTANTLY, they were to leave NO RECORD OR DOCUMENTS OF THIS WORK. . . However, there remained on the floor the diary of a young girl. The Nazi soldiers had failed in their mission. They had left behind a comment on their work" (Preface).*

Here we have the clue to the riddle. The one diary story was invented to accuse the Germans of ruthless persecutions and to maintain a plausible air of truth over the "Secret Annexe." The diary also did more than

anything else to keep a world blind and to keep their mouths shut when the "chosen race" invaded and took away Palestine from its original inhabitants calling it "Israel" even though the bandits were nothing else but phoney Khazars who have no right whatsoever to their stolen loot. Mr. Frank and his lot and his phoney Foundation continue to ceaselessly spew hate propaganda against the Germans, yet these masters of hate have the audacity to claim they work to abandon hate and prejudice amongst mankind. What they in fact work for is that not only PERPETUAL HATE should be focused on the Germans but also so that people will forgive them for displacing the Palestinians from their homeland. The swindle now takes on gigantic proportions. As long as all criticism is not directed against the "chosen race" everything is permissible. The Zionists must have a clear field to work with and for this reason the Anne Frank myth is VITAL TO THEM.

Embarrassingly the question remains. Perhaps by some chance those thorough Nazis could have missed one diary but what about this heap of other writings that they also left behind? If they came to plunder and loot and leave nothing behind how could they have missed them? It is too bad George Stevens is no longer alive. He may have been puzzled about it. That the Nazis didn't bother about confiscating all the books and other writings may simply be for the reason they didn't give a hoot about them. In tracing all the peculiar arguments and reasoning that have been offered by the exponents of these tales we begin to get a clear picture of the swindle's vast scope. The whole postwar labors of the Zionists have been linked up with this fable of the Anne Frank Diary. It is indeed astounding to find out that the best proof they can give for holding onto their stolen loot is the Anne Frank fiction. In their haste to spew hatred upon others and steal a whole country away from its rightful owners the Zionists have been caught in their own trap. The whole Zionist swindle now comes tumbling down upon them. At no time was it more unfortunate for the swindle to be exposed than now. For thirty years they have been able to fool a whole world. What shocking effect this revelation must have on all those people now realizing they have been hoodwinked.

## HOW THE DIARY WAS LEFT AND HOW IT WAS FOUND

One popular version maintains the diary was left up amongst the beams which was the reason why the Gestapo could not find it. Another version claims that the mysterious Mr. "M" had saved it. Schnabel's version is that Elli and Miep found Anne's papers ONE WEEK AFTER the police had broken in. Why so long afterwards, seeing they were working there daily, we are not

[78]

told. Amongst the papers and other things on the floor lay a book with red-chequered covers. Miep picked it up, recognizing Anne's handwriting. They took the book with them along with Anne's exercise books and pink papers locking them up in the large office downstairs, a place by the way which the new caretaker of the warehouse, Mr. "M" must have had access to. Curiously Mr. "M" whom it is alleged had betrayed them and who was working for the Nazis, gave Eli some more of Anne's papers, making one wonder if he has been intentionally created as the "baddie" in the story (Schnabel 12:1889).

George Stevens informs us the diary was in "Mr. Frank's brief case" when the Gestapo entered. Apparently this is what Otto Frank had told him (Cardinal ed., preface). Simon Wiesenthal adopts the same view even citing Mr. Frank himself "The SS man took my brief case. . . threw Anne's diary on the floor" (176). However this view seems strange for several reasons. Again it makes us wonder whether not only the others but even Mr. Frank himself was rather *reading* a story than living it. Perhaps A. Schutz had helped him more than we have reason to believe.

In one of Anne's last entries she writes:

*"These things have made me never mention my views on life nor my well considered theories to anyone but my diary and, occasionally, to Margot. I concealed from Daddy everything that perturbed me; I never shared my ideals with him"* (15 July44:231).

Why then would she have placed her diary in her own dad's briefcase? Moreover, she had written a nasty letter to her father, who in finding it stated: "*I have received many letters in my life, but this is certainly the most unpleasant*" (7 May-44:201; compare 6 May-44:200 and 15 July44:232).

It seems reasonable to expect Anne would not stick her own diary into her father's briefcase where this information was written. It would have been the best place for him to find her innermost secrets.

Another official version seems more plausible. It is presented in the AFFA brochure where it says:

*"The legend [we fully agree: LEGEND] had its start when the Nazi sergeant who arrested the Franks needed something in which to carry the money and valuables he was confiscating. He chose Anne's briefcase, and emptied her papers and notebooks on the floor. It was a fortunate event, for Anne was then less likely to take the papers with her, and they could lie unmolested a few days [why if the Nazis constantly were raiding the places and in view of Mr. "M" being there?] until Miep and Elli, loyal Dutch friends, found them and locked them up in Mr. Frank's former office. There the papers stayed until the return of Otto Frank, the only one of Anne's fellow fugitives to survive the concentration camps. It took him many weeks to finish reading the diary; the emotional strain of even a few pages would overcome him" (6).*

In pausing we wonder how they dared to put the most devastating documents, that would expose the Nazis and which they were after, RIGHT IN THE OFFICE WHICH NOW WAS TAKEN CARE OF BY MR. "M"? In what possibly worse place could they have been kept? That the diary was kept in Anne's own briefcase is also the view of Uff Brandell (\*DN, 1959, March 22) whereas Margit Vinberg opts for the view that Mr. Frank himself found it on the floor (\*1956, Nr 35). The BG:3 presents its version on how the diary was found

[79]

and in doing so two questions arise. We quote:

*"On 4th August 1944, the hiding place was betrayed to the Gestapo, [this is contradicted by Schnabel 9:143 who informs that Mr. Frank himself did not believe they were betrayed but that someone had been careless - if so, then the one he should blame is himself and his lot] its inmates were arrested and deported. All furniture and clothing was confiscated; [again contradicted by Schnabel] some books and papers were left scattered on the floor. When Miep and Elly, the loyal friends of the family in hiding, were cleaning up they found the exercise books in which Anne had kept her diary."*

First, that "all furniture and clothing" was confiscated is flatly contradicted by Schnabel. In his book, Miep is supposed to have said that everything lay helter-skelter in the rooms and that they looked so empty, not because they had taken the furniture but because there were NO PEOPLE there. In fact, she claims that on the floor lay clothing, letters, papers and exercise books. Even Anne's sweater hung up on a hook. Therefore, seeing that it is reported that Eli and Miep entered the place "a week after," then what the BG reports is obviously wrong (Schnabel 12:188 9). No mention is made in Schnabel's book that the Gestapo took furniture and clothing with them but we do read that THE GROUP TOOK THINGS WITH THEM. If they really believed that they were taken away to be gassed to death (compare 9 Oct.-42:35, 3 Feb.-44:133) why would they have done so? They must have known others; their own enemies would have taken their goods away from them. The police on their part seemed to have had trouble enough to get a large car to take the eight people with them. We are told: "He phoned a military post and ordered a car 'But a large one !' he said. There are seven or eight persons" (8:134). Later even Kraler and Koophuis had to follow them in the car (8:135). All in all there were around thirteen people in the car !

The group of eight people took with them their own belongings. We must indeed agree they needed A VERY LARGE CAR. Really then, it was not the police (Gestapo) who took goods with them but the group of eight people: "Mr. Frank said They gave us more time than we needed. Each one of us already knew what he should take with him. It was the package which we had agreed on we would take with us in case of fire" (8:134; compare Schnabel 6:87 8). That the sergeant should have taken "all furniture and clothing" with him seems a bit ridiculous indeed for he only had a motorcycle which he pushed in front of him to get it started after leaving the house (8:138). Really, the only ones we read of taking anything away were the Jewish girl Lies, and Joppie. They went to the warehouse and took with them some of Anne's property which sounds a bit greedy to us (4:69). The safe thing to do in view of all this evidence seems to be to dismiss the whole thing about the Gestapo confiscating their furniture and clothing and add it to an already overfilled list of fantasies. Likely the diary was placed in Anne's own "school satchel" (8 July-42:13) or briefcase and not in Mr. Frank's briefcase.

Margareta Schwartz in her Expressen article (1976, Sunday: 6, Oct.10) says, on a basis of her personal interview with Mr. Frank, that it was Miep who found the diary. Contrary to what Schnabel reports, that Miep had noticed Anne's hand writing, this version claims she took it up without reading it and sealed it inside an envelope thereby indicating it should

[80]

have been a rather small book. Here again no mention is made of the other material. How all these other writings appeared on the scene remains a mystery. Another popular version, if we have not had enough of them already, claims that it was when Mr. Frank returned to Prinsengracht he "found Anne's diary in a pile of rubble after the Gestapo had cleared out the annex." This version is presented in *The Christian Science Monitor* (1977, July-44:23). It is also supported by such celebrities as Simon Wiesenthal and others (176). Seeing there are so many contradictory versions, both official and non official, circulating around even in printed material it seems impossible to find out the truth. It may even be so, and we hope Mr. Frank will take no offence to our suggestion, seeing he himself has created such rich varieties of answers, that some diaries were in fact taken with them by the group AFTER they were evicted from the homes. They may have been packed in with the belongings they took with them. There are legions of other stories circulating about Anne Frank, the group and her diary. We have only taken a few, pointing out those which the readers themselves are likely to meet and may be able to investigate.

## ANONYMOUS NAMES

Another strange circumstance surrounding the diary is the fact that the PRINTED diary, loudly voiced to the most significant document to come out of World War II, does not contain the real names. The real names we are told have been substituted for fictitious names. Why we were not told this in the beginning when the diary first came out is rather interesting. Our 1963 Cardinal ed. makes no mention that fictitious names are used. In fact it gives the impression the names are real. It states: "Apart from a very few passages, which are of little interest to the reader, the ORIGINAL TEXT HAS BEEN PRINTED" (Epilogue). In other words, only a few PASSAGES have been excluded. The "ORIGINAL TEXT" *has been* printed. However, substituting real names for fictitious names makes the printed text no longer the "original text." Our 1975 Pan Books ed. makes likewise no mention of that fictitious names are being used. The idea about using fictitious names in case the diary was printed, we are told, may come up after Anne had listened to Bolkestein (AFFA:14 calls him "Bolkenstein") on the radio, which is mentioned in her 29 March-4 entry. Henri F. Pommer writes: "It cannot have been long after this that Anne wrote out a list of FICTITIOUS NAMES TO BE SUBSTITUTED FOR REAL ONES if her diary were ever published - a list which Otto Frank used, changing for example the real name Van Pelz to Van Daan" (AFFA:15). Most people are not even aware that this "authentic document" uses fictitious names. Schnabel in his irresponsible "authentic history" surrounding Anne Frank gives us the same information of anonymous names being used in the diary and he follows up the whole fracas by himself using fictitious names. In this way no person can follow up on his information. He does claim however that by writing to Fischer Bucherei in Frankfurt they will send us a list of the real names and addresses (Foreword:9). However this appears to be but another gimmick in a long line of gimmicks for when the editor of FRIA ORD, a Swedish paper, wrote them, their lawyer, Mr. Ernst Wahl wrote back in a letter dated Frankfurt am Main, December 6, 1962, that this was

[81]

impossible: "I have no authority to give you the desired information. It is in no way possible to give out the names and addresses. I beg for your understanding. - Sincerely, E. Wahl, Lawyer" (1963, March 30:5).

Several questions arise now. The whole manner in which the affairs have been worked out reek of fatuous play. If Anne wanted to use pseudonymous names why should she then not be even more interested to keep herself, her father, her mother, and her sister Margot pseudonymous? We see the soundness of our query when we remember the numerous disparaging remarks that she made about members of her own family. Where is this list which is supposed to contain the substitute, fictitious names? Where and how was this list found? Did Miep and Elli also find it? Are Koophuis, Kraler, Kolen & Co., Travies, Kitty, Bolkestein, Gerbrandy and others real or not? What about "Storm Jameson" the English edition preface author? Are even the names of the cats pseudonymous perhaps? Why did she use the real names for Hitler, (20 June-42:3, 19 March-43:64, 10 Aug.-43:92, 21 July-44:233) Mussolini, (26 July-43:82, 10 Aug.-43:92) and Mussert (27 June-44:224)? Or are they also pseudonymous?

Two further points arise, first, it seems rather coincidental, to say the least, that after hearing the Bolkestein broadcast (if in fact it ever took place) Anne speculates on one day having her diary published as *Het Achterhuis* the exact title (in Dutch) that was given to the diary. Secondly, if all the names of her cohabitants are fictitious, it would be remarkably difficult to trace them in the concentration camp records where they are all supposed to have died. Or maybe, as Richard Harwood speculates, it was only their names which were exterminated!

Anne mentions Dussel endangering their lives for letting Miep take "a FORBIDDEN BOOK. . . one which abuses Mussolini and Hitler" to them (10 Aug.-43:92). Why have we not been given proof from the ORIGINALS where the REAL names are supposed to be written? Scarcely few excerpts purporting to be taken from the originals have been presented and one gets even more suspicious when one notices that the ones we have seen never include any names. The exception the only one, being an alleged handwriting of an "interview" by Anne in Schnabel's book (10:161 opposite page). There the name "Peter" is found. That a mysterious work of this kind should be classified as an "authentic document" in learned literature may give us some indication of the intellectual standard. And perhaps we also have here a sign of the time for without Jewish support our literary experts and college presidents would be fortunate to find employment as janitors while our government officials would hardly qualify even as swineherds. The literary expertise have joined their hands in fooling the public. The very fact that an "authentic document," claiming to be an *exact replica* except for the elision of minor portions, uses fictitious names should indicate sane people the real nature of the product. Sane people therefore exclude it completely for being either a "document" or being "authentic."

## **DON'T KID AROUND WITH "KITTY"**

While we are on the point of names we would like to bring up the name of "Kitty" which we assume is not pseudonymous for that would mean it would be an pseudonymous name of a

[82]

pseudonymous name making it twice pseudonymous. From the date of 20 June-42 the name "Kitty" is used in introducing every entry, even those in which "Kitty" does not have the remotest thing to do with it. It is but another gimmick to make the diary popular or is it found in the original diary and in all those instances? Perhaps it may only be found in some places or it may not be found there at all but in one of Anne's letters or it may have been one of her real friends. We do not know. Again we have been shown no excerpt where "Kitty" is used. The diary introduces "Kitty" in such a way that the careful investigator cannot help but get suspicious:

*"Hence, this diary. In order to enhance in my mind's eye the picture of the friend for whom I have waited so long, I don't want to set down a series of bald facts in a diary like most people do, but I want this diary itself to be my friend, and I shall call my friend KITTY. No one will grasp what I'm talking about if I begin my letters to KITTY just out of the blue, so albeit unwillingly. I will start by sketching in brief the story of my life"* (20 June-42:3).

If "Kitty" was her only friend why then did she make so few entries? Besides being one of the most suspicious passages in the whole diary where the story is trying to sell itself like lifting yourself with your own boot straps, we know from other portions that the diary apparently was not kept secret at all, yet the name "Kitty" still appears. For what logical reason would she use "Kitty" when others, by nature of her own statement above, in their inquisitiveness would have asked her who "Kitty" was? Here we believe there is something which smells more than rotten fish. What a splendid opportunity Mr. Frank has in helping to convince us if he would but give us photostats of the first fifteen entries in their entirety! But Mr. Frank refuses to give us even ONE photostat A "document" which by so many is claimed to be the most moving "authentic document" to come out of the Second World War - yet, we are unable to get even ONE photostat of it from Mr. Frank. What a pity! We feel Anne would have been more gracious had she been alive.

## **TO LIFT ONESELF WITH ONE'S OWN BOOT STRAPS**

An interesting point to us is the way in which the diary tries to give an excuse with an explanation for its own existence. By creating self importance it attempts to sell itself. We have just made reference to one portion above. It seems like the story is trying to lift itself by its own boot straps. Let us take additional quotes from the mysterious entries that are found in the beginning of the diary:

"I haven't written for a FEW DAYS, [later on she lets off writing even for weeks!] because I wanted first of all to think about my diary. It's an odd idea for someone like me to keep a diary; not only because I have never done so before, but because it seems to me that neither I - nor for that matter anyone else - will be interested in the unbosomings of a thirteen-year old schoolgirl. Still, what does that matter? I want to write, but more than that, I want to bring out all kinds of things that lie buried up in my heart. There is a saying that paper is more patient than man'... Yes, there is no doubt that paper is patient and as I don't intend to show this cardboard-covered notebook, bearing the proud name of a 'diary' to anyone, unless I find a real friend, boy or

[83]

girl, probably nobody cares. And now I come to the root of the matter, the reason for my starting a diary: it is that I have no such real friend. . . [strange in view of that she in other places claims to have an abundance of them] I will start by sketching in brief the story of my life... So far everything is all right with the four of us and here I come to the present day. Dear Kitty. I'll start straight away" (20 June-42:2,3, & 20 June-42:4).

The dates are correct there are supposed to be two entries under the same date. (Her statement "I'll start straight away" makes one wonder whether it may not be faked.) Does the story appear genuine or does it seem that they are trying to force the story to fit, like forcing a size twelve foot into a size six shoe? A. R. Butz, author of the shocking book *The Hoax Of The Twentieth Century* which tries to explode the idea that all of us have believed; that, there were gas chambers and that six million Jews died, makes a candid comment about the diary:

"It was in Belsen in March 1945 that Anne Frank is said to have perished... The question of the authenticity of the diary is not considered important enough to examine here; I will only remark that I have looked it over and don't believe it. For example, already on page 2 one is reading an essay on why a 13 year old girl would start a diary, and then page 3 gives a short history of the Frank family and then quickly reviews the specific anti-Jewish measures that followed the German occupation in 1940. The rest of the books is in the same historical spirit" (Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, Ca. 90505).

The question to us in view of all the discrepancies, is not, if the book is faked but HOW it is faked. Let us bring your attention to further portions from the diary. The 29 July-43:84 entry states:

"P.S. - WILL THE READER take into consideration that when this story was written the writer had not cooled down from her fury!"

But we know that only "Kitty" was to know about her diary. Why write "will the reader take into consideration"? The content of the 17 March-44 entry seems equally construed. In the 29 March-44 entry we are told of a Mr. Bolkestein, an M.P., who was speaking on the Dutch News from London requesting "that they ought to make a collection of diaries and letters after the war." Then Anne claims of her diary which was supposed to be such a secret that:

"Of course, they ALL MADE A RUSH AT MY DIARY IMMEDIATELY. Just imagine how interesting it would be if I were to publish a romance of the 'Secret Annexe.' The title alone would be enough to make people think it was a detective story" (176, compare 14 April-44:186).

What better excuse could there be for the product? The claim by H.F. Pommer (AFFA:15) that it cannot have been long after that she made her list of fictitious names does not make sense. What Anne states is not that she wants her diary published but that she should publish a "romance" about the "Secret Annexe." Unless we call the diary a "romance" (perhaps the best claim for it after all!) the whole thing seems nonsensical for she had not written a "romance," therefore no fictitious names were needed, besides her "P.S." note quoted above, already indicates "readers" in the picture. The statement:

[83]

"I must work, so as not to be a fool, to get on, to become a journalist, because that's what I want! I know that I can write, a couple of my stories are good, my descriptions of the 'Secret Annexe' are humorous, there's a lot in my diary that speaks, but whether I have real talent remains to be seen" (4 April 44:174-5).

Seems like someone is trying to make something out of it, to present her being talented, clever and smart,

and to make a good reason for the diary. The same can be said for her 11 May-44:206 entry where she is supposed to have written:

*"Now, about something else: you've known for a long time that my greatest wish is to become a journalist someday and later on a famous writer. Whether these leanings towards greatness will ever materialize remains to be seen, but I certainly have the subjects in my mind. In any case, I want to publish a book entitled 'Het Achterhuis' after the war. Whether I shall succeed or not, I cannot say, but my diary will be a great help. I have other ideas as well, besides Het Achterhuis."* Such as The Works of Anne Frank, perhaps? How prophetic!

All sorts of stories have been presented to the public as to why the young girl COULD write a diary. Even here they have stretched the matter so far that by their very enthusiasm in trying to convince us of its truthfulness we are left wondering if it may not after all be rigged. Why all this fervor in trying to convince us? Why are all these "reasons" given? Why not do the only logical thing? Make an exact replica of the diary - there would be no better way to convince the public and critics. Yet the most logical is the least considered. The world has waited for some 30 years from its inception to get at least a facsimile - they have scarcely given us even a complete page. Certain news reports have been given out purporting that the complete diary would be brought out in facsimile but up to now nothing has been done in this direction. Rather, these reports seem to be just more attempts to fool the public and make them believe the diary is an authentic replica of the original (\*DN, 1959, April 27, "Tysk tvivlar p? Anne Frank" by Kama Dannevig).

Schnabel went head over heels trying to establish that the girl could master the job. Looking for evidence, the best he could produce were some statements that she could write (2:40,45) while in the same breath mentioning others who were surprised to find out that she could write (2:27,34; compare AFFA:13). Schnabel mentions curiously enough that in the long letter he had received from Mr. Kraler in Toronto, Canada, (he had moved there) he made no mention of Anne's diary. Could the reason be that Kraler himself was suspicious about it? (6:91). Schnabel tries to mobilize some support for Anne's possibility of being a writer by telling of the event when Miep found Anne writing, at which instance Anne's mother is alleged to have said "they have a daughter who writes" (6:93). That appears to be the best evidence he could muster up for her "authorship." But which mother has not seen their daughter writing unless she was analphabetic? What persons have not seen children writing? Children just love to write. Does that fact make an author out of every Tom, Dick and Harry? It would have been more convincing had Schnabel, instead of relying on ludicrous "reasons" for her "adeptness" as an author, he would himself produce some solid facts from her own diary by giving us facsimiles of it. There is not even one facsimile of the diary in the book. A Swedish news report, mentioning about Schnabel's work on a new book about Anne Frank,

[85]

says that in it they will produce facsimiles, showing the various developments of Anne's handwriting. No such facsimiles appear in our Swedish copy (\*AB, 1960, Aug. 9, "Ny bok av Anne Frank,"... Boken är forsedd med facsimiltryck som visar hur Armes handskrift utvecklades).

## **DID OTHERS KNOW OR DID THEY NOT THAT IS THE QUESTION**

As any legend has its beginning so did the legend of Anne Frank. A whole world was led to believe that the diary was a closely guarded secret of Anne alone. The first time the father got to know about it was at his return to Amsterdam. It completely shocked him. He could not bear reading it. Only by a slow, piecemeal reading, was he at last able to go through it. For instance, the AFFA brochure says of the father: "It took him many weeks to finish reading the diary; THE EMOTIONAL STRAIN OF EVEN A FEW PAGES WOULD OVERCOME HIM" (6; compare Expressen, 1976, Oct. 10, Sondags: 16: "Sedan borjade han lasa. Ett litet, litet avsnitt varje kvall. Mer orkade han röte"). So goes the legend but what are the facts? Even here, like with the rest, we find numerous contradictions.

Let us first deal with the contention that only Anne knew about her diary. At the outset we notice the diary makes no mention that it was given as a gift to her by her father. It merely states:

*"The first to greet me was you, possibly the nicest of all. . . Now I must stop. Bye bye, we're going to be great pals!"* (14 June-42:1).

Is it intentional that the diary makes no mention about her father giving it to her to - throw an air of mystery and secrecy over the gift? What evidence besides that of Mr. Frank, do we have that YOU refer to the diary? In Anne's second entry it speaks of the diary in this way: "*as I don't intend to show this cardboard covered notebook to ANYONE, unless I find a real friend, boy or girl*" (20 June-42:2). She then mentions about guarding her secret by using the name "Kitty" (3). It seems that Anne's secret was a necessary part in trying to explain why so little external evidence of her being able to write could be found, yet out of the clear blue sky, there pops down a complete diary that becomes world famous, lauded by the press to be the greatest document to come out of World War II. H. F. Pommer writes:

*"It was to be expected that little external evidence of Anne's talent would be found. When she went into hiding, she was not a diarist worthy of much attention. During the twenty five months in the Secret Annexe, the world of her thought WAS A SECRET WITHIN - A SECRET A SECRET SO WELL KEPT THAT EVEN HER FATHER CONFESSED, when the Diary was first published, 7 never realized my little Anna was so deep"* (AFFA:13).

How silly all this must be can be seen when we realize it must have been the father himself who was responsible for faking the "document." The father "realized" quite well his pretended ignorance is but a smoke screen. On 19 March-44:160 the diary still maintains that Anne has nothing for herself except her diary: "*That I love peace and quiet too, and have NOTHING FOR MYSELF ALONE, EXCEPT MY DIARY.*" In the third last entry it is still maintained that the diary is Anne's secret:

[85]

*"These things have made me never mention my views on life nor my well considered theories to anyone BUT MY DIARY and, occasionally, to Margot. I CONCEALED FROM DADDY EVERYTHING"* (15 July-44:231).

When George Stevens talked to Mr. Otto Frank in 1957 he was under the impression that the diary was seen ONLY by Anne, an impression which at that time was the official version: "Anne was quietly penning her words in the little diary SEEN ONLY BY HERSELF" (Preface).

We now make an interesting observation which may be an additional important clue in indicating *The Anne Frank Diary* is a conglomeration taken from a variety of sources. Anne writes:

*"Oh, heavens above, now I'm getting you in a muddle too. Forgive me, but I don't like crossing things out, and in these days of paper shortage we are not allowed to throw paper away"* (28 Nov.-42:50).

Would she have written that they are not allowed to throw paper away if she meant her own diary, her most precious possession ? Would she just tear out pages from it ? May it not indicate that at least by this time she had come to the end of her diary, starting to write on loose sheets of paper ? We suggest the following. Besides her Diary, Anne wrote other things like most children do. She would have had plenty of time being in the situation she was in. Some were written on loose sheets of paper. She may have addressed real or fictitious letters to a "Kitty." This material has afterwards been incorporated into the diary along with other material. Margot's material may also be there or it may even be so that the majority belongs to Margot but the father chose to use his younger daughter as the authoress seeing that people would be impressed that such a young girl could write such a book. As we already have stated, no explanation so far has been given why Margot is so little mentioned. Seeing she is supposed to have been much more studious and thrifty, why has the father completely placed her outside ?

Others of the group may also have written diaries. Very likely, at least after Bolkestein's recommendation they also started to write diaries. After selecting out of the diaries different portions and typing it out it was later presented to the world as an authentic document coming from A YOUNG GIRL. We shall go further into this but we feel that somewhere around these lines lays the truth. Then entry of Dec. 22-43:108: "*A bad attack of flu has prevented me from writing you until today*" may be taken from one of the letters or part from it or it may even be taken from a letter addressed to Anneliese Schutz. Anne writes further of her diary: "*This diary is of great value to me because it has become a book of memories in many places*" (2 Jan.-44:113) and she was happy to have her "diary" (7 May-44:202). It isn't likely she would tear pages from it.

As we shall go further into this point we shall now make note of the fact that contrary to George Steven's

assumption, the diary was not only seen by others but also read, very likely by her own father, so that his so called astonishments at first reading it is a mere gimmick to sell the story. We find an entry where Anne is supposed to have said: "*Who besides me will ever read these letters*" to her friend "Kitty" (7 Nov.-42:41). If, by this, she meant her diary it is an odd comment for at two previous occasions she herself wrote that others WANTED to read it. The first instance is the snoopy Mrs. Van Daan:

[86]

*"I had just written something about Mrs. Van Daan when in she came. Slap ! I closed the book.  
'Hey Anne, can't I just have a look ?'"* (21 Sept.-42:26).

Here is another one:

*"Margot and I got in the same bed together last e evening; it was a frightful squash, but that was just the fun of it. She asked IF SHE COULD READ MY DIARY. I said 'yes - at least bits of it'; and then I asked of I could read hers and she said 'Yes.'" (16 Oct.-42:36).*

Observe here the important fact that Margot also wrote a diary or diaries. Where is it? Why do we never hear of it? If the Gestapo left Anne's diary behind why not her sister's? Did others besides these two keep diaries? Could it be that the major portion of the diary actually belongs to her? These questions are indeed most interesting and demand honest answers.

Lastly we have the Bolkestein bulletin where he is recommending that diaries and letters be collected after the war at which instance Anne writes: "*Of course, they all made a rush at my diary immediately*" (29 March44:170). Hence it seems that not only did they know about Anne's diary and were interested in it but they also knew where it was located. It was not a secret.

Further confirmation that the diary was not a secret at all can be observed from Schnabel's book. He informs us that the seven other people at the warehouse knew that she wrote (Preface:8) and that Anne in fact now and then read out portions from her diary to them (6:91). We have already observed how others besides the seven (for instance: Miep) knew about it. Clearly then the claim that the diary was Anne's secret alone is a myth.

## HOW MUCH ELIDED – HOW MUCH ADDED?

It is officially claimed that "Apart from A VERY FEW PASSAGES, which are of LITTLE INTEREST TO THE READER, the ORIGINAL TEXT has been printed" (Cardinal ed., Epilogue). The same claim is made in the AFFA brochure: "Eventually he copied out ALMOST THE ENTIRE WORK, OMITTING ONLY 'some passages which he felt to be TOO INTIMATE or which might hurt other peoples feelings. He had no thought of publishing it'" (6).

Let us start with the last statement that Mr. Frank "had no thought of publishing it." We don't believe it. In fact, that was his BIG problem and worry: To get it published. The EJ clearly states: "Attempts to have the diary published after the war were initially frustrated by the unwillingness of numerous publishers" (Vol. 7:54). No doubt many of these publishers were suspicious or even may have suspected that the diary was faked. It is to their credit they refused the work.

Having demolished this ridiculous claim, we move on and say that if Mr. Frank was so concerned about not hurting people, (by excluding portions "which might hurt other peoples feelings") we feel that this would have necessitated that the story would never be published at all, since the diary is virtually replete with disparaging remarks. We know absolutely nothing of what proportion of the "original text" has been printed or how much has been omitted. Apparently Mr. Frank's Dutch publisher was in the same position for we are told how they were surprised to later find out Anne had left additional writings. How these were preserved we have never been told.

[88]

## A DOCUMENT

Encyclopaedic and literary works of various types acclaim the diary to be a "document," an authentic work of a young girl. One of the reasons it was published was because of the "high literary quality" in spite of that the girl was so young. The only assurance we have however of its authenticity is Mr. Frank's own words. Even those immediately involved with the diary seem to be people with retarded memories. Schnabel for instance, mentions that Elli on that crucial day of eviction saw the table prepared "with plates, cups and spoons, but everything was empty" (12:189) whereas Miep claims everything lay helter skelter (188). The confusion only increases. Mr. Frank claims Eli was wrong in her observations (189). There are so many conflicting stores surrounding the diary no sensible person can look at it as anything but a nightmare of confusion or, at best, as a bad joke. In spite of this, or because of it, the mass media have dubbed it as a great "document." The *Philadelphia Inquirer* termed it; "one of the most moving DOCUMENTS TO COME OUT OF WORLD WAR II" (Cardinal ed., back cover). If so, we must say the world is in a bad state. That a swindle of this nature should be lauded in this manner may indicate the present state of affairs. Apparently anything that gets rigged and which the mass media then can pick up gets called a "document."

This document of confusion is called by Eleanor Roosevelt "one of the wisest and most moving commentaries on war and its impact on human beings that I ever read" (Cardinal ed., inside, front page & "Introduction"). George Stevens in his "Preface" says of the Green police who raided the premises that "they were to leave no record or DOCUMENTATION OF THIS WORK." *The Observer*: "Few more moving and impressive books have come out of the war" - Naomi Lewis (Pan Books, inside flap). *Times Literary Supplement*: "This human document should be read by thousands" (*Ibid.*) *Guardian*: "a touch of literary genius about her power to describe them" (*Ibid.*). Pan Books, back cover: "this touchingly human document remains timeless in its appeal." President John F. Kennedy wrote: "the kind and the hopeful and the gentle are the TRUE MAKERS OF HISTORY" (AFFA:16). Mr. Frank himself considers it of course to be a living document. The book reviewer Knut Jaensson in his review of the diary in DN lauded it as being a "completely unique document" (DN, May-4, 1953).

The Jewish writer Margit Vinberg who had had an interview with Mr. Frank and who claims her information is absolutely correct assures us it is: "World War II's most read, humanly document." She claims it is "Anne's unretouched diary" and that millions of people have been touched by it because it is a "genuine testimony" (VJ, 1956, Nr 35). If millions have been touched because it was and is a "genuine testimony" what shall these millions now think when they learn the whole thing is a hoax?

In standard works this hoax is acclaimed to be a *diary*. Observe what *The New Columbia Encyclopaedia* (USA, 1975:758) has to say under the word "diary": "Diaries are of particular interest to historians because they depict every day life in a particular interest to historians because they depict every day life in a particular place and time, often illuminating important historical events. Examples of such diaries are... Anne Frank's diary (1947, tr.1953), an account of the early days of

[89]

World War II by a German Jewish girl who died in concentration camp." Diaries are important to historians and they have an important bearing on what a world is lead to believe. No book coming out of the Second World War has been used more effectively in brainwashing a whole world.

## DID ANNE EXIST?

Likely because of noticing all the numerous contradictions, confusion and mysterious events some people have even gone so far as to claim that Anne never existed and that the story from its beginning is a colossal hoax. But the matter is a colossal hoax as it is, without stretching our doubts so far. In fact, it is because the girl existed that the story is so grave, so ugly. The big problem Mr. Frank has is not that he has no diary but THAT HE HAS A DIARY OR DIARIES. With every hoax there must be elements of truth or it won't succeed. It would be idiotic to print Donald Duck's picture on a faked dollar bill or make it out of toilet paper. Everyone would notice it. No serious faker wanting to succeed would do so. Instead he tries to get as close to the original as he possibly can.

## STRANGE ENTRY

Please observe now Fig 5, a most peculiar entry. It is taken from the Cardinal edition and is inserted at the beginning of the diary. The Pan Books edition is identical except for a line that appears after the period of "Frank" (12) No explanation is given to whom this "*I hope I shall be able to confide in you completely, as I have never been able to do in anyone before*" is directed to. It hardly can be "Kitty" for she is first mentioned in the THIRD entry, where Anne says she will begin her LETTERS to "Kitty." In the fourth entry "Dear Kitty" appears for the first time and is henceforth used with each entry. We are left guessing. It may not at all belong to the diary she received at her birthday on 12 June-42 and may actually be part of a letter. Why she makes no entries on 12 and 13 June is certainly most strange in view of the fact the diary was supposed to have been the most precious gift received on her birthday. The excerpt purports to have been written by the youngest daughter. We notice the signature "Anne Frank." Observe however another signature (Fig. 13) which is found in the AFFA brochure (36): "Your Anne M. Frank." The entries in the diary NEVER END with "Your Anne M. Frank" but always end with "Yours, Anne." We notice the date of "June 12th." However the first entry appearing in the diary was first on 14 June-42. She explicitly says in her third entry "I haven't written for a few days" and that she never kept a diary before (20 June-42:2). How then does 12 June fit in? In view of the above date and in spite of her statements that she had never kept a diary before, did she do this? Has she kept diaries before and is the notion presented to us that she had never written a diary before but another of the many gimmicks we have been presented with? Why are we not given the complete entry of 12 June, for the excerpt hardly seems complete. And in this case we should remember that we are told only a "very few passages" of no importance to the reader have been left out. Also, why do we find the date at the end? In the diary the date appears always *prior* to the entry and in observing Fig. 13, we notice no date at all after her signature. We observe also a small difference with the handwriting (the "F" in Frank is slightly different) of

[90]

Fig. 5 and Fig. 13 in spite of the fact that the latter one was written on 15 July-44:233 thus more than two years have passed in the young girl's life without any changes in her handwriting.




Fig. 5

Extracted from the American Cardinal edition, 36<sup>th</sup> printing, 1963. Compare this with figure 14, the British edition, which is supposed to be exactly the same. A close study will show that one has the "k" of "Frank" underlined and the other does not. Why is this ?  
Who tampered with Anne's handwriting ?

A closer examination of the originals may also indicate that the same fountain pen was used all the way through yet we have learned how it got destroyed in her 11 Nov.-43 entry. Square all this up with Fig. 9 where an entirely different handwriting is shown purporting to stem from 18 October-42 (BER:36).




Fig. 13

This further "example" of Anne's handwriting is taken from the official booklet published by the Anne Frank Foundation (referred to herein as AFFA) 5<sup>th</sup> edition, page 36. The printed edition never ends with "Anne M. Frank", but with "Yours, Anne." Who changed it ?

Perhaps the handwritings in Figs. 5 and 13 belong to Margot, the elder daughter.

Fig. 13 is not a true replica. There the formal signature of Anne M. Frank (the "M." and the "Frank" never appear in the diary) has been transposed for it should first appear after two additional paragraphs. (Part of it moves into the second last paragraph.) Also, how are we to explain the informal "Yours, Anne" which always appears in the diary with the formal "Your Anne M. Frank" appearing in Mg. 13?

Another question is whether the handwriting even has the remotest thing to do with a girl of thirteen. And perhaps the parts that Mr. Frank is supposed to have, may simply be something copied out from a book. The document in Fig. 13 certainly could have been copied from a book, or at least some of it. An example of Anne copying another book can be found in the Pan Books edition, page 210 (Fig. 15). The whole matter seems most

confusing and has all the ingredients of a palpable fraud.

In summing up our observations it seems to us that the handwritings may not at all belong to Anne. The question is to whom; and when it was written? Do they belong to Anne, to Margot, to Dussel, to Mr. or Mrs. Van Daan, to Anneliese Schutz, to Mr. Frank, to his present wife "Fritzi," to Isa or Albert Cauvern or someone else or may they even be a combination of various handwritings from different people?

## HOW DOCUMENTS MAY BE FORGED

Carefully study now Fig. 13. Here we have actual evidence of the fact that the replica has been altered and of the fact that the informal signatures in the diary are not identical to the one appearing in Fig. 13. Whether it is an exact reproduction in size and contents with the original we are not told. In any case the signature has been transposed. This can be observed by going to the 15 July-44:233 entry where the quotation is found. Two more paragraphs appear there before the signature "Yours, Anne," which by the way is not the same as the formal "Your, Anne M. Frank." (The paragraph moves into the 2nd last in the English edition.) What the initial "M" stands for we also wonder. Observe also the numerous punctuation marks. By reading the entire 15 July-44 entry it gives us the impression of it being rigged. We also note the handwriting. How the printed edition can be contained in a "little diary" is beyond us. The reader can easily observe how various portions may be lifted completely out and transposed one of the reasons why photostats are as good as useless to the serious investigator. Even facsimiles are completely useless if they have been tampered with in this way.

## FRAU MINNA BECKER

Our various attempts to reach "Frau Minna Becker" have been futile. Mr. Frank has refused to give us her address, so has Dr. Annemarie Hubner

[91]

and from Mr. Frank's lawyers at Hamburg we have heard nothing. We know nothing about her background, who she was, about her qualifications, where she had studied graphology, whether actual verifiable tests have been made about her competence, how long she had been a graphologist. Also, where did she study the "documents" of the diary? Did she just study photocopies of it, for how long and how thorough were her studies? If it was the original material she apparently never made photographic and chemical tests. Her whole person along with the methods used are shrouded in mystery. We feel the entire matter surrounding "Frau Minna Becker" needs to be thoroughly investigated. It seems strange why we are refused information about her. She may very well just be one of the thousands of crackpot graphologists existing in Germany. A news report of 1961 mentions that "Some of the world's foremost graphologists appear as witnesses" speaking about the trial that was supposed to prove the Diary's authenticity (\*DN, 1961, Oct. 17). However it is quite evident that the only graphologist that appeared was this "Frau Minna Becker."

Suffice it to state that until now we have no verifiable records about the woman.

Observe now the most interesting way in which the 17 Nov. 61 letter (Fig. 18) to Mr. Frank was written. Photocopies of it were sent to us by Mr. Frank himself and enclosed in his 22 April 77 letter (Fig. 17). What is made to be "personal" (*persönlich*) letter to Mr. Frank, after some reflections seems rather to be a letter intended for the serious doubter, the aim being to dissuade further inquiries. It is claimed that because of the bulk of the material (after all, only some 181 pages!) no photocopies could be made. Then we are told the "Gutachten" (expert opinion) involves 131 pages, along with an enclosure of some 50 photocopies. Having thus been told the reason why no photocopies were made of the entire "Gutachten" we are then told that a complete photocopy of it in any case is of no importance, thereby indicating to us what worth they place on their own "expert opinion." In this way one fabricates a lame excuse to forward even ONE photocopy. We quote:

*"Leider Kann ich Ihnen angesichts des grossen Umfanges dieser Arbeit KEINE Fotokopien fertigen. Das Gutachten umfasst 131 Seiten and etwa 50 fotokopierte Anlagen. Ich meine, dass eine vollständige Fotokopie des Gutachtens für Sie keinen hinreichenden Wert hat" (1).*

There are absolutely no reasons why a mere number of 181 photocopies should not have been sent to Mr. Frank - much less why at least some were not sent, not to mention their excuse about finding it of no importance. When those claiming to be the possessors and guardians of the "documents" view their own praised documents with such nonchalance we can see it is NOT the critics who disregard the documents but themselves.

After a short resume of Frau Minna Becker's "expert opinion" Mr. Frank is asked whether he is pleased with it or if he wants to take a look at it himself in Hamburg. His lawyers are not allowed to send the "expert opinion" to him which makes us wonder why he hasn't in the first place sent photocopies of it to Mr. Frank. If Mr. Frank was so disinterested in his own case, not wanting to go to Hamburg, he would at least have had photocopies of Frau Minna Becker's "expert opinion." With all the money Mr. Frank has made on his faked diary, the cost of 181 photocopies would have been practical-

[92]

ly nil. The letter seems to us to have been written for some other purposes, the real purpose being to smother further inquiries. It smacks of skulduggery. Apparently Frau Minna Becker's "expert opinion" was recklessly used by Mr. Frank, the mass media and his lawyers in evidence for the "authenticity" of the diary against Lothar Stielau and Buddeberg. Whether the actual "Gutachten" of some 181 pages was given in evidence or a mere resume of it we do not know, nor if Frau Becker herself appeared in court. The court case in itself seems rather mysterious. The 27 Nov. 61 letter to Mr. Mank(Fig.18) appears to carry the signature of Ares Damassiotis, one of the lawyers. His name is not on the letterhead of a letter which the firm sent us (Letter of 21 1277) and he may have left the firm. Peculiarly enough the same letter makes the statement that the "Anschrift" and this "Madame Minna Becker" are unknown to them. They still carry Mr. Frank's legal interests. We plan to throw more light on this court case and related subject in our next book. It is sufficient to state at this moment that people who work for truth and with truth do not work in this manner.

## THE FORGERY UNMASKED

We feel our lengthy presentation has completely shattered the Anne Frank "document" and has unmasked it for what it really is: a forgery. We have endeavored in our First Part of the book to analyze the historicity and veracity of *The Diary of Anne Frank*. For this task we have used the material at our disposal. We would have wanted to make a thorough investigation of the VIRGIN source material. However Mr. Frank who had previously shown a spirit of cooperation later refused all further contacts between us when he found out that we wanted to investigate the virgin source material. Nevertheless, our concentration for the first part of this book has been on the INTERNAL evidence of the diary itself. The Cardinal edition (1963, 36th printing) was used. As there are discrepancies between the various translations we have nevertheless used the English version seeing it is the version most widely circulated. It has not been an easy task for us to untangle the labyrinth of confusion which surrounds not only the internal details of the diary but the entire question of how it came to be used as one of the most successful tools for the Zionist cause. A detailed study of the diary itself makes it apparent to every thinking person the story is one hopeless mess of confusion and contradiction. We are sure that after the readers have perused our study they will find additional contradictions. From the evidence we have produced it must be obvious to the readers the "document" is a forgery, a monstrous travesty foisted on mankind by an unscrupulous crowd of people. Without a question of doubt it must be considered as the 20th century's biggest literary hoax. Readers wanting to assist us to untangle the forgery further are encouraged to send us their information and material. Work is already started on a sequel to our study wherein numerous documents and information will be presented exposing and penetrating this racket further. In the meantime we rest with the words of FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT CAELUM: let justice be done, though the heavens fall.

## COVER FOURTH PAGE

### WHAT OTHERS SAY ABOUT THE ANNE FRANK DIARY

The question of the authenticity of the diary is not considered important enough to examine here; I will only remark that I have looked it over and don't believe it. For example, already on page 2 one is reading an essay on why a 13 year old girl would start a diary, and then page 3 gives a short history of the Frank family and then quickly reviews the specific anti-Jewish measures that followed the German occupation in 1940. The rest of the book is in the same historical spirit.

Dr. Arthur Butz  
Northwestern University, Illinois  
author: *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*

*The Diary of Anne Frank* may be a fraud. It was sold as the actual diary of a young Jewish girl who died in a Nazi concentration camp after two years of abuse and horror. Any informed literary inspection of this book would have shown it could not possibly have been the work of a teenager.

Dr. Alfred M. Lilienthal  
author: *The Zionist Connection*

Is *The Diary of Anne Frank* authentic ? For the past two years this question has been one of the subjects of my seminar entitled "Document Appraisal." *The Diary of Anne Frank* is a fake. This is the conclusion of our research and studies. It is also the title of a book I am going to publish myself. The Dutch version of the *Diary* contains a number of impossibilities, when considered against the practical and concrete reality. A visit to the actual locations in Amsterdam confirms the existence of a multitude of practical impossibilities; the tentative explanation of some of them given in the Foundation's brochures confirms our conclusion of deliberate trickery at work. I have spent nine hours interviewing Anne Frank's father in Switzerland - the interview merely underlined my conclusions of fakery. In Amsterdam, I interviewed Miep and Elli, as well as Henk. These three people have awkwardly tried to defend the legend of which they themselves are beneficiaries; they were unable to give me any detail about the life of the fugitives in the attic although they were supposed to have visited them every day. The policeman who arrested the fugitives 'on 4 August 1944 was Austrian. In Vienna I gathered information which confirms our conclusion of deliberate trickery at work. This may also explain why it was that when Simon Wiesenthal discovered the arrestor in 1963, Mr. Frank hurried to the arrestor's help. Finally, the supposed German "translation" of the *Diary* is nothing of the sort, but another book altogether. It was written prior to 1950, when the Dutch version (1947) seemed that it was never going to be a success. There are even two German versions, with slight differences between one and the other. Unless Anne Frank has risen from the dead to transform and alter the text of her *Diary*, then we must conclude that her father has been the author all along.

Dr. Robert Faurisson  
Professor of Document Appraisal  
University of Lyon, France.

## QUOTES

"If the Anne Frank case should turn out to be a hoax, a thing which we will conclusively prove, it must, in view of its vast undertaking and impact on world opinion, be one of the most flagrant literary hoaxes ever foisted on mankind."

### 'ABOUT ANNE FRANK AND THE "DIARY"'

"We learn a lot about the diary's real intention when we observe how it looks at those who lost the war. The diary has been heralded as the most truthful document coming out of the Second World War showing the cruelties of the German people under Hitler. Obviously one of Mr. Frank's and his cohorts' chief aims was to perpetuate hate against the Germans; make it out as if the Jews were the only real sufferers of these tragic events while giving an excuse to the world for the Jews' to barbarically evict the Palestinians from their homeland. The main reason why a world stood quietly by, abetting, encouraging or fence-watching the Jews as they *invaded* Palestine in the greatest racket and insidious scheme ever perpetrated on mankind, was because they were constantly being reminded (through Jewish propaganda who *ruler*, and still rule, who owned, and still own, the mass media) about such cases - the pivotal example being Anne Frank.

Through books, newspaper articles, condensed articles in magazines, movies, dramas, school plays, records, tourism and other schemes the world got brainwashed hearing about Anne Frank, and still keeps hearing about her. That is why the "legend" of Anne Frank must never die. If it falls and dies the whole Zionist conspiracy will fall with it. "If you don't support us," they remind us, "you are just as cruel and guilty as those blasted Germans who railroaded Anne Frank to her death and six million other Jews." The shout never dies. It must never die. And which sensible person would want that to happen to anyone, much less a child!"

### 'HATEMONGERS AND WARMONGERS'

"It has not been an easy task for us to untangle the labyrinth of confusion which surrounds not only the internal details of the diary but the entire question of how it came to be used as one of the most successful tools for the Zionist cause. A detailed study of the diary itself makes it apparent to every thinking person the story is one hopeless mess of confusion and contradiction. We are sure that after the readers have perused our study they will find additional contradictions. From the evidence we have produced it must be obvious to the readers the "document" is a forgery, a monstrous travesty foisted on mankind by an unscrupulous crowd of people. Without a question of doubt it must be considered as the 20th century's biggest literary hoax."

### 'THE FORGERY UNMASKED'

ISBN : 0-911038-57-4