

The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME TWELVE, NUMBER TWO SUMMER 1992

The Journal of Historical Review

INSTITUTE FOR
HISTORICAL REVIEW

Mark Weber and Andrew Allen
Treblinka

Samuel Taylor
*The Challenge of
"Multiculturalism"*

Mark Weber
*The Nuremberg Trials
and the Holocaust*

—Reviews—

Beyond Innocence and Redemption

—Historical News and Comment—

*Reviews of IHR Books Show
Greater Acceptance of Revisionism*

*Croatia's President Rejects "Six Million" Story
War Atrocity Propaganda Exposed*

VOLUME TWELVE, NUMBER TWO

SUMMER 1992

The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME TWELVE, NUMBER 2 / SUMMER 1992

Editor: Mark Weber

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District (Ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, LL.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, LL.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

FRIEDRICH P. BERG, B.Sc.
Ft. Lee, New Jersey

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, LL.M., Ph.D.
Longwood College (Ret.)

WALTER BEVERAGGI-ALLENDE, Ph.D.
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Private Research Consultant

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

VERNE E. FUERST, Ph.D.
Hartford, Connecticut

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Agorist Institute
Long Beach, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., B.D.
Seguin, Texas

MARTIN A. LARSON, Ph.D.
Phoenix, Arizona

CARLO MATTOGNO
Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (Ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

REVILO P. CLIVER, Ph.D.
University of Illinois (Ret.)
Urbana, Illinois

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Badenweiler, Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Vlotho/Weser, Germany

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE, Ph.D.
Marquette University (Ret.)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism established by scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill.

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 1306

Torrance, Calif. 90505 USA

Subscriptions include the *IHR Newsletter*, which is published seven times yearly in conjunction with the *Journal*.

Subscription price: \$40 per year, \$65 for two years, and \$90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add \$10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add \$30 per year.

Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank.

Single issues—Spring 1986 (Volume 7) to the present—are available for sale for \$7.50 each, plus \$1.05 shipping. Back issues of the *Journal* are also available for purchase in hardbound annual volumes for the years 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991. Please write for our booklist and prices. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available upon request.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially helpful are submissions on IBM-compatible computer diskette.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories, and is a member of the Conference of Historical Journals.

Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

Except for the article "The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust," which is copyright by Mark Weber, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, providing that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

Reprinted by permission from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, CA 90505, USA. Subscription rate: \$40 per year, domestic. \$50 per year, foreign.

Two copies of each reprint must be sent to the *Journal* editor. Articles may be translated into foreign languages only with the author's permission.

Errata: In the essay, "Simon Wiesenthal: Bogus 'Nazi Hunter'," in the Winter 1989-90 issue, footnote 19 on page 451 is not correct. Instead of 206,000, this figure should be 335,000. This sentence should read: "According to the *Encyclopedia Judaica* ("Mauthausen," *EJ*, Vol. 11, p. 1138), a grand total of 335,000 persons were inmates of Mauthausen and its satellite camps (including Hartheim) at one time or another."

In the letter by Paul Rassinier in the Spring 1992 issue, page 124, line 25, "Vistual" should be "Vistula" (the river in Poland).

Table of Contents

Volume Twelve, No. 2

Summer, 1992

Articles

- Treblinka 133
Mark Weber And Andrew Allen
- The Challenge of "Multiculturalism" 159
In How Americans View the Past and the Future
Samuel Taylor
- The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust 167
Mark Weber

Reviews

- Mark H. Ellis, 215
Beyond Innocence and Redemption
Robert Countess

Historical News and Comment

- Reviews of IHR Books Show Greater Acceptance 231
of Revisionism
- Croatia's President Rejects "Six Million" Story 240
- War Atrocity Propaganda Exposed 243
- Letters** 245
- About the Contributors** 255

From the Editor

We begin this issue with another IHR “scoop.” Published here for the first time in the United States are revealing reconnaissance aerial photographs of the site of the Treblinka “death camp.”

These wartime reconnaissance photos—which lay forgotten for more than forty years on the dusty shelves of the National Archives in Washington, DC—cast new doubt on the widely accepted story that Treblinka was a mass extermination center.

(This German camp was supposedly one of the greatest killing centers in history. Only Auschwitz-Birkenau is supposed to have claimed more victims. Treblinka became the focus of worldwide attention in 1987-1988 during the trial in Israel of Ukrainian-American John Demjanjuk, who was accused of operating machinery used there to gas more than 800,000 Jews.)

As the accompanying article points out, Treblinka’s reputation as an extermination center rests on dubious testimony evidence. More reliable evidence—including these aerial photographs—suggests instead that Treblinka was actually a transit camp.

Next, American writer Samuel Taylor takes a hard look at “multiculturalism,” the anti-Western movement that is currently very fashionable among much of America’s cultural-educational elite. In Taylor’s view, this misguided phenomenon has alarming implications for the future. “The multicultural, multiperspective history that has arisen,” he writes, “is not merely a departure from the history that America has always taught its children. It may be the first time that a nation has abandoned the single identity of its origins and set out deliberately to adopt multiple national identities.” Interestingly, Taylor is critical of both liberal and

(continued on page 166)

***Wartime Aerial Photos of Treblinka
Cast New Doubt on "Death Camp" Claims***

Treblinka

MARK WEBER and ANDREW ALLEN

Treblinka is widely regarded as the second most important German wartime extermination center. Only Auschwitz-Birkenau is supposed to have claimed more lives.

Treblinka became the focus of worldwide attention in 1987-1988 during the 14-month trial in Jerusalem of John (Ivan) Demjanjuk, a Ukrainian-born American factory worker. As Treblinka's "Ivan the Terrible," Demjanjuk supposedly operated the machinery used to gas hundreds of thousands of Jews there. Citing testimony by Jewish survivors, the Israeli court that condemned him to death in April 1988 declared that more than 850,000 Jews were killed at Treblinka between July 1942 and August 1943.

After the death sentence was handed down, Demjanjuk's family was able to discover previously suppressed evidence—much of it from Soviet Russian archives—indicating that the real "Ivan the Terrible" was another Ukrainian named Ivan Marchenko (or Marczenko). This new evidence discredited the courtroom testimony of five Jewish camp survivors, each of whom had "positively" identified Demjanjuk as the sadistic mass murderer of Treblinka.¹

As historians know, and as common sense would suggest, such decades-old testimony is far less trustworthy than contemporary records or forensic evidence.²

And yet, Treblinka's reputation as a mass extermination center is based almost entirely on precisely such subjective and unprovable testimony by former prisoners—evidence that has proven to be notoriously unreliable in several major trials of alleged "Nazi war criminals."³

There is no documentary evidence that Treblinka was an extermination center. In fact, contemporary records suggest that the camp had a very different function.

Aerial reconnaissance photographs taken in 1944 of the Treblinka “death camp” site—and forgotten for almost 45 years in the National Archives in Washington, DC—cast serious doubts on the widely accepted story that it was a mass extermination center.

Discovered in 1989, and published here for the first time in the United States, these German reconnaissance photos corroborate other evidence indicating that Treblinka was actually a transit camp.⁴

These photographs indicate that the remarkably small camp was not isolated, or even particularly well guarded. (They clearly show that fields where Polish farmers planted and cultivated crops were directly adjacent to the camp perimeter.)

Moreover, the camp’s burial area quite obviously appears too small to contain the hundreds of thousands of bodies supposedly buried there. (Casting doubt on the widely accepted story of hundreds of thousands of Treblinka victims, these photos suggest instead that only those deportees who died during the sometimes protracted rail journey to the camp were buried there.)

“Steam Chambers”

The generally accepted story today is that hundreds of thousands of Jews were killed at Treblinka in gas chambers with poisonous exhaust from engines. But the “original” Treblinka extermination story was that Jews were steamed to death there in “steam chambers.”

According to an “eyewitness” account received in November 1942 in London from the Warsaw ghetto underground organization, Jews were exterminated in “death rooms” at Treblinka with “steam coming out of the numerous holes in the pipes.”⁵ In August 1943, the *New York Times* reported that two million Jews had already been killed at Treblinka by steaming them to death.⁶

The Treblinka steam story is also given in detail in *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, a work published in New York in 1943 and “sponsored” by Albert Einstein, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Congressman Sol Bloom, New York Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, and other personalities.⁷ Another book, *Lest We Forget*, published in New York in 1943 by the World Jewish Congress, describes in detail how Jews were steamed to

death, and provides a diagram showing the location of the purported “boiler room” that produced the “live steam.”⁸

According to a 1944 “eyewitness” account compiled by the OSS, the principle US intelligence agency, Jews at Treblinka “were in general killed by steam and not by gas as had been at first suspected.”⁹

At the main Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946, two conflicting stories were given: steaming and gassing. Former Treblinka prisoner Samuel Rajzman testified that Jews were killed there in gas chambers.¹⁰ (To confuse matters still more, a few months earlier Rajzman claimed that during the time he was in Treblinka, Jews were “suffocated to death” there with a machine that pumped air out of death chambers.)¹¹

American prosecutors at the main Nuremberg trial supported the steam story. As proof, a Polish government report dated December 5, 1945, was submitted as prosecution exhibit USA-293. It charged that Jews were killed at the camp “by suffocating them in steam-filled chambers.” This report, which says nothing about poison gas killings, was published in the official Nuremberg trial record as document PS-3311.¹² An American prosecutor quoted from this report during his address to the Tribunal on December 14, 1945.¹³

Although no reputable historian now supports the “steam” story, and little has been heard of it during the last several decades, it was revived in a widely-circulated booklet published in 1979 and 1985 by the influential Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.¹⁴

There may have been a factual basis for the “steam chamber” stories. It is quite possible that there was indeed some kind of steaming operation at Treblinka—but one designed to kill disease-carrying lice, not people. Such disinfection steaming was commonly used in German camps for Allied prisoners of war.¹⁵

Shortly after the war, the World Jewish Congress published *The Black Book*, a 559-page volume of real and imagined wartime atrocities against Jews. At Treblinka alone, the book alleges, three million persons were killed. Three diabolical techniques, including poison gas and steam, were supposedly used there to kill some 10,000 Jews daily. But “the most widespread” method “consisted of pumping all the air out from the chambers with large special pumps.”¹⁶ A former inmate testified shortly after the war that Treblinka’s victims were “poisoned by the different gasses or asphyxiated

when the chamber was turned into a vacuum and all the air sucked out."¹⁷

In the Nuremberg trial of Oswald Pohl, U.S. Judge Michael A. Musmanno declared that "death was inflicted here [at Treblinka] by gas and steam, as well as by electric current." Citing Nuremberg document PS-3311, Musmanno declared: "After being filled up to capacity the chambers were hermetically closed and steam was let in."¹⁸

Adolf Eichmann, the wartime head of the SS Jewish affairs section, said in 1961 during pre-trial interrogation in Israel that during the war he "was told" that Jews were gassed at Treblinka "with potassium cyanide."¹⁹

One of the strangest Treblinka extermination stories, which appeared in September 1942 in a Polish underground periodical, claimed that Jews were killed there with a "delayed action" gas:²⁰

They enter it [the gas chamber] in groups of 300-500 people. Each group is immediately closed hermetically inside, and gassed. The gas does not affect them immediately, because the Jews still have to continue on to the pits that are a few dozen meters away, and whose depth is 30 meters. There they fall unconscious, and a digger covers them with a thin layer of earth. Then another group arrives.

According to the testimony of yet another "eyewitness," a Jew named Oskar Berger who escaped from the camp, many Jews were systematically put to death at Treblinka by shooting them with rifle and machine-gun fire.²¹

Diesel Gassing

In recent years, the most widely-circulated story has been that Jews were gassed at Treblinka with carbon monoxide from the exhaust of a diesel engine.²²

However, as American engineer Friedrich Berg has established, this story is improbable for technical reasons.²³ In spite of the obnoxious odor of diesel exhaust, diesel engines produce much smaller quantities of toxic carbon monoxide than ordinary gasoline motors.²⁴ It would thus be difficult efficiently to gas large numbers of people using diesel exhaust. A normal gasoline engine would be much more logical.²⁵

It is important to keep in mind that the “evidence” now usually cited for diesel gassing at Treblinka is no more credible than the evidence that was once presented for steaming and suffocating. Apparently the steaming and suffocating stories have been dropped for the sake of credible consistency.

Solid evidence for gassings at Treblinka has proven to be very elusive. For example, it turned out that none of the witnesses in the 1951 West German “Treblinka” court case ever actually saw anyone being gassed. “The type of gas used to kill the people there [Treblinka] cannot be determined with certainty because none of the witnesses was able to witness this procedure,” the judges declared in their verdict.²⁶

At least some former Treblinka prisoners testified in postwar West German trials that they not only never saw a gas chamber, but did not even hear about gassings from others.²⁷

Holocaust historians today are not able to agree about the number of homicidal “gas chambers” at Treblinka. Raul Hilberg maintains that there were three at first, but because they were allegedly not adequate for the job, more were built later on. There were eventually six or perhaps ten chambers, he reports.²⁸ Others have reported the existence of 13 gas chambers at Treblinka.²⁹

Bomba's Testimony

One of the most memorable testimonies about Treblinka presented in *Shoah*, the nine-and-a-half-hour Holocaust film by French Jewish film maker Claude Lanzmann, is that of Abraham Bomba. He told how he and other Jewish barbers cut the hair of the naked Jews who were about to be gassed. They worked *inside* “the” gas chamber (he always spoke of one chamber), which was “around four by four meters” (about 12 feet by 12 feet). Bomba also reported that “140 or 150 women,” with children, as well as 16 or 17 barbers, were inside this small room. In addition, there were *benches* where the women sat while their hair was cut, as well as two or more German guards.

The barbers had to leave the chamber for five minutes while the victims were gassed, Bomba said, and it took just *one minute* to clear out the 140 or so corpses, and clean the

floor and walls, before everything was ready for the next batch of victims.³⁰

Bomba's moving testimony, which conservative writer George Will called the "most stunning in this shattering film," is simply not credible.

Treblinka Labor Camp

About one mile (1.5 km) from the "extermination camp," which was known as "Treblinka II," was a penal labor camp for Poles and Jews known as "Treblinka I." It was not at all secret. The 1941 directive announcing the establishment of the "Treblinka Labor Camp" was published in both Polish and German in widely distributed official journals.³¹ Poles and Jews worked in a large sand and gravel quarry at the Treblinka labor camp.³²

As wartime aerial reconnaissance photographs clearly show, the Treblinka T-I labor camp was located at the end of the rail spur on which the Treblinka T-II "extermination" (transit) camp was also located. This fact strengthens the thesis that the T-II camp was not particularly secret, since penal labor prisoners being taken by train to and from the publicly known T-I camp passed directly by the supposedly top secret T-II "extermination" camp.³³

Documentary Evidence

Documents found after the war confirm that large numbers of Jews were deported to Treblinka in 1942 and 1943. German railway records report the transfer of trainloads of "settlers" ("*Umsiedler*") and "workers" to Treblinka from various places in Poland and from other countries.³⁴

In July 1942, a senior German railway official reported to the chief of Himmler's personal staff that 5,000 Jews were being transported daily to Treblinka.³⁵ An August 3, 1942, German "Ostbahn" railway directive similarly reported that special trains would be carrying "resettlers" from Warsaw to Treblinka daily, until further notice.³⁶

Interestingly, it was not until September 1, 1942, that the Treblinka train station was closed to passenger rail travel by the general public ("to permit a smooth handling of the special resettlement trains"), which suggests that German

officials were not particularly concerned with keeping the deportations or the station secret.³⁷

Other records mention trains to Treblinka in March 1943 from Vienna, Bulgaria and Greece.³⁸ From Vienna and Luxembourg, Jews reportedly arrived at the camp in passenger train coaches, and the deportees were given food and medical care during their journey.³⁹ In at least one case, a train with sleeping cars and a dining car arrived at Treblinka.⁴⁰

German railway records have been cited as evidence that hundreds of thousands of Jews were exterminated at Treblinka.⁴¹ While there is little doubt that these documents are genuine, and that they confirm transports of Jews to Treblinka, they are not proof of an extermination program.⁴²

Transit Camp

If Treblinka was not an extermination center, what was it? As already mentioned, the balance of evidence indicates that Treblinka II—along with Belzec and Sobibor—was a transit camp, where Jewish deportees were stripped of their property and valuables before being transferred eastwards into German-occupied Soviet territories.⁴³

The generally-accepted story is that Treblinka II was a “pure” extermination center, from which no Jew was permitted to leave alive.⁴⁴ However, credible reports of deportations of Jews *from* Treblinka refute the allegation that all Jews sent there were destined for extermination, and indicate instead that the camp functioned as a transit center.

In the aftermath of the April 1943 Warsaw ghetto uprising, for example, Jews were transported from Warsaw to Treblinka II. As some of the deportees later confirmed, after a “selection” in the camp, trainloads of hundreds of Jews were taken from Treblinka to Lublin (Majdanek), and possibly other camps.⁴⁵ Several thousand Jews (at least) were transferred by German authorities from Treblinka to other camps, a postwar German court determined.⁴⁶

Letters and postcards that arrived in the Warsaw ghetto from Jews who, by all accounts, had been deported to Treblinka, indicate that the camp was a transit center from where Jews were resettled in the occupied Soviet territories. These messages, which arrived from settlements and camps in Belarus (Byelorussia), Ukraine, and even Russia proper

(near Smolensk), were written by Jews who had been deported in 1942. Some letters and cards had been sent by mail and some had arrived through the underground. Many mentioned that the senders were working hard, but confirmed that they (and often their children) were being fed.⁴⁷

Completely contrary to its supposed character as a top secret extermination center, Treblinka was neither secret nor even closely guarded, as both former inmates and officials have confirmed. "Secrecy? Good heavens, there was no secrecy about Treblinka," Jewish prisoner Richard Glazer later testified. "All the Poles between there and Warsaw must have known about it, and lived off the proceeds. All the peasants came to barter, the Warsaw whores did business with the Ukrainians—it was a circus for all of them." Polish farmers worked the fields that directly adjoined the camp. "And many others," said Jewish survivor Berek Rojzman, "came to the fence to barter, mostly with the Ukrainians, but with us too."⁴⁸

Even regular German concentration camps such as Dachau and Buchenwald were much more closely guarded than Treblinka. As already mentioned, aerial reconnaissance photographs taken in 1944 confirm that the area around Treblinka was not cleared. The photos show that one perimeter of the camp passed through a wooded area, and that cultivated fields where Polish farmers worked were directly adjacent to the camp perimeter.⁴⁹

How Many Victims ?

Shortly after the end of the war, the World Jewish Congress and at least one former Treblinka prisoner alleged that more than three million Jews had been exterminated there.⁵⁰ More recent estimates of the number of people allegedly killed at Treblinka range from between 700,000 (Leon Poliakov and Uwe Adam), 750,000 (Raul Hilberg and *Encyclopaedia Judaica*), 870,000 (Yitzhak Arad), to more than 900,000 (Wolfgang Scheffler and *Washington Post*).⁵¹

There is no documentary or physical evidence for any of these figures, which are simply conjectural estimates.

Layout and Size

Diagrams published in recent years that show Treblinka as a neatly organized, rectangular-shaped camp are not accurate.⁵² As already mentioned, though, wartime aerial reconnaissance photographs confirm that the Treblinka II camp was actually unsymmetrically four-sided and irregularly shaped.⁵³

One of the most remarkable features of the Treblinka "death camp" is its small size. The entire Treblinka II camp area was only 32 or 33 acres (13 hectares), or about one-twentieth of a square mile.⁵⁴ Even smaller was the alleged "extermination" area of the camp, which was 200 by 250 meters in size (or five hectares) according to purportedly authoritative sources.⁵⁵

Poland's "Central Commission" announced shortly after the war that the burial or "ditches" area where the bodies of Treblinka's victims were buried (before they were supposedly later dug up for burning) was about two hectares or five acres (or some 20,235 square meters).⁵⁶ And according to a diagram in a book about Treblinka by Jewish Holocaust historian Alexander Donat, the camp's "ditches" area was not more than 80 or 100 meters in length and about 50 meters wide—that is, a maximum of 5,000 square meters or half a hectare.⁵⁷

By comparison, the mass graves area in the Katyn forest (near Smolensk), which held the bodies of some 4,500 Polish officers who had been killed by Soviet secret police and buried there in 1940, measured about 500 square meters.⁵⁸

In short, it is very difficult to accept that anything like 700,000 or 800,000 bodies could have been buried in the minuscule area allegedly set aside at Treblinka for this purpose.

Cremation Inconsistencies

Between April and July 1943, the corpses of Treblinka's hundreds of thousands of victims were allegedly dug up from the burial pits and burned with "dry wood and branches" on grids made of rails in batches of 2,000 or 2,500. The residual "ash and bits of bone" were dumped back into the burial pits, and covered with a layer of sand and dirt two meters deep. This was done, it is said, in order to eliminate the physical evidence of mass extermination.⁵⁹

Although enormous amounts of fuel would have been needed to cremate the hundreds of thousands of alleged corpses, there is no documentary record or witness recollection of the great quantities of firewood that would have been required. According to Polish-Jewish historian Rachel Auerbach, fuel to burn bodies was not needed at Treblinka because “the bodies of woman,” which had more fat, “were used to kindle, or more accurately put, to build the fires among the piles of corpses.” Even more incredible, “blood, too, was found to be first-class combustion material,” she wrote.⁶⁰

Missing Remains

A wartime Warsaw ghetto internee, Dr. Adolf Berman, testified in the 1961 Eichmann trial that he visited the Treblinka camp site shortly after the Soviet occupation of Poland. He told the Jerusalem court that he saw “an area of several square kilometers covered with bones and skulls, and nearby tens upon tens of thousands of shoes, many of them children’s shoes.”⁶¹

Berman’s testimony, which was considered one of the most emotionally moving of the Eichmann trial, is completely inconsistent with known facts. For one thing, the entire Treblinka camp was much smaller than one square kilometer in size, and no other witness has confirmed the presence of “tens of thousands” of shoes.

Jewish historian Rachel Auerbach, a member of an official Polish commission that inspected the camp site in November 1945—that is, a few months after the end of the war—reported finding large human bones, “rotted masses of corpses,” “pieces of half-rotted corpses,” and “fully dressed” corpses, at the Treblinka camp site.⁶²

In the area where the gas chambers were supposed to have been located, the commission’s team of 30 excavation workers reportedly found “human remains, partially in the process of decay,” and an unspecified amount of ash. Untouched sandy soil was reached at 7.5 meters, at which point the digging was halted. An accompanying photograph of an excavated pit reveals some large bones.⁶³


Poland’s “Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes” reported that “large quantities of ashes mixed with sand, among which are numerous human bones, often with the remains of decomposing tissues,” were found in the five

acre (two hectare) burial area during an examination of the site shortly after the end of the war.⁶⁴


The presence of uncremated human remains is not consistent with the often-repeated allegation that all such remains were thoroughly destroyed. Significantly, none of the Polish reports specifies the quantity of human remains, the numbers of corpses, or the amount of ash found at the camp site, which suggests that evidence of hundreds of thousands of victims was not found.⁶⁵

In spite of its often inconsistent, contradictory and implausible character, testimony indicating that many Jews lost their lives at Treblinka cannot easily be dismissed. Many Jewish prisoners doubtless perished during their rail journey to the camp site, and were almost certainly buried there. Furthermore, it is plausible and even likely that hundreds and perhaps thousands of Jews who were too weak or ill to continue the eastbound journey from the camp were killed there by officials acting on their own authority.

All the same, there is no hard or compelling evidence that Treblinka was a mass extermination center where hundreds of thousands of Jews were systematically put to death. To the contrary, credible reports of transfers of Jews from Treblinka eastwards to the occupied Soviet territories, the relative lack of secrecy and security in the camp, and the small size of the area where the bodies were supposedly buried, all suggest instead that this was a transit center.



This diagram of the Treblinka II camp was used in the “Treblinka Trial” in Düsseldorf, where it was supposedly “accepted by all of the defendants and witnesses.” In this diagram, not only is the general shape of the camp inaccurate, but no scale is provided, thus giving a misleading impression that the camp was much larger than it actually was. The alleged extermination “gas chambers” are marked 32 and 33. The supposed mass burial sites, which are marked 34, are not large enough to have held the hundreds of thousands of bodies allegedly buried there. [From: Eugen Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (Frankfurt: 1986), p. 342.]



Inaccurately portraying a rectangular-shaped camp, this diagram of Treblinka appears in the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*. The alleged extermination “gas chambers” are marked 32 and 33. The supposed mass burial areas are marked 34. [From: Israel Gutman, editor, *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), Volume 4, p. 1485.]

Treblinka II Camp

KEY



Buildings (still standing in 1944)



Buildings (foundations visible in 1944)



Watchtowers




Probable arrival and re-embarkation path
("Schlauch")




Perimeter fence



The "black road"



Roads and paths (still visible)




Main road (Malkinia-Siedlce) [at upper right]




Railroad

1. Arrival area
2. Sorting and storage area, and "Lazarett" execution pit.
3. "The Vault"
4. Supposed location of extermination "gas chambers"
5. Mass burial area
6. Probable re-embarkation and departure area
7. Camp administration buildings and staff quarters
8. "Ghetto" quarters for Jewish forced laborers
9. Camp vegetable gardens
10. Adjacent fields cultivated by Polish peasants
(Note: Size of buildings shown here is exaggerated for clarity.)

The diagram on the facing page of the Treblinka II camp in 1942-1943 is based on wartime aerial photographs, published sources, and postwar on-site inspection. (Copyright 1991 by Janusz Patek. Reproduced by permission.)



The site of Treblinka II (“death camp”) is at the center of this aerial reconnaissance photo (reportedly taken in September 1944). Cultivated fields of Polish farmers can be seen directly adjacent to the T II camp, suggesting that it was not carefully guarded or closed off. A small part of the Malkinia-Siedlce main road is visible at the upper right. At the bottom, the Treblinka I labor camp site can be clearly seen, just below the quarry area.



Trees and other vegetation seen in this aerial photo of Treblinka II (Sept. 1944) show that the camp site was not carefully closed off from the surrounding area.



This reconnaissance photo of Treblinka II (reportedly taken in October 1944), clearly shows that part of the outer perimeter of the camp (above) passes through part of a forest of trees, and that the area around the camp was not cleared to insure a high level of security.

Notes

1. F. Dannen, "How Terrible is Ivan?," *Vanity Fair* (New York), June 1992, pp. 132 ff.; "New Evidence: Demjanjuk a Nazi Guard, Probably Not 'Ivan'," *Los Angeles Times*, January 16, 1992.; C. Haberman, "Soviet Files Are Presented . . .," *The New York Times*, June 2, 1992, p. A6.
2. On the unreliability of such testimony, see John Cobden's review of *Witness for the Defense* (by E. Loftus and K. Ketcham) in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991, pp. 238-249.; Samuel Gringauz, a Jewish historian who was himself interned in the Kaunas ghetto during the war, wrote: "Most of the memoirs and reports [of Holocaust survivors] are full of preposterous verbosity, graphomantic exaggeration, dramatic effects, overestimated self-inflation, dilettante philosophizing, would-be lyricism, unchecked rumors, bias, partisan attacks and apologies." (*Jewish Social Studies*, New York, January 1950, Vol. 12, p. 65.).
3. On the unreliability of such "eyewitness" testimony in the illustrative case of Frank Walus, who was falsely accused of murdering Jews as a Gestapo officer in Poland, see, for example, "The Nazi Who Never Was," *The Washington Post*, May 10, 1981, pp. B5, B8.
4. These aerial reconnaissance photos are on file in the National Archives (Washington, DC), Cartographic Division (Record Group 373).

Several of these reconnaissance photos were published in Germany in 1990 by Udo Walendy in the booklet "Der Fall Treblinka," *Historische Tatsachen*, Nr. 44, 1990. (Postfach 1643, D-4973 Vlotho, Germany). See especially pages 13, 31, 34, 35, 38. In this booklet, Walendy cites specific archival source references from the US National Archives for these photographs. Unfortunately, these specific references are not always quite accurate. The specific source references cited by Walendy are:

- GX 12225 (or 122225?), Exp. 257 (and 258, 259?). (November or May 1944)
- GX 180 D F 934/44 SK , Exp. 246 (May 18, 1944)
- GX 12299 B A -2249, Exp. 014 (July 10, 1944)
- GX 72 F 933/44 SK, Exp. 139, 140 (May 13, 1944)
- GX 1946 F 2926 /44 SK, Exp. 062 (Sept. 18, 1944)
- GX 937 F 13 A 6099, Exp. 74
- GX 12250 F 2795 SK, Exp. 045 (Sept. 2, 1944)
- GX 12290 F 3086 SK r 2600, Exp. 68 (Oct. 16, 1944)
- GX 1946 / 44 SD, Exp. 076.
- GX 12373, Exp. 11 (Sept. 2, 1944)

The most important of these Treblinka aerial photographs were made public for the first time in the United States in January 1991 at a meeting in Palo Alto, California. (*IHR Newsletter*, Feb. 1991, p. 3.).

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the Polish Historical Society (Stamford, Connecticut) in compiling this essay.

Soviet wartime aerial reconnaissance photographs of the Treblinka camp site almost certainly exist, and are very probably still held in Russian archives. If so, they should be made public.

5. "Likwidacja zydowskiej Warszawy, Treblinka," *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego* (Warsaw), Jan.-June 1951, pp. 93-100. Quoted in: Carlo Mattogno, "The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1988, pp. 273-274, 295 (n. 16).
6. *New York Times*, Aug. 8, 1943, p. 11. Reprinted in: *The Record: The Holocaust in History* (New York: ADL, 1985), p. 10. (*The Record* was also distributed as an advertising supplement to the *New York Post*, April 17, 1978.)
7. Jacob Apenszlak, ed., *The Black Book of Polish Jewry* (New York: 1943), pp. 142-143, 145.
8. World Jewish Congress, *Lest We Forget* (New York: 1943), pp. 4, 6-7.; See also the reference to killings at Treblinka by "hot steam" in *Hitler's Ten-Year War On the Jews* (p. 149), a book published in New York in 1943 by the "Institute of Jewish Affairs," an agency of the American Jewish Congress and the World Jewish Congress.
9. OSS document, April 13, 1944. National Archives (Washington, DC), Military Branch, Record Group 226 (OSS records), No. 67231.
10. International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal*, Nuremberg: 1947-1949, ("blue series"), Vol. 8, p. 325. (Feb. 27, 1946)
11. Rajzman text in: Yuri Suhl, ed., *They Fought Back* (New York: 1967), p. 130.; This story also appears in: Isaiah Trunk, *Jewish Responses* (New York: 1982), p. 263.
12. IMT, *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal* (IMT "blue series"/ 1947-1949), vol. 32, pp. 153-158; Also published in: *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (NC&A "red series"/ 1946-1948), Vol. 5, pp. 1104-1108. See also: NC&A ("red series"), vol. 1, pp. 1005-1006.
13. IMT, *Trial of the Major War Criminals* ("blue series"), vol. 3, p. 567-568.
14. *The Record: The Holocaust in History*. (The NYT report of Aug. 8, 1943, is reproduced here.)
15. Major S. G. Cowper, "A Note on a Disinfestation Plant Used in a Typhus Hospital for Prisoners of War in Germany," *Journal of the*

Royal Army Medical Corps, Sept. 1946, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 173-176.; "Typhus," 1922 supplement to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Facsimile reprint in: Carlos Porter, *Made in Russia* (1988), p. 364.; Globocnik reported in Jan. 1944 that textile goods seized in the course of "Aktion Reinhardt" were disinfected. See: 4024-PS. IMT "blue series," vol. 34, p. 84.

Jacob Seewald, a Polish Jew, spent the war years working as a forester in a German labor camp. When he came down with a severe illness, he was transferred to a hospital, where he recovered. After the war he emigrated to the United States. In a 1983 interview, he recalled that the camp authorities "took us [Jewish workers] into a shower for the steam to kill lice. There we got no clothes, just a bundle with our names on them. Naked. Then they turn on the water for a second—scalding water." (John C. Bromely, "Stories from the Darkness," *The Denver Post Magazine*, Sunday, June 12, 1983, p. 20.) Similar events at Treblinka may perhaps have provided a basis for the camp's "steam" legend.

16. Jewish Black Book Comm., *The Black Book* (1946), pp. 407-408.
17. Isaiah Trunk, *Jewish Responses* (New York: 1982), p. 263.
18. *Trials of the War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals* (NMT "green series"/ Washington, DC: 1949-1953), vol. 5, pp. 1133-1134.
19. Jochen von Lang, ed., *Eichmann Interrogated* (New York: 1983), p. 84.; See also: R. Aschenauer, ed., *Ich, Adolf Eichmann* (1980), pp. 179, 183.
20. "Information Bulletin," Sept. 8, 1942, published by the command of the Polish underground "Armia Krajowa." Quoted in: Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka* (Bloomington: 1987), pp. 353 f.
21. E. Kogon, *Theory and Practice of Hell* (New York: Berkley, pb., 1981), pp. 183-185.
22. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: 1985), p. 878.; "Treblinka," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1971), vol. 15, p. 1368.; Eugen Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen* (1986), p. 163; Yitzhak Arad, "Treblinka," in: I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, pp. 1483, 1484.
23. F. Berg, "The Diesel Gas Chambers," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984, pp. 15-46.
24. R. Schmidt, A. Carey, and R. Kamo, "Exhaust Characteristics of the Automotive Diesel," *Society of Automotive Engineers Transactions* (New York), Vol. 75, Sec. 3, 1967, pp. 106, 107. (paper 660550).

25. Even more logical and efficient than a gasoline engine—in the view of engineer Friedrich Berg—would have been the “Holzgas” generator, which were in very widespread use in Europe during the war years. See: F. Berg, “The Diesel Gas Chambers,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984, pp. 38-41.
26. Case against J. Hirtreiter, LG Frankfurt, 1951. *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen* (Amsterdam: 1972), Band 8, p. 264 (270 a-4).
27. Hans Peter Rullmann, *Der Fall Demjanjuk* (Sonnenbühl: 1987), p. 149. Source cited: Adalbert Rückerl, *NS-Vernichtungslager* (1977).; An unsatisfactory explanation has been offered for this remarkable testimony: these witnesses must have been inmates of the nearby Treblinka labor camp, or for some other reason were never in the “extermination” section of the T-II camp.
28. R. Hilberg, *Destruction* (1985), p. 879.
29. Central Commission . . ., *German Crimes in Poland* (Warsaw: 1946-1947), vol. 1, p. 97.; Yitzhak Arad, “Treblinka,” in: I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, pp. 1483, 1485.
30. *Shoah* (Paris: Fayard, 1985), pp. 126-129. (I am thankful to Dr. Faurisson for pointing this out.) See also: Bradley R. Smith, “Shoah: Abraham Bomba, the Barber,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1986, pp. 244-253.
31. Directive of Nov. 15, 1941. *Amtsblatt für den Distrikt Warschau*, Dec. 16, 1941, p. 116. Facsimile reproduction in: S. Wojtczak, “Karny Oboz,” *Biuletyn Głownej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, pp. 155-156.; Also published in: *Amtlicher Anzeiger*, Dec. 2, 1941. Cited in: Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka* (1987), p. 352. Facsimile reproduction in: C. Pilichowski, *No Time-Limit for These Crimes* (Warsaw: 1980), no page number.; An internal German document dated July 7, 1942, refers to the “Treblinka labor camp,” which means that it was operating at the same time as the nearby “extermination center.” Facsimile is reprinted in: H. Eschwege, ed., *Kennzeichen J* (East Berlin: 1966), p. 245.
32. I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* (1990), p. 1482.
33. Note particularly the aerial photograph dated Sept. 2, 1944, in: U. Walendy, “Der Fall Treblinka,” *Historische Tatsachen*, Nr. 44 (1990), p. 31.; Even today, a visitor to the site is struck by the large size of the quarry pit there. Hundreds (and perhaps thousands) of rail cars must have gone to and from the site (passing by the T-II “extermination camp”) to carry away the sand and gravel excavated from the large pit.

34. Facsimile documents in: *Biuletyn Glownej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, pp. 171-182.; These records also show that (presumably empty) trains were promptly returned to their points of origin.; See also: Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1985), p. 488 (and notes).
35. Ganzenmüller to Wolff, July 28, 1942. Document NO-2207. R. Hilberg, *Destruction* (1985), p. 491.
36. Main rail office (Gedob) in Krakow, directive No. 548. Facsimile in: *Biuletyn Glownej Komisji . . .* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, p. 171.
37. Main rail office (Gedob) in Krakow, directive of Aug. 27, 1942. Facsimile in: *Biuletyn Glownej . . .* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, p. 182.; Also quoted in: Y. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka* (1987), p. 96.
38. *Biuletyn Glownej . . .* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, pp. 178 f.; Y. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka* (1987), p. 145.
39. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, (London: Sphere, pb., 1971), p. 150.
40. Martin Gilbert, *Final Journey* (New York: 1979), p. 119.
41. R. Hilberg, *Destruction* (1985), p. 488 (and notes).
42. For one thing, the surviving documents are not at all clear about the numbers of deportees, and certainly do not confirm the deportation of hundreds of thousands of Jews to the camp.
43. Dr. Arthur Butz has concluded that Treblinka served both as a labor camp and as a transit center for Jews being deported eastwards: A. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (1983), p. 221.; See also: Steffen Werner, *Die Zweite Babylonische Gefangenschaft* (1990), pp. 70-71, 171.
44. Y. Wiernik, in: A. Donat, ed., *The Death Camp Treblinka* (New York: 1979), p. 166.; Jewish Black Book Comm., *The Black Book* (1946), p. 399.
45. I. Trunk, *Jewish Responses* (1982), pp. 197-198, 261-262.; A. Donat in: B. Chamberlin, M. Feldman, eds., *The Liberation of the Nazi Concentration Camps* (Washington, DC: 1987), p. 171.; This point is also confirmed in US Dept. of Justice (OSI) interviews with Treblinka survivors. Portions of several such OSI interview reports are reproduced in facsimile in *UFFA Bulletin* (Stamford, Conn.), Oct. 1990, p. 6.
46. Adalbert Rückerl, ed., *NS-Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse* (Munich: DTV, 1977), p. 198. This work by the main

German official responsible for prosecuting war crimes cases is based on records of postwar German court cases.

47. Yisrael Gutman, *The Jews of Warsaw, 1939-1943* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ., 1982), p. 219.; Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews*, (New York: Bantam, pb., 1976), pp. 414, 451.; L. Dawidowicz, *Holocaust Reader* (New York: 1976), pp. 356, 364.; See also: Abraham Lewin, *A Cup of Tears* (New York: 1988), pp. 38-39. (Holocaust historians maintain that because none of the "resettled" Jews from Warsaw survived Treblinka, these letters and postcards therefore are either forgeries or were written under duress.)
48. Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness* (London: A. Deutsch, 1974), p. 193.; The Lanzman film *Shoah* also confirms that Polish farmers worked the fields right next to Treblinka.
49. Aerial reconnaissance photos from the US National Archives. Published in: U. Walendy, "Der Fall Treblinka," HT Nr. 44 (1990), pp. 31, 34, 35, 38.
50. I. Trunk, *Jewish Responses to Nazi Persecution* (1982), p. 263.; Jewish Black Book Comm., *The Black Book*, pp. 400, 407.
51. Leon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate* (New York: 1979), p. 334.; Uwe Adam, in: F. Furet, ed., *Unanswered Questions*, (New York: 1989) p. 146.; R. Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1985), p. 893.; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 15, p. 1371.; Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews* (Bantam pb., 1976), p. 200.; Y. Arad in: I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, p. 1486.; A. Rückerl, ed., *NS-Ver-nichtungslager* (DTV, 1977), p. 199 (n.); Glen Frankel, "Demjanjuk Proceeding Unites Israel," *Washington Post*, Feb. 21, 1987, p. A 17.; K. Feig, *Hitler's Death Camps* (1981), p. 311.; Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness* (1974), p. 250.
52. For example: I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, pp. 1482, 1485.; Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 146.; *Obozy hitlerowskie na ziemiach polskich 1939-1945* (Warsaw: 1979), p. 526.; E. Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen* (1986), p. 342.;
53. U. Walendy, "Der Fall Treblinka," HT Nr. 44 (Vlotho: 1990), pp. 31, 34, 35, 38.; This same layout is also shown in: Central Commission..., *German Crimes in Poland* (Warsaw: 1946), Vol. 1, fold-out diagram between pp. 96-97.
54. Central Commission . . . , *German Crimes in Poland* (1946), Vol. 1, p. 96.; Janusz Gumkowski, K. Lezczynski, *Poland Under Nazi Occupation* (Warsaw: Polonia, 1961), p. 72.; "Treblinka," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1971), vol. 15, p. 1367.; One hectare equals 10,000 square meters. One square mile is 640 acres.

55. E. Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen* (1986), p. 162.; Y. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka*, p. 41.; I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, p. 1483.; Note also the discussion of this matter in: U. Walendy, "Der Fall Treblinka," HT 44 (1990), passim.
56. Central Commission . . . , *German Crimes in Poland* (Warsaw: 1946-1947), Vol. 1, p. 96.; This is equivalent to about 142 by 142 meters.
57. A. Donat, ed., *The Death Camp Treblinka* (1979), pp. 318-319.
58. Louis FitzGibbon, *Katyn* (IHR, 1980), p. 141.; According to one informed historical researcher, the 1944 aerial reconnaissance photographs indicate that the burial area of the Treblinka II camp was about one-fifth smaller than the mass graves area in the Katyn forest. Also, contrary to claims made during the Demjanjuk trial and elsewhere, the 1944 aerial photos also suggest that the retreating Germans left the camp's burial area intact.
59. Y. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka* (1987), pp. 174-177.; E. Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (1986), p. 190.; On the other hand, the World Jewish Congress claimed in 1946 that the bodies of Treblinka's victims were cremated immediately after gassing in large crematory furnaces. See: Jewish Black Book Comm., *The Black Book* (New York: 1946), pp. 410 f.; And according to one "eyewitness" account, bodies were burned while still in the large burial pits. This is physically all but impossible. See: Abraham Krzepicki, in: A. Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka*, p. 92.
60. Rachel Auerbach, "In the Fields of Treblinka," in: A. Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka* (1979), p. 38.; Similarly, former prisoner Wiernik claimed that "the bodies of women were used for kindling the fires" at Treblinka. J. Wiernik, in: A. Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka*, p. 170.
61. Moshe Perlman, *The Capture and Trial of Adolf Eichmann* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963), pp. 303-304.
62. R. Auerbach, "In the Fields of Treblinka," in: A. Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka*, pp. 19, 69, 71, 72.
63. Facsimile of report, Nov. 13, 1945, in: *Biuletyn Glownej Komisji . . .* (Warsaw), Vol. 26, 1975, pp. 183-185. (Translation provided to the author).; Note also photo of skulls and large bones on p. 151. This is similar to the photo in: A. Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka*, p. 266.
64. Central Commission . . . , *German Crimes in Poland*, Vol. 1, pp. 96-97.

65. After cremation, between five and about ten pounds of residual ash and bone are left from each corpse. (Frederick Peterson, with Haynes and Webster, *Legal Medicine and Toxicology*, vol. 2, pp. 877, 883. Facsimile in: C. Porter, *Made in Russia*, pp. 346, 351.) If, let us say, 700,000 Jews were killed at Treblinka, and each cremated corpse resulted in five pounds of ash and residual bone, 1,750 tons of remains would have been left at the camp site. Nothing like this quantity of remains has ever been found and identified.

The Challenge of “Multiculturalism” In How Americans View the Past and the Future

SAMUEL TAYLOR

Of all the ways in which a nation defines itself, few are more important than what it teaches its children about itself. In the history classes of its public schools, a nation retells its own story and instills a national identity in the minds of young citizens. In today’s America, where competing racial, cultural and linguistic claims now make it nearly impossible even to speak of national identity, questions about history have become a struggle for the possession of America’s past.

The multicultural, multiperspective history that has arisen from this struggle is not merely a departure from the history America has always taught its children. It may be the first time that a nation has abandoned the single identity of its origins and set out deliberately to adopt multiple national identities.

Significantly, the understanding by many non-whites of multicultural history is entirely different from that of whites. For whites, the central concepts are “inclusion” and “pluralism.” American history is to be rewritten so that racial and cultural perspectives that were once “ignored” or “neglected” will get equal treatment. For many non-whites, however, multicultural history is merely a step on the way to an explicitly racial, Afrocentric or Hispanic history. Their goal is separation rather than inclusion.

The “conservative” view is that explicitly racial histories are illegitimate. America, it is argued, must be united by a common history, and exclusionist histories will disunite us. This position is logically correct; exclusionist histories are divisive. But as we shall see, the “conservative” position is wrong—practically, emotionally, and even morally. America is *already* disunited by race, and no approach to history can

change that. Just as it would be impossible to use the same history book in both France and England, it is impossible to write a single American history that satisfies white, black, Indian, Hispanic, and Asian.

Schooling as Assimilation

The purpose of American public education has never been simply to impart knowledge. One of its central goals has been to make children into Americans. American schools fly the American flag and students pledge allegiance to it. The central events of history are from the American past. The most glorious achievements are American achievements. There is nothing odd about that. Every nation gives its children a national education.

Nevertheless, American schools have had an even more explicitly nation-building purpose than others because of the need to assimilate immigrants. John Quincy Adams wrote that immigrants “must cast off their European skin, never to resume it.” Horace Mann argued that “a foreign people . . . cannot be transformed into the full stature of American citizens merely by a voyage across the Atlantic.” One of the strongest motives for building public schools was, therefore, the need to make *Americans* out of Europeans.

Europeans weren't going to be made into Americans by teaching them about the contributions of Africans, Mexicans and Indians. The old, standard history united Americans because it has a coherent purpose and a single voice. It emphasized one point of view and ignored others. To put it bluntly, it was history about white people for white people.

This history served the country well, so long as the population was overwhelmingly white, and the two traditional minorities—blacks and Indians—did not have voices. All this changed, beginning in the 1960s. The civil rights movement gave voices to blacks and Indians, and changes in immigration laws brought a massive influx of non-whites. It was the end of a certain kind of America.

Non-whites began to complain about a version of history that left them out. The nation-building history that has bound Europeans into a single people had not bound whites and non-whites into a single people. “Multicultural” history was therefore to be a broader, more inclusive history that would give every American his rightful share of America's

past. At the same time, “culturally relevant” history would keep blacks and Hispanics in school and stop them from dropping out at ever-increasing rates.

Squaring the Circle

Something that well-meaning whites did not understand is that an “inclusive” history—one that would be all things to all people—is impossible. History has winners and losers, and they see the same events with different eyes. At the same time, virtually every non-white group sees the conflicts of the past as struggles with whites, so multicultural history becomes a collection of perspectives that are often not merely non-white but anti-white.

How, for example, is a multicultural history to treat the discovery and settlement of North America by Europeans? The old history called it a triumphant advance for civilization. But for Indians, the same historical events are an unending sequence of defeats and disaster. Does a multicultural textbook call this a triumph or a disaster or both or neither?

What about the Mexican-American War [1846-1848]? At the time, it was thought a glorious success because it added huge chunks to the American West. But was it, instead, an imperialist atrocity? Are today's school children to rejoice that California is part of America or are they to weep over the stolen birthright of their Hispanic brothers?

Slavery poses a similar riddle. Blacks want to make it the centerpiece of their history, and in many ways it is. For nearly 300 years, most American blacks were slaves, and virtually everything that blacks did or thought was circumscribed by slavery. Today, it is still the centerpiece of black history, because it excuses failure and can be used to extract benefits from whites.

For whites, though, slavery is a minor historical event. Except for the Civil War (which was set in motion and fought by whites) the course of the nation's history would hardly have been different if there had been no slavery. To give it a prominent place in white history is a transparent effort to manipulate the way that whites think about the present.

Once slavery is promoted to the status of unparalleled evil, much of the past becomes incomprehensible. Is George Washington *both* the Father of his Country *and* a wicked

man because he owned slaves? Is Abraham Lincoln the storied savior of the Union or is he a fiend because he thought blacks were inferior and should be sent back to Africa?

Those of us who went to school when American history still had coherence are likely to learn about the new, multicultural history only by accident. One such accident is that this year is the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America. A typical multicultural problem has thus spilled out of the classroom and gotten wider notice: Was Columbus a great explorer or was he a genocidal tyrant? Are we to celebrate half a millennium of European America or are we to hang our heads in shame? Or are we to do both?

Problems and Uncertainties

Multicultural histories, by their very nature, cannot answer these questions. And because they cannot, they present American history as a bundle of uncertainties, as a series of unsolved "problems." Unlike the old history, which viewed the past with pride and the future with confidence, multicultural histories are diffident and perplexed. Unlike the old history, which at least gave white children a firm foundation for national identity, multicultural history says, in effect, that America has no identity. The only thing left to unite a multicultural America is geography.

One way to understand the impossible task that multicultural history has set itself is to imagine how one would write a school history book to be used in both France and Britain. How would it treat Napoleon? The very geography of London—Waterloo Station, Trafalger Square—is a monument to Englishmen who killed Frenchmen. Napoleon's tomb, Austerlitz station, and street names like Jena and Ulm all mark the pride the French take in their ancestors' readiness to slaughter foreigners. A "multicultural" history book of the Napoleonic wars would be an absurdity, and everyone knows it. And yet, it would be no more absurd than the history books American children use today.

Non-whites have a much keener sense of their group interests than whites. They see very clearly that the future will have its winners and losers, just as history has had them. Thus, while virtually every school district with a white majority is trying to square the circle by teaching a history

that is everything to everyone, school districts with black majorities are beginning to replace the old "Euro-centric" curriculum with one that is openly "Afro-centric." They are not interested in supplementing the traditional history with different points of view. They want a single, African point of view.

In Atlanta, where 92 percent of the public school students are black, history and social studies courses have been rewritten from an "African-American" perspective. New York's public schools recently authorized a curriculum revision based on an openly anti-white position paper drafted, in part, by the black-supremacist professor, Leonard Jeffries. In California, school districts in heavily-black Oakland and East Palo Alto started the 1991/1992 school year *without social studies textbooks*. They decided to develop their own black-centered materials because they could find nothing suitable.

Private black schools have gone the farthest. Some reject America, and teach their pupils that they are the African diaspora. Many teach patent nonsense, claiming that the ancient Egyptians and even King Solomon were black. Nevertheless, even if some of their material is ridiculous, Afro-centric teachers have recognized something that white teachers have forgotten: History has a point of view; it cannot be all things to all people.

Building a Nation

Blacks, then, are learning the kind of history that whites once learned—a history that builds identity and certitude. White children are learning that every interpretation is valid, that nothing is certain, that their nation's past is all paradoxes and unsolved problems. Patriotism will not grow in the heart of a child who cannot look back with pride upon his nation's past. We have come a long way from schooling that made Europeans into Americans. We now make Americans into nothing at all.

Multicultural history is like Affirmative Action. Just as whites are to step aside to give hiring preferences to minorities, whites are to set aside their own point of view and study those of others. Non-whites, on the other hand, are free to promote their own interests and exclusionist histories.

Like Affirmative Action, multicultural history is possible only because the majority has abandoned its position at the center. If whites insisted on their own history as strongly as non-whites insist on theirs, the inevitability of separate histories would have been recognized long ago. Nor will whites be willing to forego their own history forever. They will eventually realize that only they are studying a past with no answers and no certainties. They will eventually see that there *cannot* be one history that satisfies all. And they will begin to wonder whether there can be one nation that satisfies all.

History for Everyone and No One

Five years ago, the California Board of Education adopted guidelines for a new history curriculum that would "accurately portray the cultural and racial diversity of our society." Several book companies proposed texts to meet that requirement, and last year, Houghton Mifflin won approval for its series for grades one through eight.

The title of the fifth-grade text tells the whole story. It is a line from a poem by the black writer, Langston Hughes: *America Will Be*. It is hard to imagine any other country publishing a history book that puts the nation in the future tense. Most nations want their children to look back on their people's history with pride. This book seems to suggest that the real, multicultural America is yet to come.

Of course, as the texts go to great pains to explain, America was always multicultural. A typical section is entitled, "A Nation of Many Peoples," and this does not mean Englishmen, Swedes, and Germans. One gets the impression that Europeans were a furtive side-show in a vast history that began with Indians and ends with Chinese, blacks, Hispanics, West Indians, and Native Americans.

Among the "moments in time" that the books illustrate with full-page portraits of people typical of a period, is a lasso-whirling, bronco-busting, Mexican lady-cowboy, or *vaquera*. Such an apparition would probably have astonished the longhorns as much as this "moment in time" astonished anyone over the age of twenty. In the 50 pages that one text

devotes to the horrors of Negro slavery, there is a full-page portrait, not of a working slave but of an *escaping* slave.

This was not enough for the racial activists, for what they want is their own, exclusionist history. Houghton Mifflin officials, who expected praise and gratitude for their painstakingly "inclusive" history, were astonished by the accusations hurled at them. They did not realize that, for the most part, it is only whites who want a multiperspective history.

The overall director of the series, Professor Gary Nash, is a well-known leftist and a leading proponent of multiculturalism. He, too, was shocked by critics who called him a racist and a white supremacist. "If I'm the bad guy," he wanted to know, "who are your allies?"

Several majority-black school districts rejected the texts outright. In San Francisco, where 82 percent of the public school children are non-white, the school board reluctantly accepted the books, but added a supplemental reading list with titles like *Black Heroes of the Wild West*, *Chinese Americans, Past and Present*, and *Gays in America*. (Homosexuals were angry that these grade school texts said nothing about their contributions to America.)

The battle over text books was especially bruising in California because, by 1995, a majority of its public school students will be non-white. Nevertheless, the white decline is rapidly moving East. The struggle for America's past is only warming up.

Some battles have already been lost. A 1983 study by Nathan Glazer and Reed Ueda of six leading history texts found that blacks and Hispanics got at least four times as much coverage as European immigrant groups, and even trivial non-white successes were paraded as brilliant achievements.

The multiculturalists have already come a long way. More American 17-year-olds can now tell you who Harriet Tubman was than know who Winston Churchill or Joseph Stalin were. They are more likely to know about her than to know that Lincoln wrote the Emancipation Proclamation or that George Washington commanded the American revolutionary army.

traditional conservative views of how we should look at our history and ourselves.

When people first hear about Holocaust Revisionism, a very common reaction is to say something like “What about Nuremberg? What about all the evidence presented at the war crimes trials? Everyone knows that the extermination of the Jews was proved at Nuremberg.” In our next article, “The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust,” we take a close look at those trials, and the evidence presented there to prove Judeocide.

This article—which is adapted from a chapter of a forthcoming book that your editor has been working on for several years now—shows that the evidence presented at Nuremberg for an extermination plan or program is, to put it mildly, far from compelling. This article also exposes the hypocrisy and moral pretentiousness of the most elaborate judicial undertaking in history.

In our book review section, Dr. Robert Countess introduces an important new book by an astute and sensitive Jewish writer, *Beyond Innocence and Redemption: Confronting the Holocaust and Israeli Power*. In carefully argued and sometimes eloquent prose, author Marc Ellis challenges two of the most venerable icons our age: Israel and the Holocaust story. He warns of the terrible price to be paid for Zionist cruelty towards Palestinians, and for Jewish obsession with the pseudo-religion of the Holocaust.

So provocative is Ellis’s book that, in New Zealand at least, a kind of boycott has been organized to stifle distribution and sales. In Christchurch, a New Zealander recently told Dr. Countess, the book purchaser at the main branch of Whitcoulls, the country’s largest national bookstore chain, acknowledged that Ellis’ book is not available because, he had heard, it is “offensive to Jewish people.” While conceding that the book is not, as far as he knows, actually anti-Jewish

(continued on page 230)

Do the “War Crimes” Trials Prove Extermination?

The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust

MARK WEBER

A common response to expressions of skepticism about the Holocaust story is to say something like “What about Nuremberg? What about the trials and all the evidence?!” This reaction is understandable because the many postwar “war crimes” trials have given explicit, authoritative judicial legitimacy to the Holocaust extermination story.

By far the most important of these was the great Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946, officially known as the International Military Tribunal (IMT). The governments of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and France put on trial the most prominent surviving German leaders as “Major War Criminals” for various “war crimes,” “crimes against peace,” and “crimes against humanity.” In the words of the Tribunal’s Charter, these “Nazi conspirators” carried out their crimes as part of a great “Common Plan or Conspiracy.”

In addition, twelve secondary Nuremberg trials (NMT) organized by the US government alone were conducted between 1946 to 1949. Similar trials were also conducted by the British at Lüneburg and Hamburg, and by the United States at Dachau. Since then, many other Holocaust-related trials have been held in West Germany, Israel and the United States, including the highly-publicized trials in Jerusalem of Adolf Eichmann and John Demjanjuk.

Germany’s wartime treatment of the Jews figured prominently in the Nuremberg trials. In their condemnation of the defendants, the Allies gave special emphasis to the alleged extermination of six million European Jews. Chief US prosecutor Robert H. Jackson, for example, declared in his opening address to the Tribunal:¹

The most savage and numerous crimes planned and committed by the Nazis were those against the Jews . . . It is my purpose to show a plan and design, to which all Nazis were fanatically committed, to annihilate all Jewish people. . . . The avowed purpose was the destruction of the Jewish people as a whole . . . The conspiracy or common plan to exterminate the Jews was . . . methodically and thoroughly pursued . . . History does not record a crime ever perpetrated against so many victims or one ever carried out with such calculated cruelty.



Robert Jackson, chief US prosecutor at the Nuremberg Tribunal, listens to the proceedings. He privately acknowledged that the Allied governments conducting the trial were guilty of the same crimes they accused the defendants of committing. In a letter to President Truman, he confided that the Allies "have done or are doing some of the very things we are prosecuting the Germans for."

Echoing these words, chief British prosecutor Sir Hartley Shawcross declared in his final address to the Tribunal:²

There is one group to which the method of annihilation was applied on a scale so immense that it is my duty to refer separately to the evidence. I mean the extermination of the Jews. If there were no other crime against these men [the defendants], this one alone, in which all of them were implicated, would suffice. History holds no parallel to these horrors.

How compelling was the evidence presented at Nuremberg to substantiate such damning words? How did the defendants respond to the charges?

While much of the specific testimony and documentation presented in these trials has been dealt with in other *Journal* articles, here we take a closer look at the general trustworthiness of the evidence cited at Nuremberg and elsewhere for the Holocaust extermination story. This chapter also focuses on the basic character of these trials, which have played such an important role in “legitimizing” the Holocaust story.

Political Justice

The Nuremberg enterprise violated ancient and fundamental principles of justice. The victorious Allies acted as prosecutor, judge and executioner of the German leaders. The charges were created especially for the occasion, and were applied only to the vanquished.³ Defeated, starving, prostrate Germany was, however, in no position to oppose whatever the Allied occupation powers demanded.

As even some leading Allied figures privately acknowledged at the time, the Nuremberg trials were organized not to dispense impartial justice, but for political purposes. Sir Norman Birkett, British alternate judge at the Nuremberg Tribunal, explained in a private letter in April 1946 that “the trial is only in form a judicial process and its main importance is political.”⁴

Robert Jackson, the chief US prosecutor and a former US Attorney General, declared that the Nuremberg Tribunal “is

a continuation of the war effort of the Allied nations” against Germany. He added that the Tribunal “is not bound by the procedural and substantive refinements of our respective judicial or constitutional system . . .”⁵

Judge Iola T. Nikitchenko, who presided at the Tribunal’s solemn opening session, was a vice-chairman of the supreme court of the USSR before and after his service at Nuremberg. In August 1936 he had been a judge at the infamous Moscow show trial of Zinoviev and Kamenev.⁶ At a joint planning conference shortly before the Nuremberg Tribunal convened, Nikitchenko bluntly explained the Soviet view of the enterprise:⁷

We are dealing here with the chief war criminals who have already been convicted and whose conviction has been already announced by both the Moscow and Crimea [Yalta] declarations by the heads of the [Allied] governments . . . The whole idea is to secure quick and just punishment for the crime. . .

The fact that the Nazi leaders are criminals has already been established. The task of the Tribunal is only to determine the measure of guilt of each particular person and mete out the necessary punishment—the sentences.

Indicative of the largely political nature of the Nuremberg process was the important Jewish role in organizing these trials. Nahum Goldmann, one-time president of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, reported in his memoir that the Nuremberg Tribunal was the brain-child of World Jewish Congress officials. Only after persistent effort were WJC officials able to persuade Allied leaders to accept the idea, he added.⁸

The World Jewish Congress also played an important but less obvious role in the day to day proceedings. Above all, the powerful but secretive organization made sure that Germany’s persecution of the Jews was a primary focus of the trials, and that the defendants were punished for their involvement in that process.⁹

Two Jewish officers in the US Army—Lieutenant Colonel Murray Bernays and Colonel David “Mickey” Marcus—played key roles in the Nuremberg enterprise. In the words of historian Robert Conot, Bernays was “the guiding spirit leading the way to Nuremberg.” Bernays, a successful New York attorney, persuaded US War Secretary Henry

Stimson and others to accept the idea of putting the defeated German leaders on trial.¹⁰

Marcus, a fervent Zionist, became the “number three man in making American policy” in occupied Germany. As chief of the US government’s War Crimes Branch in 1946 and 1947, he selected almost all of the judges, prosecutors and lawyers for the Nuremberg NMT Trials. (He later became a commander of Zionist “Haganah” military forces in Palestine.)¹¹



US Army Colonel Murray C. Bernays persuaded War Secretary Henry Stimson and others to accept the idea of putting the defeated German leaders on trial. American historian Robert Conot called Bernays “the guiding spirit leading the way to Nuremberg.”

Some of the Americans who participated in the Nuremberg trials became disillusioned with the entire business. One of the few to make public his feelings was Charles F. Wennerstrum, an Iowa Supreme Court justice who served as presiding judge in the Nuremberg trial of German generals. “If I had known seven months ago what I know today, I would never have come here,” he declared immediately after sentences were pronounced. “The high ideals announced as the motives for creating these tribunals have not been evident,” he added.¹²

Wennerstrum cautiously referred to the extensive Jewish involvement in the Nuremberg process. “The entire atmosphere here is unwholesome . . . Lawyers, clerks, interpreters and researchers were employed who became Americans only in recent years, whose backgrounds were imbedded in Europe’s hatreds and prejudices.” He criticized the one-sided handling of evidence. “Most of the evidence in the trials was documentary, selected from the large tonnage of captured

records. The selection was made by the prosecution. The defense had access only to those documents which the prosecution considered material to the case." He concluded that "the trials were to have convinced the Germans of the guilt of their leaders. They convinced the Germans merely that their leaders lost the war to tough conquerors." Wenn-erstrum left Nuremberg "with a feeling that justice has been denied."

America's leading jurist was dismayed by the Nuremberg process. US Supreme Court Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone remarked with irritation: "[Chief US prosecutor] Jackson is away conducting his high-grade lynching party in Nuremberg. I don't mind what he does to the Nazis, but I hate to see the pretense that he is running a court and proceeding according to common law. This is a little too sanctimonious a fraud to meet my old-fashioned ideas." In a private letter he wrote: ". . . I wonder how some of those who preside at the trials would justify some of the acts of their own governments if they were placed in the status of the accused." On another occasion Stone specifically wondered "whether, under this new [Nuremberg] doctrine of international law, if we had been defeated, the victors could plausibly assert that our supplying Britain with fifty destroyers [in 1940] was an act of aggression . . ." ¹³

In Congress, US Representative Lawrence H. Smith of Wisconsin declared: "The Nuremberg trials are so repugnant to the Anglo-Saxon principles of justice that we must forever be ashamed of that page in our history . . . The Nuremberg farce represents a revenge policy at its worst." ¹⁴ Another Congressman, John Rankin of Mississippi, stated: "As a representative of the American people I desire to say that what is taking place in Nuremberg, Germany, is a disgrace to the United States . . . A racial minority, two and a half years after the war closed, are in Nuremberg not only hanging German soldiers but trying German businessmen in the name of the United States." ¹⁵

Probably the most courageous condemnation was by US Senator Robert A. Taft, widely regarded as the "conscience of the Republican party." At considerable risk to his political career, he denounced the Nuremberg enterprise in an October 1946 speech. "The trial of the vanquished by the victors cannot be impartial no matter how it is hedged about with the forms of justice," he said. Taft went on: ¹⁶

About this whole judgment there is the spirit of vengeance, and vengeance is seldom justice. The hanging of the eleven men convicted will be a blot on the American record which we will long regret. In these trials we have accepted the Russian idea of the purpose of trials—government policy and not justice—with little relation to Anglo-Saxon heritage. By clothing policy in the forms of legal procedure, we many discredit the whole idea of justice in Europe for years to come.

Milton R. Konvitz, a Jewish specialist of law and public administration who taught at New York University, warned at the time that the Nuremberg Tribunal “defies many of the most basic assumptions of the judicial process.” He went on: “Our policy with respect to the Nazis is consistent with neither international law nor our own State Department’s policy . . . The Nuremberg trial constitutes a real threat to the basic conceptions of justice which it has taken mankind thousands of years to establish.”¹⁷

In the years since, distinguished figures in both the United States and other countries have expressed similar views. US Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas wrote: “I thought at the time and still think that the Nuremberg trials were unprincipled. Law was created *ex post facto* to suit the passion and clamor of the time.”¹⁸

US Rear Admiral H. Lamont Pugh, former Navy Surgeon General and Commanding Officer of the National Naval Medical Center, wrote: “I thought the trials in general bordered upon international lunacy. I thought it particularly unfortunate, inappropriate, ill-conceived and dupably injudicious that the United States should have been cast in the leading role as prosecutors and implementators of the trials of German participants or principals.”¹⁹

Another indictment of the Nuremberg trial appeared more recently in the pages of the liberal *New Republic*:²⁰

The whole majesty of the Western heritage of the law was used to subvert that heritage in the Nuremberg Tribunal. Weighty jurists in every Western country (but not Russia) protested against this travesty of the Western legal system. So did historians. So did merely cultured and moral men and women. If the victors were to “try” the vanquished for war crimes, then they should try themselves for often committing the same crimes. Who would try [British] Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Travers “Bomber” Harris, the architect of the

policy of saturation bombing of German cities? But it was not only a matter of our own "war crimes." If it was right to use the apparatus of the law to punish those responsible for exceptional crimes like the Holocaust, it was wrong to use it to punish errors of judgment and statecraft such as every defeated regime seems to have committed. "We used the methods of the enemy"—and used them in peace at Nuremberg.

While the Nuremberg trials were underway, and for some time afterwards, there was quite a lot of talk about the universal validity of the new legal code established there. A new age of international justice had begun, it was claimed. Many sincerely believed that the four Allied powers would themselves abide by the Tribunal's standards.²¹

As it happened, none of the four powers that participated in the Tribunal ever made the slightest effort to apply the principles so solemnly and self-righteously proclaimed at Nuremberg either to their own leaders or to those of any other country.

No Soviet leader was executed for the Soviet military interventions in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968. No British leader was put on trial for the British invasion of Egypt in October 1956. President Eisenhower was not tried for his invasion of Lebanon in 1958. President Kennedy was not hanged for his ill-fated 1962 "Bay of Pigs" invasion of Cuba. President Johnson was never called to judicial account for his conduct of the war in Vietnam or his invasion of the Dominican Republic. President Nixon was not brought before a tribunal for his armed "incursion" into Cambodia.

When (North) Vietnamese officials threatened to put captured US airmen on trial in 1966, US Senator Everett Dirksen was moved to remark that the Nuremberg trials "may have been a ghastly mistake."²²

A Double Standard

In conducting the Nuremberg trials, the Allied governments themselves violated international law. For one thing, their treatment of the German defendants and the military prisoners who testified violated articles 56, 58 and others of the Geneva convention of July 1929.²³

Justice—as opposed to vengeance—is a standard that is applied impartially. At Nuremberg, though, standards of “justice” applied only to the vanquished. The four powers that sat in judgment were themselves guilty of many of the very crimes they accused the German leaders of committing.²⁴ Chief US prosecutor Robert Jackson privately acknowledged in a letter to President Truman that the Allies²⁵

have done or are doing some of the very things we are prosecuting the Germans for. The French are so violating the Geneva Convention in the treatment of [German] prisoners of war that our command is taking back prisoners sent to them [for forced labor in France]. We are prosecuting plunder and our Allies are practicing it. We say aggressive war is a crime and one of our allies asserts sovereignty over the Baltic States based on no title except conquest.

In violation of the first Nuremberg count of “planning, preparation, initiating or waging a war of aggression,” the Soviet Union attacked Finland in December 1939 (and was expelled from the League of Nations as a result). A few months later the Red Army invaded Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and ruthlessly incorporated them into the Soviet Union. The postwar French government violated international law and the Nuremberg charge of “maltreatment of prisoners of war” by employing large numbers of German prisoners of war as forced laborers in France. In 1945 the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union jointly agreed to the brutal deportation of more than ten million Germans from their ancient homes in eastern and central Europe, a violation of the Nuremberg count of “deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population.”²⁶

While Allied prosecutors charged the defendants with a “crime against peace” in planning the German invasion of Norway in 1940, the British government eventually had to admit that Britain and France were themselves guilty of the same “crime” in preparing a military invasion of Norway, code-named “Stratford,” before the German move. And in August 1941, Britain and the Soviet Union jointly invaded and occupied Iran, a neutral nation.²⁷

Given this record, it is hardly surprising that the four governments that organized the Nuremberg trial of 1945-

1946 included no definition of "aggression" in the Tribunal's Charter.²⁸

Mikhail Vozlenski, a Soviet historian who served as a translator at the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1946, later recalled that he and the other Soviet personnel felt out of place there because the alleged crimes of the German leaders were "the norm of our life" in the Soviet Union.²⁹ The Soviet role in the proceedings, which the United States fully supported, moved American diplomat and historian George F. Kennan to condemn the entire Nuremberg enterprise as a "horror" and a "mockery."³⁰

Nuremberg's double standard was condemned at the time by the British weekly *The Economist*. It pointed out that whereas both Britain and France had supported the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the League of Nations in 1939 for its unprovoked attack against Finland, just six years later these same two governments were cooperating with the USSR as a respected equal at Nuremberg. "Nor should the Western world console itself that the Russians alone stand condemned at the bar of the Allies' own justice," the *Economist* editorial went on. It continued:³¹

. . . Among crimes against humanity stands the offence of the indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations. Can the Americans who dropped the atom bomb and the British who destroyed the cities of western Germany plead "not guilty" on this count? Crimes against humanity also include the mass expulsion of populations. Can the Anglo-Saxon leaders who at Potsdam condoned the expulsion of millions of Germans from their homes hold themselves completely innocent? . . . The nations sitting in judgment [at Nuremberg] have so clearly proclaimed themselves exempt from the law which they have administered.

An official with the postwar US military occupation administration in Germany commented: "What good are the high-flown morals enunciated at Nuremberg if the Americans have agreed to such things as deportation in documents which bear official signatures, and which, therefore, give the Allies the legal right to do the things which at Nuremberg they described as immoral?"³²

If the Nuremberg Tribunal's standards had been applied to the victors of the Second World War, American General and supreme Allied commander in Europe Dwight Eisenhow-

er would have been hanged. At the end of the war Eisenhower ordered that German prisoners in American military custody were no longer to be treated according to the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war. This violation of international law removed masses of Germans from the protection of the International Red Cross (ICRC), and condemned hundreds of thousands of them to slow death by starvation and disease.³³

Perhaps nothing better illustrates the essentially unfair character of the Nuremberg proceedings than the treatment of Rudolf Hess, Hitler's deputy. He was sentenced to life imprisonment even though he alone of leading figures of the countries involved in the Second World War risked his life in a dangerous but fruitless effort to conclude peace between two of the warring nations. British historian A.J.P. Taylor once succinctly summed up the injustice of the Hess case and, by implication, of the entire Nuremberg enterprise:³⁴

Hess came to this country in 1941 as an ambassador of peace. He came with the . . . intention of restoring peace between Great Britain and Germany. He acted in good faith. He fell into our hands and was quite unjustly treated as a prisoner of war. After the war, we should have released him. Instead, the British government of the time delivered him for sentencing to the International Tribunal at Nuremberg . . . No crime has ever been proved against Hess . . . As far as the records show, he was never at even one of the secret discussions at which Hitler explained his war plans.

The Problem of Evidence

The victorious Allies thoroughly scoured Germany for every scrap of paper that might be used to incriminate the defeated regime. Never before or since have a nation's records been so completely ransacked. In addition to official government papers, including countless secret documents tracing Germany's wartime Jewish policy, the Allies confiscated the records of the National Socialist Party and its affiliated organizations, as well as those of numerous private business firms, institutions and individuals. The sheer quantity of paper seized is staggering. For example, the records of the German Foreign Office confiscated by US officials amounted to some 485 *tons* of paper.³⁵

From this mountain of paper, US military personnel alone selected some two thousand documents considered most incriminating for use in the main Nuremberg trial. The tons of confiscated records were later shipped to the United States. It is estimated that in the US National Archives alone, more than one million pages of documents on the Third Reich's Jewish policy are on file. Many hundreds of these Nuremberg documents have since been published, most notably by the U.S. government in the 42-volume "blue series" record of the main Nuremberg trial, the 15-volume "green series" record of the "second string" Nuremberg trials, and in the 11-volume "red series."³⁶

It is as if governments hostile to the United States were to seize the top secret files of the Pentagon and CIA, and then selectively publish the most embarrassing and incriminating documents from the vast collection.

In the years since the Nuremberg trials, historians of many different countries have carefully sifted through the German records, including countless documents that were not available to the Nuremberg prosecutors. Historians have been able to compare and cross-check the records of different ministries and agencies, as well as numerous private diaries and papers.³⁷

And yet, out of this great mass of paper, not a single document has ever been found that confirms or even refers to an extermination program. A number of historians have commented on this remarkable "gap" in the evidence. French-Jewish historian Leon Poliakov, for example, noted in his best-known Holocaust work:

The archives of the Third Reich and the depositions and accounts of its leaders make possible a reconstruction, down to the last detail, of the origin and development of the plans for aggression, the military campaigns, and the whole array of procedures by which the Nazis intended to reshape the world to their liking. Only the campaign to exterminate the Jews, as regards its conception as well as many other essential aspects, remains shrouded in darkness.

No documents of a plan for exterminating the Jews have ever been found, he added, because "perhaps none ever existed."³⁸

At Nuremberg, the German documents were in the custody of the Allied prosecutors, who did not permit defense attorneys to make their own selections of the material. Historian Werner Maser has pointed out that at Nuremberg “thousands of documents which seemed likely possibly to incriminate the Allies and exonerate the defendants suddenly disappeared . . . There is much evidence that documents were confiscated, concealed from the defense or even stolen in 1945.” Other important documents suddenly “disappeared” when specifically requested by defense attorneys. Officials at the National Archives in Washington have confirmed to this writer on several occasions that the originals of numerous Nuremberg documents remain “lost” to this day. The Tribunal refused to allow in evidence several collections of German and captured foreign documents published during the war as German Foreign Office “White Books.” Most of the 1,809 affidavits prepared by the Nuremberg defense have never been made public.³⁹

Among the documents that the defense was not permitted to bring to light was the secret supplement to the German-Soviet treaty of August 23, 1939, which divided eastern Europe into German and Soviet spheres of influence.⁴⁰

After the Nuremberg Tribunal pronounced its sentence, Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop pointed out some of the obstacles put up in his particular case:⁴¹

The defense had no fair chance to defend German foreign policy. Our prepared application for the submission of evidence was not allowed . . . Without good cause being shown, half of the 300 documents which the defense prepared were not admitted. Witnesses and affidavits were only admitted after the prosecution had been heard; most of them were rejected . . . Correspondence between Hitler and Chamberlain, reports by ambassadors and diplomatic minutes, etc., were rejected. Only the prosecution, not the defense, had access to German and foreign archives. The prosecution only searched for incriminating documents and their use was biased. It knowingly concealed exonerating documents and withheld them from the defense.

The Charter of the International Military Tribunal permitted the use of normally inadmissible “evidence.” Article 19 specified that “The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence . . . and shall admit any evidence

which it deems to have probative value." Article 21 stipulated:⁴²

The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take judicial notice thereof. It shall also take judicial notice of official governmental documents and reports of the United [Allied] Nations, including acts and documents of the committees set up in the various allied countries for the investigation of war crimes, and the records and findings of military and other Tribunals of any of the United [Allied] Nations.

On the basis of these articles, the Tribunal accepted as valid the most dubious "evidence," including hearsay and unsubstantiated reports of Soviet and American "investigative" commissions. For example, the Tribunal accepted an American congressional report that "proved" gas chamber killings at Dachau, and a Polish government report (submitted by the US) that "proved" killings by steam at Treblinka.⁴³ (No reputable historian now accepts either of these stories.)

In addition, the Tribunal validated Soviet reports about Auschwitz and Majdanek (documents USSR-8 and USSR-29), which explained in detail how the Germans killed four million at Auschwitz and another one-and-a-half million at Majdanek. (These days, no reputable historian accepts either of these fantastic figures.)

German guilt for the killing of thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn forest near Smolensk was similarly confirmed by Nuremberg document USSR-54. This detailed report by yet another Soviet "investigative" commission was submitted as proof for the charge made in the joint indictment of the four Allied governments. As a Soviet prosecutor explained: "We find, in the Indictment, one of the most important criminal acts for which the major war criminals are responsible was the mass execution of Polish prisoners of war shot in the Katyn forest near Smolensk by the German fascist invaders."⁴⁴ (Interestingly, two of the eight members of the Soviet Katyn Commission were also members of the Soviet Auschwitz commission: Academician N. Burdenko and Metropolitan Nikolai.) It wasn't until 1990 that the Soviet government finally acknowledged that the Katyn massacre was carried out, not by a German unit, as "proven" at Nuremberg, but by the Soviet secret police.⁴⁵



The Nuremberg Tribunal judges (left to right): A. F. Volchkov, the Soviet alternate; I. T. Nikitchenko, the Soviet judge; Norman Birkett, the British alternate; Lord Geoffrey Lawrence, the British judge; Francis Biddle, the American judge; John J. Parker, the American alternate; Donnedieu de Vabres, the French judge; and Robert Falco, the French alternate. Seated in front of the judges' bench are members of the secretariat and stenographers.

It is sometimes claimed that the evidence presented by the prosecution to the Nuremberg Tribunal was so incontrovertible that none of the defense attorneys ever disputed the authenticity or accuracy of even a single prosecution document.⁴⁶ This is not true. Not only did defense lawyers protest against the prosecution use of spurious documents, but some of the most important Nuremberg documents are now generally acknowledged to be fraudulent.⁴⁷

For example, defense attorney Dr. Boehm protested to the Tribunal that Nuremberg document 1721-PS, which purportedly confirms attacks by stormtroopers against Jewish synagogues in November 1938, is a clumsy forgery. He went on to explain his reasons at some length.⁴⁸

Several Nuremberg documents based on the purported "death bed confession" of Mauthausen commandant Franz Ziereis, are demonstrably fraudulent. (Nuremberg documents 1515-PS, 3870-PS, and NO-1973.) These documents supposedly prove systematic killings of hundreds of thousands of people by gassing and other means at Mauthausen and Hartheim.⁴⁹

Almost forty years after the Tribunal handed down its verdicts, Nuremberg document USSR-378 was definitively exposed as a fraud. It is a purported record of numerous private conversations with Hitler by Hermann Rauschning, a former National Socialist official in Danzig. In brutal language, the Führer supposedly revealed his most intimate thoughts and secret plans for world conquest. Rauschning's "memoir" was published in 1939 in Britain under the title *Hitler Speaks*, and in the United States in 1940 as *The Voice of Destruction*. It was this US edition that was accepted in evidence at Nuremberg as proof of the "guiding principles of the Nazi regime."

Chief British prosecutor Sir Hartley Shawcross and his Soviet colleagues cited numerous quotations from it. Defendant Baldur von Schirach contested its authenticity, but defense attorney Pelckmann (who did not know any better) accepted this "evidence" as authentic.⁵⁰ In 1983 Swiss historian Wolfgang Hänel established that the "memoir" is entirely fraudulent. Rauschning never had even a single private meeting with Hitler.⁵¹

Another fraudulent Nuremberg document is the so-called "Hossbach protocol" (document 386-PS), a purported record of a high-level 1937 conference at which Hitler supposedly

revealed his secret plans for aggressive conquest. US Nuremberg prosecutor Sidney Alderman called it “one of the most striking and revealing of all the captured documents,” and told the Tribunal that it removed any remaining doubts about the guilt of the Germans leaders for their crimes against peace. It was largely on the basis of this document that Göring was condemned to death.⁵²

Similarly spurious is Nuremberg document L-3 (US-28), supposedly a record of a bellicose speech by Hitler to armed forces commanders on August 22, 1939. It contains a widely-cited quotation attributed to Hitler, “Who talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?”⁵³

Jewish historian Lucy Dawidowicz, author of *The War Against the Jews*, acknowledged that “There are also Holocaust documents that are outright falsification and some that purvey myth rather than historical fact.”⁵⁴

Dubious Testimony

Much of the evidence for the Holocaust story presented at Nuremberg and in subsequent trials has been “survivor testimony.” As numerous historians have acknowledged, though, such testimony is often defective.⁵⁵

Gerald Reitlinger cautioned readers of his detailed study, *The Final Solution*, that Holocaust evidence, including Nuremberg documents and testimony, cannot be accepted at face value: “A certain degree of reserve is necessary in handling all this material, and particularly this applies to the last section (survivor narratives) . . . The Eastern European Jew is a natural rhetorician, speaking in flowery similes.”⁵⁶ French historian Jean-Claude Pressac likewise warned in his detailed book about Auschwitz that “extreme care is required with the testimony of survivors . . .”⁵⁷

Jewish historian Hannah Arendt observed in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem* that the “eyewitnesses” who testified in the 1961 trial in Jerusalem of Adolf Eichmann were only rarely able to distinguish between what actually happened to them years earlier and what they had read, heard or imagined in the meantime.⁵⁸ Holocaust historian Lucy Dawidowicz similarly noted that “the survivor’s memory is often distorted by hate, sentimentality, and the passage of time. His perspective on external events is often skewed by the limits of his personal experience.”⁵⁹

French historian Germain Tillion, a specialist of the Second World War period, has warned that former camp inmates who lie are, in fact,⁶⁰

very much more numerous than people generally suppose, and a subject like that of the concentration camp world—well designed, alas, to stimulate sado-masochistic imaginations—offered them an exceptional field of action. We have known numerous mentally damaged persons, half-swindlers and half fools, who exploited an imaginary deportation. We have known others of them—authentic deportees—whose sick minds strove to even go beyond the monstrosities that they had seen or that people said happened to them.

Jewish historian Samuel Gringauz, who was himself interned in the ghetto of Kaunas (Lithuania) during the war, criticized what he called the “hyperhistorical” nature of most Jewish “survivor testimony.” He wrote that “most of the memoirs and reports are full of preposterous verbosity, graphomantic exaggeration, dramatic effects, overestimated self-inflation, dilettante philosophizing, would-be lyricism, unchecked rumors, bias, partisan attacks and apologies.”⁶¹

Shmuel Krakowki, archives director of the Israeli government’s Holocaust center, Yad Vashem, confirmed in 1986 that more than 10,000 of the 20,000 “testimonies” of Jewish “survivors” on file there are “unreliable.” Many survivors, wanting “to be part of history” may have let their imaginations run away with them, Krakowski said. “Many were never in the places where they claimed to have witnessed atrocities, while others relied on second-hand information given them by friends or passing strangers.” He confirmed that many of the testimonies on file at Yad Vashem were later proved to be inaccurate when locations and dates could not pass an expert historian’s appraisal.⁶²

We now know that witnesses at the main Nuremberg trial gave false testimony. Perhaps the most obvious were the three witnesses who ostensibly confirmed German guilt for the Katyn massacre of Polish officers.⁶³

Stephen F. Pinter of St. Louis, Missouri, served as a US Army prosecuting attorney from January 1946 to July 1947 at the American trials of Germans at Dachau. Altogether, some 420 Germans were sentenced to death in these Dachau trials. In a 1960 affidavit Pinter stated that “notoriously

perjured witnesses” were used to charge Germans with “false and unfounded” crimes. “Unfortunately, as a result of these miscarriages of justice, many innocent persons were convicted and some were executed.”⁶⁴

A tragi-comic incident during the Dachau proceedings suggests the general atmosphere. US investigator Joseph Kirschbaum brought a Jewish witness named Einstein into court to testify that the defendant, Menzel, had murdered Einstein’s brother. But when the accused pointed out that the brother was, in fact, sitting in the courtroom, an embarrassed Kirschbaum scolded the witness: “How can we bring this pig to the gallows if you are so stupid as to bring your brother into court?”⁶⁵

August Gross, a German who worked as a civilian employee for the U.S. Army at the Dachau trials, later declared:⁶⁶

The American prosecutors paid professional incrimination witnesses, mostly former criminal concentration camp inmates, the amount of one dollar per day (at that time worth 280 marks on the black market) as well as food from a witness kitchen and witness lodging. During the recess periods between trial proceedings the US prosecuting attorneys told these witnesses what they were to say in giving testimony. The US prosecuting attorneys gave the witnesses photos of the defendants and were thereby able to easily incriminate them.

A young US Army court reporter at the Dachau trials in 1947, Joseph Halow, later recalled the unwholesome situation:

The witnesses in the concentration camp cases were virtually all of the sort we court reporters termed “professional witnesses,” those who spent months in Dachau, testifying against one or another of the many accused . . . It was to their economic advantage to testify, and many of them made a good living doing so. As one might well imagine, the motive of the professional witnesses was also one of spite and revenge . . . In many instances their vengeance included relating exaggerated accounts of what they had witnessed. It also included outright lying.

In one case, testimony provided by the prosecution witnesses “appeared to raise more questions than provide

answers. Some of it was obviously fabricated, or so grossly exaggerated as to render it unbelievable. There were repeated instances of mistaken identity of the same accused, and vague, uncertain statements about some of the others." Moreover, Halow reported, the US courts paid "scant attention to testimony by and for the accused."⁶⁷

In the 1947 "Nordhausen-Dora" case, American defense attorney Major Leon B. Poullada protested against the general unreliability—and frequent outright lying—of prosecution witnesses in this US military trial of former concentration camp officials.⁶⁸

Use of such unreliable testimony continued in "Holocaust" trials in later years. Federal district judge Norman C. Roettger, Jr., ruled in 1978 in a Florida case that all six Jewish "eyewitnesses" who had testified to direct atrocities and shootings at Treblinka by Ukrainian-born defendant Feodor Fedorenko had wrongly identified the accused after being misled by Israeli authorities.⁶⁹

New York "Nazi hunter" Charles Kremer visited Israel in 1981 looking for Jews who could confirm atrocities allegedly committed by a former Ukrainian SS man living in New Jersey. But Kremer cut short his visit, bitterly disappointed by the numerous Jews who offered to provide spurious "testimony" in return for money. As the Brooklyn *Jewish Press* reported, "Kremer was stricken with gastronomic pains—a malady he attributes to his difficulties in dealing with hucksters who tried to use his search for their personal gain."⁷⁰

One of the most blatant examples of perjury by Jewish Holocaust witnesses in recent years was in the case of a retired Chicago factory worker named Frank Walus who was charged with killing Jews in his native Poland during the war. A December 1974 letter from "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal that accused Walus of working for the Gestapo prompted the US government's legal campaign. During his trial, eleven Jews testified under oath that they personally saw Walus murder Jews, including several children. After a costly and bitterly contested four-year legal battle, Walus was finally able to prove that he had actually spent the war years as a teenager quietly working on German farms. A lengthy article copyrighted by the American Bar Association and published in 1981 in the *Washington Post* concluded that

“. . . in an atmosphere of hatred and loathing verging on hysteria, the government persecuted an innocent man.”⁷¹

Torture

Allied prosecutors used torture to help prove their case at Nuremberg and other postwar trials.⁷²

Former Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss was tortured by British officials into signing a false and self-incriminating “confession” that has been widely cited as a key document of Holocaust extermination. His testimony before the Nuremberg Tribunal, a high point of the proceeding, was perhaps the most striking and memorable evidence presented there of a German extermination program.⁷³ Höss maintained that two and half million people had been killed in Auschwitz gas chambers, and that another 500,000 inmates had died there of other causes. No serious or reputable historian now accepts either of these fantastic figures, and other key portions of Höss’ “confession” are now generally acknowledged to be untrue.⁷⁴

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has cited the case of Jupp Aschenbrenner, a Bavarian who was tortured into signing a statement that he had worked on mobile gas chambers (“gas vans”) during the war. It wasn’t until several years later that he was finally able to prove that he had actually spent that time in Munich studying to become an electric welder.⁷⁵

Fritz Sauckel, head of the German wartime labor mobilization program, was sentenced to death at the main Nuremberg trial. An important piece of evidence presented to the Tribunal by the US prosecution was an affidavit signed by the defendant. (Nuremberg document 3057-PS.) It turned out that Sauckel had put his signature to this self-incriminating statement, which had been presented to him by his captors in finished form, only after he was bluntly told that if he hesitated, his wife and children would be turned over to the Soviets. “I did not stop to consider, and thinking of my family, I signed the document,” Sauckel later declared.⁷⁶

Hans Fritzsche, another defendant in the main Nuremberg trial, was similarly forced to sign a self-damning confession while he was a prisoner of the Soviet secret police in Moscow. (Nuremberg document USSR-474.)⁷⁷

Nuremberg defendant Julius Streicher, who was eventually hanged because he published a sometimes sensational

anti-Jewish weekly paper, was brutally mistreated following his arrest. He was badly beaten, kicked, whipped, spat at, forced to drink saliva and burned with cigarettes. His genitals were beaten. Eyebrow and chest hair was pulled out. He was stripped and photographed. Fellow defendant Hans Frank was savagely beaten by two black GIs shortly after his arrest. August Eigruber, former *Gauleiter* of Upper Austria, was mutilated and castrated at the end of the war.⁷⁸

Josef Kramer, former commandant of both the Bergen-Belsen and Auschwitz-Birkenau camps, and other defendants in the British-run "Belsen" trial, were reportedly also tortured, some of them so brutally that they begged to be put to death.⁷⁹

Although most of the defendants at the main Nuremberg trial were not tortured, many other Germans were forced to sign affidavits and give testimony against their former colleagues and superiors. A simple threat to turn the subject over to the Soviets was often enough to persuade him to sign an affidavit or provide testimony needed in court. Threats against the subject's wife and children, including withdrawal of ration cards, delivery to the Soviets or imprisonment, often quickly produced the desired results. If all else failed, the subject could be placed in solitary confinement, beaten, kicked, whipped or burned until he broke down.⁸⁰

The testimony of the prosecution's chief witness in the Nuremberg "Wilhelmstrasse" trial was obtained by threat of death. The American defense attorney, Warren Magee, had somehow obtained the transcript of the first pretrial interrogation of Friedrich Gaus, a former senior official in the German Foreign Office. Despite frantic protests by prosecuting attorney Robert Kempner, the judge decided to permit Magee to read from the document. During the pretrial interrogation session, Kempner told Gaus that he would be turned over to the Soviets for hanging. Tearfully pleading for mercy, Gaus begged Kempner to think of his wife and children. Kempner replied that he could save himself only by testifying in court against his former colleagues. A desperate Gaus, who had already endured four weeks in solitary confinement, agreed. When Magee finished reading from the damning transcript, Gaus sat with both hands to his face, totally devastated.⁸¹

American soldiers repeatedly beat former SS captain Konrad Morgen in an unsuccessful effort to force him to sign

a perjured affidavit against Ilse Koch, a defendant in the US military's 1947 "Buchenwald" case. American officials also threatened to turn Morgen over to the Soviets if he did not sign the false statement.⁸²

Luftwaffe General Field Marshal Erhard Milch was warned by a US Army Major to stop testifying on behalf of Hermann Göring in the main Nuremberg trial. The American officer told Milch that if he persisted, he would be charged as a war criminal himself, regardless of whether or not he was guilty.⁸³ Milch did not back down and was indeed charged. In 1947 a US Nuremberg court sentenced him to life imprisonment as a war criminal. Four years later, though, the US High Commissioner commuted his sentence to fifteen years, and a short time after that Milch was amnestied and released.⁸⁴

Reports of widespread torture at the postwar American-run "war crimes" trials at Dachau leaked out, resulting in so many protests that a formal investigation was eventually carried out. A US Army Commission of inquiry consisting of Pennsylvania Judge Edward van Roden and Texas Supreme Court Judge Gordon Simpson officially confirmed the charges of gross abuse. German defendants, they found, were routinely tortured at Dachau with savage beatings, burning matches under fingernails, kicking of testicles, months of solitary confinement, and threats of family reprisals. Low ranking prisoners were assured that their "confessions" would be used only against their former superiors in the dock. Later, though, these hapless men found their own "confessions" used against them when they were tried in turn. High ranking defendants were cynically assured that by "voluntarily" accepting all responsibility themselves they would thereby protect their former subordinates from prosecution.⁸⁵

One Dachau trial court reporter was so outraged at what was happening there in the name of justice that he quit his job. He testified to a US Senate subcommittee that the "most brutal" interrogators had been three German-born Jews. Although operating procedures at the Dachau trials were significantly worse than those used at Nuremberg, they give some idea of the spirit of the "justice" imposed on the vanquished Germans.

Virtually all of the US investigators who brought cases before American military courts at Dachau were "Jewish

refugees from Germany” who “hated the Germans,” recalled Joseph Halow, a US Army court reporter at the Dachau trials in 1947. “Many of the investigators gave vent to their hatred by attempting to force confessions from the Germans by treating them brutally,” including “severe beatings.”⁸⁶

The case of Gustav Petrat, a German who had served as a guard at the Mauthausen, was not unusual. After repeated brutal beatings by US authorities, he broke down and signed a perjured statement. He was also whipped and threatened with immediate shooting. Petrat was prevented from securing exonerating evidence, and even potential defense witnesses were beaten and threatened to keep them from testifying. After a farcical trial by a US military court at Dachau, Petrat was sentenced to death and hanged in late 1948. He was 24 years old.⁸⁷

Use of torture to produce incriminating statements has not been limited to postwar Germany, of course. Such techniques have been systematically used by governments around the world. During the Korean War, American airmen held as prisoners by the Communist North Koreans made detailed statements “confessing” to their roles in waging germ warfare. Under physical and psychological torture, 38 US airmen “admitted” dropping bacteriological bombs that caused disease epidemics and claimed many Korean civilian lives. These statements were later shown to be false, and the airmen repudiated them after returning to the United States. Their phony confessions were the same kind of evidence given by Rudolf Höss and others at the Nuremberg trials. Under similar circumstances, Americans proved at least as ready to “confess” to monstrous but baseless crimes as Germans.⁸⁸

One of the most important and revealing Nuremberg cases is that of Oswald Pohl, the wartime head of the vast SS agency (WVHA) that ran the German concentration camps. After his capture in 1946, he was taken to Nenndorf where British soldiers tied him to a chair and beat him unconscious. He lost two teeth in repeated beatings.⁸⁹ He was then transferred to Nuremberg, where American military officials intensively interrogated him for more than half a year in sessions that lasted for hours. Altogether there were about 70 such sessions. During this period he had no access to an attorney or any other help. He was never formally charged

with anything, nor even told precisely why he was being interrogated.

In a statement written after he was sentenced to death at Nuremberg in November 1947 by the American military court ("Concentration Camp" Case No. 4), Pohl described his treatment.⁹⁰ He reported that although he was generally not physically mistreated in Nuremberg as he had been at Nenndorf, he was nevertheless subjected to the less noticeable but, as he put it, "in their own way much more brutal emotional tortures."

American interrogators (most of them Jews) accused Pohl of killing 30 million people and of condemning ten million people to death. The interrogators themselves knew very well that such accusations were lies and tricks meant to break down his resistance, Pohl declared. "Because I am not emotionally thick-skinned, these diabolical intimidations were not without effect, and the interrogators achieved what they wanted: not the truth, but rather statements that served their needs," he wrote.

Pohl was forced to sign false and self-incriminating affidavits written by prosecution officials that were later used against him in his own trial. As he recalled:

Whenever genuine documents did not correspond to what the prosecution authorities wanted or were insufficient for the guilty sentences they sought, "affidavits" were put together. The most striking feature of these remarkable trial documents is that the accused often condemned themselves in them. That is understandable only to those who have themselves experienced the technique by which such "affidavits" are obtained.

He and other defendants were "destroyed" with these affidavits, which "contain provable errors of fact regarding essential points," Pohl wrote. Among the false statements signed by Pohl was one that incriminated former Reichsbank President Walter Funk, whom the Nuremberg Tribunal eventually sentenced to life imprisonment.⁹¹

American officials also made use of false witnesses at Nuremberg, Pohl wrote:

Whenever these productions [affidavits] were not enough to produce the result sought by the prosecuting authorities, they marched out their so-called 'star witnesses,' or rather,

paid witnesses . . . A whole string of these shady, wretched characters played their contemptible game at Nuremberg. They included high government officials, generals and intellectuals as well as prisoners, mental defectives and real hardened criminals . . . During the WVHA trial [of Pohl] a certain Otto appeared from a mental institution as a "star witness." His previous lifestyle would have been considered exemplary by any hardened criminal. The same is true of prosecution witness Krusial who presented the most spectacular fairy tales to the court under oath, which were naturally believed . . .

Pohl also protested that defense attorneys were not allowed free access to the German wartime documents, which the prosecution was able to find and use without hindrance:

For almost two years the prosecution authorities could make whatever use they wanted of the many crates of confiscated documentary and archival material they had at their disposal. But the same access right was refused to the German defendants despite their repeated efforts . . . This meant a tremendous or even complete paralysis and hindrance of the defense cases for the accused, for those crates also contained the exonerating material that the prosecution authorities were able to keep from being presented to the court. And that is called "proper" procedure.

Because Pohl held the rank of general in the German armed forces, his treatment by the British and Americans was illegal according to the international agreements on the treatment of prisoners of war.

"As result of the brutal physical mistreatment in Nenndorf and my treatment in Nuremberg, I was emotionally a completely broken man," he wrote. "I was 54 years old. For 33 years I had served by country without dishonor, and I was unconscious of any crime."

Pohl summed up the character of the postwar trials of German leaders:

It was obvious during the Dachau trials, and it also came out unmistakably and only poorly disguised during the Nuremberg trials, that the prosecution authorities, among whom Jews predominated, were driven by blind hatred and obvious lust for revenge. Their goal was not the search for

truth but rather the annihilation of as many adversaries as possible.

To an old friend Pohl wrote: "As one of the senior SS leaders I had never expected to be left unmolested. No more, however, did I expect a death sentence. It is a sentence of retribution."⁹²

He was hanged on June 7, 1951. In his final plea to the Nuremberg court, Pohl expressed his faith that one day blind hysteria would give way to just understanding.⁹³

After distance and time have clarified all events and when passion has ceased and when hatred and revenge have stilled their hunger, then these many millions of decent Germans who have sacrificed their lives for their fatherland will not be denied their share of sympathy which today is being attributed to the victims of the concentration camps, although a large number of them owe their fate not to political, racial or religious characteristics, but to their criminal past.

Extermination Denied

Along with the millions of people around the world who avidly followed the Nuremberg proceedings by radio and newspaper, the defendants themselves were shocked by the evidence presented to substantiate the extermination charge. Above all, the testimony of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss and Einsatzgruppen commander Otto Ohlendorf made a deep impression. Contrary to what is often claimed or insinuated, however, the Nuremberg Tribunal defendants declared that they did not know of any extermination program during the war.⁹⁴ These men were, in a sense, the first "Holocaust revisionists."

The main Nuremberg defendant, Hermann Göring, who had been Hitler's second-in-command and designated successor during most of the Third Reich years, vehemently denied knowing of any extermination program during the war. "The first time I learned of these terrible exterminations," he exclaimed at one point, "was right here in Nuremberg." The German policy had been to expel the Jews, not kill them, he explained, and added that, to the best of his knowledge, Hitler did not know of any extermination policy either.⁹⁵



Chief Nuremberg Tribunal defendant Hermann Göring, who had been Hitler's second-in-command, denied knowing of any extermination plan or program during the war. "The first time I learned of these terrible exterminations," he declared, "was right here in Nuremberg."

During a rare unguarded break between court sessions, fellow defendant Hans Fritzsche privately asked Göring about the truth of the extermination charge. The former *Reichsmarschall* solemnly assured Fritzsche that the accusation was not true. The Allied evidence for the charge, he insisted, was inaccurate or incomplete and totally contradicted everything he knew about the matter. In any case, Göring added, if there had been any mass killings, they certainly were not ordered by Hitler.⁹⁶

General Alfred Jodl, chief of the operations staff of the Armed Forces High Command, and probably Hitler's closest

military adviser, gave similar testimony to the Tribunal. Responding to a direct question about this matter, he said:⁹⁷

I can only say, fully conscious of my responsibility, that I never heard, either by hint or by written or spoken words, of an extermination of Jews . . . I never had any private information on the extermination of the Jews. On my word, as sure as I am sitting here, I heard all these things for the first time after the end of the war.

Hans Frank, the wartime governor of German-ruled Poland, testified that during the war he had heard only rumors and foreign reports of mass killings of Jews. He asked other officials, including Hitler, about these stories and was repeatedly assured that they were false.⁹⁸

Frank's testimony is particularly noteworthy because if millions of Jews had actually been exterminated in German-occupied Poland, as alleged, hardly anyone would have been in a better position to know about it. During the course of the trial, Frank was overcome by a deep sense of Christian repentance. His psychological state was such that if he had known about an extermination program, he would have said so.

At one point during the proceedings, Frank was asked by his attorney, "Did you ever take part in any way in the annihilation of Jews?" His reply reflects his emotional state at the time:⁹⁹

I say yes, and the reason why I say yes is because, under the impression of these five months of the proceedings, and especially under the impression of the testimony of the witness [former Auschwitz commandant] Höss, I cannot answer to my conscience to shift the responsibility for this solely on these low-level people. I never built a Jewish extermination camp or helped to bring one into existence. But if Adolf Hitler personally shifted this terrible responsibility onto his people, than it also applies to me. After all, we carried on this struggle against Jewry for years . . . And therefore I have the duty to answer your question in this sense and in this context with yes. A thousand years will pass and this guilt of Germany will not be erased.



Standing among co-defendants in the dock of the Nuremberg Tribunal, Alfred Jodl makes his final plea. Hitler's closest wartime military adviser testified that he had "never heard, either by hint or by written or spoken words, of an extermination of Jews . . . I heard all these things for the first time after the end of the war."

These words, and especially the final sentence, have often been quoted to give the impression that the defendants themselves admitted their guilt and acknowledged the existence of a wartime German policy to exterminate the Jews.¹⁰⁰ Less well-known are Frank's words during his final address to the Tribunal:¹⁰¹

In the witness stand I said that a thousand years would not be enough to erase the guilt of our nation because of Hitler's behavior in this war. [However,] not only the behavior of our wartime enemies against our people and our soldiers, which has been carefully kept out of these proceedings, but also the enormous mass crimes of the most terrible kind against Germans, which I have only now learned about, especially in East Prussia, Silesia, Pomerania and in the Sudetenland, which have been and are still being carried out by Russians, Poles and Czechs, have now already completely canceled out any possible guilt of our people. Who will ever judge these crimes against the German people?

Ernst Kaltenbrunner, wartime head of the powerful Reich Security Main Office (RSHA), was certain that he would soon be put to death regardless of the evidence presented to the Tribunal: "The colonel in charge of the London prison that I was in has told me that I would be hanged in any case, no matter what the outcome would be. Since I am fully aware of that, all I want to do is to clear up on the fundamental things that are wrong here." In a question-and-answer exchange, Kaltenbrunner rejected the charge that he had ordered gassings.¹⁰²

Q. Witness after witness, by testimony and affidavit, has said that the gas chamber killings were done on general or specific orders of Kaltenbrunner.

A. Show me one of those men or any of those orders. It is utterly impossible.

Q. . . Practically all of the orders came through Kaltenbrunner.

A. Entirely impossible.

The case of Albert Speer, one-time Hitler confidant and wartime Armaments Minister, deserves special mention. His Nuremberg defense strategy was unique and also rather successful because he did not hang. While maintaining that he personally knew nothing of an extermination program during the war, he nevertheless declared himself morally culpable for having worked so diligently for a regime he belatedly came to regard as evil. After serving a twenty-year sentence in Spandau prison, the "repentant Nazi" was "rehabilitated" by the mass media for his somewhat subtle but fervent condemnation of the Hitler regime. His contrite memoir, published in the US as *Inside the Third Reich*, was highly acclaimed and sold very profitably in Europe and America.

Until his death in 1981, Speer steadfastly insisted that he did not know of any extermination program or gassings during the war. His position was remarkable because, if a wartime policy to exterminate the Jews had actually existed, almost no one would have been in a better position to have known about it. As Reich Armaments Minister, Speer was responsible for the continental mobilization of all available resources, including critically needed Jewish workers. That millions of Jews could have been transported across Europe and killed at a wartime industrial center as important as Auschwitz, and elsewhere, without Speer's knowledge simply defies belief.¹⁰³

During the Nuremberg "Wilhelmstrasse" trial, the chief of the Reich Chancellery from 1933 to 1945, Hans Lammers, was asked if he "was still of the opinion that no program for exterminating the Jews was ever set up." He answered: "Yes, I am of that opinion. At least the program never came to my attention. The program cannot have been set up." Lammers, who was Hitler's closest legal adviser, went on to explain: "I did not know of any mass killings and, of the cases I heard about, the reports were allegations, rumors . . . The fact that individual cases occurred here and there, the shooting of Jews in wartime in some towns or other, that I read something about that and heard something about that, that is very easily possible."¹⁰⁴

Such testimony by the men who were most familiar with Germany's overall Jewish policy is routinely dismissed as brazen lying. But the categorical and self-consistent nature of this testimony, sometimes by men who knew that death

soon awaited them, suggests a core of truth. On the other hand, to accept the Holocaust extermination story means giving greater credibility to the most fantastic and often demonstrably false testimonies by very questionable witnesses.

Other Postwar Trials

During the decades since Nuremberg, many individuals have been tried in (West) Germany and other countries for alleged wartime participation in exterminating the Jews. Rarely, if ever, has a defendant ever substantially challenged the Holocaust story. The accused invariably adopted the defense strategy successfully used by Speer at Nuremberg: He accepted the extermination story but denied or minimized his own personal involvement. To deny an extermination program in trials that were organized on the working assumption that such a program existed would have been judicial suicide.

These trials are comparable in some respects to the Soviet show trials of 1936-1938. The defendants in the well-publicized Moscow trials never denied the existence of vast criminal conspiracies involving major Soviet personalities who supposedly plotted the most horrible crimes in league with hostile foreign powers. Instead, the accused pleaded that he was not personally guilty, or that his guilt was minimal and that he had truly repented. (Remarkably, even **foreign observers who should have known better, such as US Ambassador in Moscow Joseph Davies, were inclined to accept the Stalinist show trials as genuine and essentially just.**)¹⁰⁵

Comparisons have also been drawn between the "Holocaust" trials and the witchcraft trials of past centuries. Those accused of witchcraft never denied the existence or diabolical power of witches. Instead they insisted that they were not personally guilty of the charges against them. Nuremberg defendant Hans Fritzsche, who had been one of Germany's most prominent and effective wartime radio news commentators, summed up the problem: "If someone accuses me of killing someone, than I can prove the contrary. But if I am accused of being the devil, there's no way to disprove that, because it can't be done."¹⁰⁶

One of the most important of the post-Nuremberg "Holocaust" trials was the 1963-1965 Frankfurt "Auschwitz" trial

of 22 former Auschwitz SS men. The lengthy case received worldwide media coverage and assumed something of the character of a show trial.¹⁰⁷ Deciding the guilt or innocence of the defendants was “extraordinarily difficult,” the judges declared in their verdict, because of the very inconclusive nature of the evidence. “We have no absolute evidence for the individual killings. We have only the witness testimonies.” The judges acknowledged that “the possibilities of verifying the witness declarations were very limited.” The judges further emphasized “this weakness of witness testimony” by citing the case of a Buchenwald official convicted of murdering an inmate who later turned up alive.¹⁰⁸

This situation was embarrassingly underscored during the trial when former inmate Rudolf Kauer suddenly repudiated earlier statements about his one-time SS masters. In pre-trial interrogation he claimed to have seen defendant Wilhelm Boger brutally beat a naked Polish woman with a horse whip, ripping off one breast and flooding a room with blood. When asked to repeat his statement in court, Kauer admitted: “I lied about that. That was just a yarn going around the camp. I never saw it . . .” Another claim that Boger had smashed an infant’s skull against a tree trunk was also not true, he confessed. Although Boger was not liked, Kauer told the court, he was actually a just SS man.

Another defendant, Klaus Dylewski, whom Kauer had called “one of the worse killers” at Auschwitz, was actually “harmless.” All of his pre-trial accusations were lies, Kauer said, calmly adding: “You can punish me if you want. I am used to that.” After the presiding judge admonished him several times for repudiating his earlier statements, Kauer replied: “We don’t need to lose any more words. It’s not worth it. What I say now is the truth.”¹⁰⁹

Former Auschwitz camp adjutant and SS Captain Robert Mulka, the main defendant in the trial, was pronounced guilty of participation in mass murder and sentenced to 14 years at hard labor, a verdict that many outsiders considered outrageously lenient. But less than four months later Mulka was quietly released, an outcome that should astonish only those not familiar with the nature of such trials.¹¹⁰

Conclusion

Very few of those who glibly refer to “all the Nuremberg evidence” as proof for the Holocaust extermination story are familiar with either the real nature of this “evidence” or the character of these trials. On closer examination, solid documentary or forensic evidence of a wartime German policy to exterminate Europe’s Jews proves to be elusive. As we have seen, the evidence that has been presented consists largely of extorted confessions, spurious testimonies, and fraudulent documents. The postwar Nuremberg trials were politically motivated proceedings meant more to discredit the leaders of a defeated regime than to establish truth.

We do not need trials or “confessions” to prove that the Katyn massacre or the postwar deportation of Germans from eastern and central Europe actually took place. By comparison, the Holocaust story does not claim just a few isolated massacres, but a vast extermination program taking place across the European continent over a three-year period involving several governments and millions of people. The fact that the Holocaust story must rely so heavily on highly dubious testimony evidence and trials staged in a historically unparalleled atmosphere of hysteria, intimidation and propaganda demonstrates its inherent weakness.

Notes

1. Office of the United States Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (11 vols.), Washington, DC: U.S. Govt., 1946-1948. (The “red series.”) / NC&A, Vol. 1, pp. 134-135.
2. International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal*. 42 vols. Nuremberg: 1947-1949. (The “blue series.”) / IMT, vol. 19, p. 501.
3. See the succinct declaration by all the German defense attorneys in the IMT case. Published in: Jay W. Baird, ed., *From Nuremberg to My Lai* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972), pp. 81-83.; Note also the summary comment by Hans Lammers of the Nuremberg verdict

- against him, in: Georg Franz-Willing, *Die Reichskanzlei 1933-1945* (Tübingen: 1984), p. 221.
4. Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (New York: Scribner's, 1979), pp. 281, 282.; The liberal American weekly *Nation* editorially acknowledged in October 1945: "The Nuremberg court is political court with a political job to perform." *Nation*, Oct. 27, 1945, p. 418. Quoted in: James J. Martin, *Revisionist Viewpoints* (Colorado Springs: 1971), p. 125.
 5. International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the Major War Criminals...* ("blue series"), IMT, Vol. 19, p. 398. (Testimony of July 26, 1946).; In a letter to his wife, written shortly before his execution, former Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop commented: "Everyone knows that the [guilty] verdict is utterly untenable, but I was once Adolf Hitler's Foreign Minister and politics demands that for this fact I shall be condemned." Quoted in: Joachim C. Fest, *The Face of the Third Reich* (New York: 1970), p. 185.
 6. Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 92.
 7. *Report of Robert H. Jackson, United States Representative to the International Conference on Military Trials, London, 1945* (Washington, DC: US State Dept., 1949), pp. 104-106, 303.; Whitney R. Harris, *Tyranny on Trial: The Evidence at Nuremberg* (Dallas: S.M.U. Press, 1954), pp. 16-17.; Leo Kahn, *Nuremberg Trials* (New York: Ballantine, 1972), p. 26.
 8. Nahum Goldmann, *The Jewish Paradox* (New York: 1978), p. 122.; N. Goldmann, *The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann* (New York: 1969), pp. 216-217.; WJC official Rabbi Maurice Perlzweig claimed in 1949 that "it was the WJC which had secured the holding of the Nuremberg Trials . . ." See: "W.J.C. Claims: The Nuremberg Trials," *Jewish Chronicle* (London), Dec. 16, 1949, p. 17. See also confirmatory letter by Zelmanovits in: *Jewish Chronicle*, Dec. 30, 1949, p. 16. Note also: Milton R. Konvitz, "Will Nuremberg Serve Justice?," *Commentary* (New York), Vol. I, No. 3, January 1946, p. 11.
 9. World Jewish Congress, *Unity in Dispersion* (New York: WJC, 1948), pp. 141, 264, 266, 267.
 10. Robert E. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), pp. 10-13; Bradley F. Smith, *Reaching Judgment at Nuremberg* (New York: Basic, 1977), pp. 26-33. Tom Bower, *Blind Eye to Murder* (London: 1983), pp. 116 f. On the other hand, American-Jewish newspaper publisher Joseph Pulitzer did not favor such trials. In May 1945 he urged that 1.5 million leading Germans should be simply be summarily shot. *The New York Times*, May 23, 1945, p. 11.

11. Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (IHR, 1983), pp. 27-30, 100. Sources cited: Ted Berkman, *Cast a Giant Shadow* (1962); "War Crimes" article written by Marcus in *Britannica Book of the Year, 1947*, pp. 819-21; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 11, p. 945; *Saturday Evening Post*, Dec. 4, 1948, p. 179. See also: R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg* (1983), p. 11.
12. Hal Foust, "Nazi Trial Judge Rips 'Injustice'," *Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 23, 1948, pp. 1, 2.
13. Alpheus T. Mason, *Harlan Fiske Stone: Pillar of the Law* (New York: Viking, 1956), p. 716.
14. *Congressional Record - Appendix*, Vol. 95, Sec. 14, (June 15, 1949), p. A 3741.
15. *Congressional Record - House*, Vol. 93, Sec. 9, (Nov. 28, 1947), p. 10938. Also quoted in: W. Bosch, *Judgment on Nuremberg* (1970), p. 83.
16. Delivered at Kenyon College, Ohio, Oct. 5, 1946. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Nov. 1, 1946, p. 47. Text also published in: Jay W. Baird, ed., *From Nuremberg to My Lai* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972), pp. 107-113. See also: William Bosch, *Judgment on Nuremberg* (1970), pp. 73-81. Taft's devotion to principle during a time of widespread anti-German hysteria impressed John F. Kennedy, who praised the Ohio senator's stand in his award-winning best seller, *Profiles in Courage*.
17. M. R. Konvitz, "Will Nuremberg Serve Justice?," *Commentary*, January 1946 (Vol. I, No. 3), p. 11.
18. H. K. Thompson and H. Strutz, eds., *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Reappraisal* (IHR, 1983), p. 196.
19. H. K. Thompson and H. Strutz, eds., *Doenitz at Nuremberg* (1983), pp. 194-195. Similarly, British Admiral Sir Barry Domville, former Director of British Naval Intelligence and President of the Royal Naval College, stated: "Anybody who was a victim of the iniquitous Nuremberg Trials has my deep sympathy. I am only surprised that so many reputable men in both our countries were found willing to take part in such a travesty of justice . . . The Nuremberg Trials leave an indelible blot upon the reputations of all countries which took part in them." (H. K. Thompson and H. Strutz, eds., *Doenitz at Nuremberg*, p. 164.)
20. Henry Fairlie, "How the Good War Went Bad," *The New Republic*, May 20, 1985, pp. 18 ff.
21. Henry L. Stimson, who had served as US Secretary of War, 1940-1945, wrote in 1947: ". . . In the judgment of Nuremberg there is

affirmed the central principle of peace . . . A standard has been raised to which Americans, at least, must repair; for it is only as this standard is accepted, supported and enforced that we can move onward to a world of law and peace." Quoted in: Jay W. Baird, ed., *From Nuremberg to My Lai* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972), p. 125. Nuremberg Tribunal defendant Alfred Rosenberg declared: "I frankly welcome the idea that a crime of genocide is to be outlawed by international agreement and placed under the severest penalties . . ." International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the Major War Criminals* . . . ("blue series"), IMT, vol. 22, p. 382.

22. W. Bosch, *Judgment on Nuremberg* (1970), p. 189.
23. Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (1979), pp. 69, 302 (n. 23). See also: James McMillan, *Five Men at Nuremberg* (London: 1985), pp. 412-413.
24. See: Ulrich Stern, ed., *Die wahren Schuldigen am zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: 1990).
25. Jackson letter to Truman, Oct. 12, 1945. State Department files. Quoted in: R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg* (1983), p. 68.
26. Constantine FitzGibbon, *Denazification* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1969), pp. 71-72.
27. "Behind the scenes at Nuremberg," *Daily Telegraph* (London), Jan. 27, 1977, p. 19.; J. McMillan, *Five Men at Nuremberg* (1985), pp. 245, 414.
28. See: Richard H. Minear, *Victor's Justice: The Tokyo War Crimes Trial* (Tokyo: C. Tuttle, 1984), p. 57.
29. M. Vozlenski, *Der Spiegel*, Oct. 6, 1986 (No. 41), pp. 55 ff.
30. George F. Kennan, *Memoirs 1925-1950* (Boston: Little Brown, 1967), pp. 175, 261.
31. "The Nuremberg Judgment," editorial, *The Economist* (London), Oct. 5, 1946, p. 532.; See also: J. McMillan, *Five Men at Nuremberg*, pp. 67, 173-174, 380, 414 f.
32. Marguerite Higgins, "Russian Quotes Allied Sanction of Deportations," *New York Herald Tribune*, Nov. 14, 1946.
33. James Bacque, *Other Losses* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1989). See especially pp. 26-28.
34. Quoted in: Wolf R. Hess, *My Father Rudolf Hess* (London: 1986), pp. 392 f.

35. *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* ("red series"), NC&A, vol. 1, p. vi (preface); William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (New York: 1960), pp. ix, x.
36. Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (New York: Behrman, 1976), pp. 2-3.; *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* ("red series"), NC&A, vol. 1, p. vi. See also: C. Mattogno, "Myth," *Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1988, pp. 133-134.; John Mendelsohn, "The Holocaust: Records in the National Archives . . .," *Prologue* (Washington, DC: National Archives), Spring 1984, pp. 23 ff. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985), pp. 1224-27.
37. Alfred M. de Zayas, *The Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau* (Lincoln: 1990), pp. 238 f.
38. Leon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate* (New York: Holocaust Library, 1979), p. 108.; Princeton University history professor Arno Mayer wrote that "authentic documents about the making, transmission, and implementation of the extermination policy" are "rare." Arno J. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* (New York: 1989), p. 363.
39. W. Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (1979), pp. 97, 98, 99, 272, 273-274, 331 (n. 50); Plea by attorney Dr. Alfred Seidl in: Udo Walendy, ed., *Auschwitz im IG-Farben Prozess* (Vlotho: 1981), pp. 380, 383.; Hildegard Springer (Hans Fritzsche), *Das Schwert auf der Waage* (Heidelberg: K. Vowinckel, 1953), p. 112.; John Mendelsohn, "Trial by Document," *Prologue* (Washington, DC: National Archives), Winter 1975, esp. pp. 230-231.; Richard Pemsel, *Hitler* (Tübingen: 1986), pp. 87-89, 104.; IMT defense attorney Dr. H. Pelckmann protested against the "disappearance" of important defense documents: International Military Tribunal "blue series," vol. 21 (pp. 383-409 of German-language IMG edition). Quoted in: U. Walendy, ed., "Lügen um Heinrich Himmler," II. Teil, *Historische Tatsachen* Nr. 47 (Vlotho: 1991), p. 32.; On the protests of defense attorneys about some of these difficulties, see: Carlos Porter, *Made in Russia: The Holocaust* (1988), pp. 242-244, 248, 249, 252-256.
40. Karl Hoeffkes, ed., *Deutsch-sowjetische Geheimverbindungen* (1988), pp. 28-30.; R. Pemsel, *Hitler* (Tübingen: 1986), p. 104.
41. W. Maser, *Nuremberg* (1979), p. 199.
42. *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* ("red series"), NC&A, Vol. 1, p. 9.; Jay W. Baird, ed., *From Nuremberg to My Lai* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972), pp. 16-17.
43. Documents 159-L (USA-222) and PS-3311 (USA-293). Published in: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 37, p. 621, and, IMT, vol. 32, pp. 153-158.

44. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 1, p. 54.; IMT, vol. 7, pp. 425-427.; A. de Zayas, *Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau* (1990), pp. 228-239.; J. McMillan, *Five Men at Nuremberg*, pp. 51, 67, 222.; R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg*, pp. 66-67, 452-455.; Document USSR-54 is published in IMT ("blue series"), vol. 39, pp. 290-332.; See also: C. Porter, *Made in Russia: The Holocaust* (1988), pp. 100-120, 229, 230, 234-235.; R. Faurisson, "Katyn a Nuremberg," *Revue d'Histoire Révisionniste*, No. 2, Aug.-Oct. 1990, pp. 138 ff.
45. *New York Times*, April 13 and 14, 1990.
46. Dorothy Rabinowitz, *About the Holocaust* (New York: 1979), p. 6.; A. Suzman and D. Diamond, *Six Million Did Die* (Johannesburg: 1978), pp. 33, 34, 35.
47. Internationally respected historian Werner Maser has noted "the existence of forged documents" at Nuremberg. W. Maser, *Nuremberg*, p. 98.; See also: Ingrid Weckert, *Feuerzeichen* (Tübingen: 1981), pp. 151, 155, 171.; After the war, Eichmann also expressed the view that some purported documents are fraudulent. See: Rudolf Aschenauer, ed., *Ich, Adolf Eichmann* (1980), p. 153.
48. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 22, pp. 148 f.; See: C. Porter, *Made in Russia* (1988), pp. 269-270, 410-411.; Defendant Baldur von Schirach, wartime *Gauleiter* of Vienna, complained that another prosecution document was fraudulent: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 14, p. 451.; Defendant Göring and attorney Stahmer objected to another document: IMT, vol. 9, pp. 610 f.
49. M. Weber, "Simon Wiesenthal," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1989-1990, p. 443.
50. Cited or quoted in: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 7, pp. 442-443; vol. 14, pp. 518-519; vol. 19, pp. 256-259, 437-438, 494-495, 498; vol. 24, p. 182.
51. W. Malanowski, *Der Spiegel*, Sept. 7, 1985, pp. 92 ff.; M. Weber, "Swiss Historian Exposes . . .," *Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1983 (Vol. 4, No. 3), pp. 378-380.; H. W. Koch, ed., *Aspects of the Third Reich* (New York: St. Martin's, 1985), pp. 13 f.; "Antideutscher Schwindel-Verleger gestorben," *D. National-Zeitung* (Munich), Jan. 24, 1992, p. 9.
52. Dankwart Kluge, *Das Hossbach - 'Protokoll'* (1980).; M. Weber, *Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1983 (Vol. 4, No. 3), pp. 372 ff.; A.J.P. Taylor, *An Old Man's Diary* (London: 1984), p. 154. (Taylor added: "No evidence that Hitler planned aggressive war has ever been produced . . . [This] revision upsets the entire verdict of the Nuremberg Tribunal, which is still solemnly quoted as justification of the Allied war against Germany.").

53. Heath W. Lowry, "The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians," *Political Communication and Persuasion*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1985. Reprinted in: *Armenian Allegations: Myth and Reality* (Washington, DC: 1986), pp. 119-132.; See also the letters by Dr. Robert John in the *New York Times*, June 8 and July 6, 1985.
54. L. Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (1976), p. 10.; In her 1981 book, *The Holocaust and the Historians* (pp. 100-101), Dawidowicz wrote of the case of Polish-Jewish historian Ber(nard) Mark, Director of the Jewish Historical Institute of Warsaw and author of several Holocaust books. She charged that he had falsified Holocaust sources. Another Jewish historian, Michel Borwicz, similarly charged in 1962 that Ber Mark was a falsifier ("transformer") of documents. See: M. Borwicz, *Revue d'Histoire de la Deuxieme Guerre Mondiale* (Paris), No. 45, Jan. 1962, p. 93.
55. Raul Hilberg has noted that Martin Gilbert's 1985 book, *The Holocaust*, relies heavily on such questionable testimony. See interview with Hilberg in: "Recording the Holocaust," *Jerusalem Post International Edition*, week ending June 28, 1986, pp. 8, 9.; On the general unreliability of "witness testimony," see *Witness for the Defense* (by E. Loftus & K. Ketcham), reviewed by John Cobden in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 238-249.
56. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (London: Sphere books, pb., 1971), p. 581.
57. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz : Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), p. 23.
58. H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (New York: Compass/Viking, 1965), p. 224.
59. L. Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (1976), p. 11.; Jewish Holocaust historian Gitta Sereny has complained about those who have simply "invented Holocaust events." See: G. Sereny, *New Statesman* (London), July 17, 1981, p. 17.
60. G. Tillion, "Le Systeme concentrationnaire allemand," *Revue de l'histoire de la Deuxieme Guerre mondiale*, July 1954. (Quoted in: *IHR Newsletter*, No. 59, July 1988, pp. 5, 6.)
61. *Jewish Social Studies* (New York: Conference on Jewish Relations), Jan. 1950, Vol. 12, pp. 65-66.
62. B. Amouyal, "Doubts over evidence of camp survivors," *Jerusalem Post* (Israel), August 17, 1986, p. 1.; Similarly, many American imposters have falsely but convincingly claimed heroic participation in pitched battles or involvement in horrific atrocities during the Vietnam war. See: "Fighting Lies for Vietnam: Phony Soldiers," *The*

- Washington Times*, June 4, 1990, pp. D1, D5.; "Imitation Vietnam Syndrome," *Baltimore Sun*, March 20, 1988, pp. 1E, 5E.
63. R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg*, p. 454.; A. de Zayas, *Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau* (1990), pp. 230-235.
64. Sworn and notarized statement by Pinter, Feb. 9, 1960. Facsimile in: Erich Kern, ed., *Verheimlichte Dokumente* (Munich: 1988), p. 429.; Note also Pinter report in *Der Weg*, No. 8, 1954, reprinted in: U. Walendy, ed., "Politikriminologie," *Historische Tatsachen* Nr. 43 (Vlotho: 1990), pp. 20 ff.
65. Freda Uteley, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), p. 195.
66. Written declaration of A. Gross, in: Erich Kern, *Meineid gegen Deutschland* (1971), p. 264.
67. J. Halow, "Innocent at Dachau," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1989-1990, pp. 459-483. ; Halow deals with this entire issue in greater detail in his book, *Innocent at Dachau*, to be published by the IHR.
- In 1948 German bishop Dr. Johannes Neuhausler, who been interned for several years in the Sachsenhausen and Dachau camps during the war, condemned the use of such "professional witnesses" in American run trials, and cited a particularly blatant example. *Münchener Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, Nov. 7, 1948. Quoted in: *D. National-Zeitung* (Munich), Dec. 13, 1985, p. 6.
68. "Major Poullada's Final Defense Plea in the Nordhausen-Dora Concentration Camp Case," *Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 1), pp. 81-119.
69. Letter by former OSI director Walter J. Rockler, *National Law Journal*, Dec. 8, 1980, p. 14.; See also: B. Amouyal, "Treblinka witnesses were discredited," *Jerusalem Post - International Edition*, Week ending April 5, 1986.
70. "Nazi Hunter Looks for Witnesses, Finds Hucksters," *Jewish Press* (Brooklyn, NY), Dec. 4, 1981, p. 2.
71. "The Nazi Who Never Was," *The Washington Post*, May 10, 1981, pp. B5, B8.; Michael Arndt, "The Wrong Man," *Sunday, The Chicago Tribune Magazine*, Dec. 2, 1984, pp. 15- 35.; Kirk Makin, "Media distorted . . .," *The Globe and Mail* (Toronto), Feb. 15, 1985, pp. M1, M3.
72. Emil Lachout, an Austrian officer who served with the postwar Allied War Crimes Commission, testified under oath in a 1988 court case that German officials had been tortured to produce fraudulent statements about alleged killings of Jews in German camp gas

chambers. He also provided what he said was a copy of a 1948 document confirming this. See: Robert Lenski, *Holocaust on Trial* (1990), pp. 274, 278.; Müller circular notice, Oct. 1, 1948, published in: *Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988, pp. 117-124.

73. Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death* (England: 1983), pp. 235-239.; R. Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf Höss," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-1987, pp. 389-403.
74. Höss statement, April 5, 1946. Document 3868-PS (USA-819).; Höss statement, May 20, 1946. Document NI-034.; Höss testimony at the Nuremberg Tribunal, published in: IMT ("blue series"), vol. vol. 33, pp. 275-279 ; NC&A ("red series"), vol. 6, pp. 787-790.
75. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago* I-II (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 112 (n. 15).
76. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 15, pp. 64-68.
77. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 17, p. 214.; K. Heiden, "Why They Confess," *Life* magazine, June 20, 1949, pp. 92 ff. (During the trial Fritzsche recanted his forced statement.)
78. W. Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (1979), pp. 51-52, 47, 60.; K. Stimely, "The Torture of Julius Streicher," *Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984, pp. 106-119.; "Streicher Case Opens," *The Times* (London), April 27, 1946, p. 3.; Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death* (England: 1983), pp. 238-239.; Montgomery Belton, *Victor's Justice* (Regnery, 1949), p. 90.
79. Montgomery Belton, *Victor's Justice* (1949), pp. 80-81. Cited in: A. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, p. 189.
80. Nuremberg "Case 8" presiding judge Wyatt took note of the charges of torture. "During the course of the trial," the American jurist declared, "several witnesses, including some defendants, who made affidavits that were offered as evidence by the prosecution, testified that they were threatened, and that duress of a very improper nature was practiced by an interrogator." Nuremberg Military Tribunals, *Trials of the War Criminals . . .* ("green series,"/ Washington, DC: 1949-1953), NMT, vol. 15, p. 879.
81. Letter by Lutz Schwerin von Krosigk written in Essen, April 15, 1975, shortly before his death. Published in: *Die Bauernschaft* (Mohrkirch), April 1981, pp. 34-35.; Freda Utey, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), p. 172.; T. Bower, *Blind Eye to Murder* (1983), p. 314.; "US Ankläger Kempner schwer belastet," *Deutsche Wochen-Zeitung*, Feb. 23, 1973. Cited in: Austin App, *No Time for Silence* (IHR, 1987), p. 17.

82. John Toland, *Adolf Hitler* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), p. 774.; Karlheinz Pintsch, an adjutant of Hitler's deputy Rudolf Hess, was tortured for months by the Soviet secret police in Moscow in an effort to force him to sign a statement designed to incriminate Hess. In spite of his cruel treatment, Pintsch never gave in. Wolf R. Hess, *My Father Rudolf Hess* (London: 1986), p. 62.
83. Milch sworn statement, April 9, 1947. Quoted in: E. Kern, ed., *Verheimlichte Dokumente* (1988), p. 400.
84. R. Wistrich, *Who's Who in Nazi Germany* (New York: Bonanza, 1984), p. 210.
85. On Dachau trial abuses see: Freda Utley, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), pp. 185-200.; Judge Edward L. van Roden, "American Atrocities in Germany," *The Progressive*, Feb. 1949, pp. 21-22. Reprinted in: *The Congressional Record - Appendix*, Vol. 95, Sec. 12, (March 10, 1949), pp. A1365-66.; Dachau trial defense attorney Lt. Col. Willis M. Everett, Jr., reviewed prosecution methods in a petition submitted to the Supreme Court. Complete text in: *The Congressional Record - Senate*, Vol. 95, Sec. 2, (March 10, 1949), pp. 2159-2165. Important excerpts were published in: *The Congressional Record - Appendix*, Vol. 95, Sec. 13, (April 5, 1949), pp. A-2065-67. Also useful are: Montgomery Beligion, *Victor's Justice* (Regnery, 1949).; Reginald T. Paget, *Manstein: His Campaigns and His Trial* (London: 1951).
86. J. Halow, "Innocent at Dachau," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1989-90, p. 459.; See also: T. Bower, *Blind Eye to Murder*, pp. 304, 310, 313.
87. J. Halow, "Innocent at Dachau," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1989-90 (Vol. 9, No. 4), pp. 452-483. Note especially pp. 478-482 (G. Petrat statement of Sept. 10, 1948).
88. "Korean War," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1973 edition, Vol. 13, p. 474.; Phillip Knightley, *The First Casualty* (1975), p. 355.
89. Legal brief for Oswald Pohl ("Grundzüge des Systems der Deutschen Konzentrationslager und Bemerkungen zum Urteil des Militärtribunals II gegen Oswald Pohl"), pp. 23-27. Compiled (in 1948?) by defense attorney Dr. Alfred Seidl. Copy provided to the author in 1990 by the defendant's grandson, Fritjof Pohl.; W. Maser, *Nuremberg* (1979), p. 100.; See also Oswald Pohl's written statement of June 1, 1948, cited below.
90. Written statement by Pohl, June 1, 1948. *Deutsche Hochschullehrerzeitung* (Tübingen), Nr. 1/2, 1963, pp. 21-26. Reprinted in: U. Walendy, ed., "Lügen um Heinrich Himmler, II. Teil," *Historische Tatsachen* Nr. 47 (Vloth: 1991), pp. 35-40.; Although I have not been able to obtain a copy of the original text of Pohl's 1948 statement, its

essential accuracy can be confirmed by comparing it with the text of the legal brief (cited above) compiled by his attorney, Dr. Siedl. Fritjof Pohl (Oswald Pohl's grandson) and Wigbert Grabert (son of the editor-publisher of the *Deutsche Hochschullehrerzeitung*) have also confirmed the authenticity of Pohl's 1948 statement.

91. W. Maser, *Nuremberg* (New York: 1979), p. 100.
92. W. Maser, *Nuremberg*, p. 175.
93. Nuremberg Military Tribunal, NMT ("green series"), Vol. 5, p. 934.
94. R. Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews* (1985), p. 1067.; R. Faurisson, "Response," *Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1986, p. 40.; J. Heydecker and J. Leeb, *Der Nürnberger Prozess* (Cologne: 1958), pp. 489 ff. Cited in: W. Stäglich, *Der Auschwitz-Mythos* (1979), p. 104.; See also: R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg*, p. 514.
According to a recent editorial in the *San Francisco Examiner* ("Holocaust disbelievers," March 30, 1992), "Not a single war criminal tried at Nuremberg offered as a defense, 'It didn't happen', they said they were "only following orders."
95. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 9, pp. 611, 612, 619.; Wm. L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (New York: 1960), p. 964, footnote.; During a conversation in early 1946 with his defense attorney, Göring said: "I really knew nothing about the mass murder of Jews." Quoted by a young lawyer who was an assistant to Göring's defense attorney, Dr. Stahmer, in: *Gespräche mit Hermann Göring während des Nürnberger Prozesses*, Teil I (W. Germany: 1950 and reprint. no date, no place), p. 15. (Conversation on Jan. 12, 1946).; See also: David Irving, *Göring* (New York: 1989), p. 469.
96. Hans Fritzsche (H. Springer), *The Sword in the Scales* (London: A. Wingate, 1953), pp. 144-145. German edition: *Das Schwert auf der Waage* (Heidelberg: K. Vowinckel, 1953), p. 118.
97. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 15, pp. 332-333. Also quoted in: J. McMillan, *Five Men at Nuremberg*, pp. 239-240.;
See also the similar testimonies of: Radio commentator and propaganda ministry official Hans Fritzsche: A. de Zayas, *Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau* (1990), p. 111.; Economics minister Walter Funk: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 22, pp. 387 f.; Minister for the occupied Soviet territories Alfred Rosenberg: IMT, vol. 22, p. 382.; Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop: R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg*, p. 54.; Foreign Office State Secretary Ernst von Weizsäcker: NMT, vol. 13, pp. 437, 443, 445.; Note also statements by officials Stuckart, Klopfer, Leibbrandt, and Kritzinger, in: Robert Kempner, *Eichmann und Komplizen* (Zurich: 1961), pp. 151-160.; Documents PL-54 and PL-64 in: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 42, pp. 348, 385.

98. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 12, pp. 17-19.; See also the testimony of Joseph Bühler, who worked closely with Frank for many years: IMT, vol. 12, pp. 64, 69, 70.; Note also: R. Faurisson, "Challenge," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1984, pp. 298 f.
99. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 12, p. 13. German text quoted in: Richard Pemsel, *Hitler* (Tübingen: 1986), p. 317.
100. Final sentence quoted by British prosecutor Shawcross at Nuremberg: IMT ("blue series"), vol. 19, p. 433, and in: W. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (1960), p. vii.; Entire passage quoted in: R. Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews* (1985), p. 1055.; R. Conot, *Justice at Nuremberg*, p. 380.
101. IMT ("blue series"), vol. 22, p. 385. German text quoted in: R. Pemsel, *Hitler* (1986), p. 129.; Postwar criminal mistreatment of the Germans by the Allies is dealt with in *Gruesome Harvest* by Ralph F. Keeling, and in *Nemesis at Potsdam* by Alfred de Zayas.
102. *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* ("red series"), Suppl. vol. B, pp. 1306-1307, 1299. See also: IMT, vol. 22, pp. 378-379.; Hans Fritzsche (H. Springer), *The Sword in the Scales* (London: Wingate, 1953), pp. 182-187.
103. Matthias Schmidt, *Albert Speer: The End of a Myth* (New York: 1985), pp. 194-195. See also: M. Weber, "Albert Speer and the Holocaust," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1984, p. 439.; M. Weber, "Legal Declaration," *Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1982, pp. 42-43.; A. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 179-180.; Henry A. Turner, Jr., "The Nazi Who Made a Comeback," *The New York Times Book Review*, March 3, 1985, pp. 9-10.
104. NMT ("green series"), vol. 13, pp. 421, 430.; See also Lammers' testimony in IMT ("blue series"), vol. 11, pp. 53, 115-116.; Lammers' career and the history of the Reich Chancellery during the Third Reich is dealt with in: Georg Franz-Willing, *Der Reichskanzlei: 1933-1945* (Tübingen: 1984).
105. On the Moscow show trials, see: Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990), pp. 83-132, 468.; Joseph E. Davies, *Mission To Moscow* (New York: Pocket Books, 1943), pp. 38-39.; Edward Crankshaw, ed., *Khrushchev Remembers* (Boston: 1970), pp. 352-353.
106. H. Fritzsche, *Es sprach Hans Fritzsche*, p. 144. Quoted in: R. Pemsel, *Hitler* (1986), p. 167.
107. See Wilhelm Staeglich's useful analysis of the trial, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (IHR, 1990), especially chapter four. (German-language edition: *Der Auschwitz-Mythos*, 1979).; See also: Konnilyn Feig, *Hitler's Death Camps* (New York: 1981), p. 365.

108. Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz* (New York: Praeger, 1966), pp. 8-26, 416-417. Quoted in: A. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 187-188.
109. "Belastende Aussage angeblich unter Alkohol," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, July 7, 1964, p. 7.; "Der Auschwitz-Prozess," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 7, 1964, p. 6.; "Lied About Auschwitz," *Miami Herald* (UPI dispatch), July 7, 1964, p. 15-A or 4-D, depending on edition.
110. Cited by A. Butz in: "Perspective in the 'Holocaust' Controversy," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1982, p. 374, and in the 1983 US edition of *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, p. 338.; K. Feig reports in *Hitler's Death Camps* (1981), p. 365, that *all* of the defendants were set free on appeal.

NEW FROM THE INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

PEARL HARBOR


The Story of the Secret War

“Still the best about the December 7, 1941 Pearl Harbor attack, despite a formidable volume of subsequent writing by many others on the subject.”

—JAMES J. MARTIN

With all the elements at hand, the reader has the ingredients of a mystery. There are victims—3,000 of them in the Pearl Harbor attack. There are a variety of clues . . . a multitude of false leads . . . numerous possible motives. Innumerable obstructions are put in the way of the discovery of truth. Many of the characters betray guilty knowledge.

From the Foreword to Pearl Harbor—The Story of the Secret War



Did Morgenstern Unravel the Mystery of Pearl Harbor? Experts Comment:

Brilliant and impressive

—Harry Elmer Barnes

*A permanent contribution to the quest
for an understanding of the tragedy*

—Charles A. Beard

*Discloses with great ability the lessons
of secret diplomacy and national
betrayal* —Charles C. Tansill

*Mr. Morgenstern is to be
congratulated on marshalling the
available facts of this tragedy in such
a manner as to make it clear to every
reader where the responsibility lies*

—Adm. H.E. Yarnell

ISBN 0-939484-38-2

Softcover • 425 pp • \$14.95

From Institute for Historical Review

REVIEW

Jewish Writer Grapples With Ethical Dilemma of the Holocaust and Zionism

BEYOND INNOCENCE AND REDEMPTION: Confronting the Holocaust and Israeli Power, by Marc H. Ellis. New York: Harper & Row (Harper Collins), 1990. Softcover. 205 pages. Bibliography. Endnotes. Index. \$13.00. ISBN: 0 06 062215 6.

Reviewed by Robert Countess

Many years before the recent, dramatic collapse of the Soviet Union, the Communist ideology on which it was based had already proven itself to be an obvious failure. Even after the Marxist-Leninist ideology had clearly shown itself unable to live up to its lofty promises, the Soviet regime was still able to hobble along for several decades.

Something very similar appears to be happening in the case of Israel and its operating ideology, Zionism.

Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism, and other prominent Zionist thinkers believed that Jewish nationalism (Zionism) would transform the Jews into a “normal” people. For centuries, Herzl argued, Jews had lived as a minority people among non-Jewish host populations. This situation inevitably gave rise to and encouraged anti-Jewish sentiment (“anti-Semitism”). Zionism would change all that, Herzl insisted. When Jews live as “normal” people in a country of their own, the basis for anti-Semitism would finally disappear.

It hasn't worked out that way. The great majority of Jews around the world continue to live outside Israel as a highly self-conscious minority among non-Jews. Even in Israel itself, many Jews—perhaps a majority—would prefer to live elsewhere.

Far from being the “normal” country envisioned by Zionist visionaries like Herzl, Israel depends for its very existence on massive transfusions of hard cash from American taxpayers. To insure that the generous flow of money never stops, Jews outside of Israel are obliged to lobby and agitate tirelessly on behalf of “their” country. Not surprisingly, this process

provides a basis (or pretext) for the ancient charge of “dual loyalty.”

For many centuries, the “glue” that has held together the widely dispersed Jewish people has been traditional religious Judaism. During this past century, though—and especially in the wake of the traumatic Holocaust cataclysm of the Second World War and the founding of the State of Israel in 1948—all that has changed.

As Marc Ellis, a bright young Jewish scholar, persuasively argues in this insightful and provocative book, a pseudo-religious mythos centered upon the Holocaust and an increasingly brutal and suppressive Israel state have now firmly replaced the Jewish religion as the binding force that unites Jews everywhere.

This new situation, Ellis goes on to emphasize, has had the most profound consequences for the Jewish people, and for the perpetually difficult relationship between Jews and non-Jews.

Ellis, who is Director of the Justice and Peace Program at the Catholic Maryknoll College in New York, unflinchingly tries to come to terms with the implications of the grim reality of Israel, and with the Holocaust religion that is used to justify the Zionist state and excuse its increasingly inhumane policies.

In this revisionist, and even iconoclastic, work, Ellis also criticizes some of the most important religious presuppositions that “Holocaust theologians” bring with them when they weave historical events into their religious dogmas.

While readers not well-grounded in religion and philosophy may find this book somewhat difficult, thoughtful readers will appreciate its incisive critique and irenic spirit.

Not long ago, British historian David Irving boldly predicted that Israel would not survive another ten years, and that the world would witness a mass emigration of Jews back to Europe. To the casual observer, such a prediction may seem fantastic, if not absurd. After all, Israel is one of the most important military powers in the world today, armed even with devastating nuclear weapons. Support from diaspora Jews (that is, outside of Israel), particularly in the United States, remains powerful. Prodded by the mighty Israel-first lobby, the American government continues to give billions of taxpayer dollars annually to the Jewish state. These are hardly the traits of a country with less than ten years to live.

And yet, major cracks in the Israeli edifice can no longer be covered up. In spite of the loud and ceaseless expressions of verbal support for Zionism and Israel, few Jews around the world are willing to actually move to Israel and live there. Instead, they prefer to encourage others to do so. Even many Israeli Jews—perhaps even a majority—would, if given the opportunity, promptly leave the country and move to United States or Europe. Envisioned as a bastion of security, Jews in Israel are actually less secure than Jews living almost anywhere else.

Like Irving, the author of this book is pessimistic about Israel's future. Its days are numbered, Ellis believes, unless Israelis and Jews make radical changes very soon (something that he does not regard as likely).

Ellis focuses here on what he regards as the fatal moral bankruptcy of present-day Israel and Zionism. Committed to the heritage of humanistic Judaism, Professor Ellis feels obliged to condemn Israeli violations of universal principles of justice, particularly in its often brutal treatment of the native Palestinian people. In his view, the massive injustice of Israel's seemingly endless maltreatment of Palestinians is squandering the moral authority that is essential for the long-term survival of the Jewish state.

Last February 29th, this reviewer participated with Ellis at a discussion in Birmingham, Alabama, that included Jews, Muslims and Christians (among them Palestinians). I was impressed, even spellbound, as Ellis thoughtfully and persuasively presented his views. Authoritatively citing Jewish religious and historical sources, he argued that Israel's very existence is inextricably bound up with its treatment of the Palestinians.

As he puts it in *Beyond Innocence and Redemption* (p. 157):

The Palestinians have been done a great historical wrong by the Jewish people. The only way forward, it seems, is a solidarity with the Palestinian people that is at the same time confessional and political. Could we say that the task of Jewish theology is to lay the groundwork for solidarity with the Palestinian people and that any theology that does not pose that as the central question is a theology that legitimates torture and murder? To carry out this task means first of all that Jewish self-perception needs to be radically altered and the framework of discussion drastically reoriented . . . A new Jewish self-understanding needs to be created.

This is not likely to take place, Ellis argues, because [Jewish] “mainstream theologians” and “Holocaust theologians . . . pretend the Palestinians do not exist.” He is therefore pessimistic about the future of the Zionist state. “Israel is a dream that cannot last,” he concludes, a verdict that could almost serve as a subtitle for this book. (pp. 158, 162)

Defining the Problem

As Ellis explains in the introduction, this book is above all “a call to Jewish moral and religious thinkers” to “speak before it is too late.” As he points out, not a single major Jewish theologian has come to grips with the foreboding realities of Israel and Zionism that are now obvious to most of the rest of the world. And unless Jews quickly come to grips with these realities, which have the most profound moral implications, Ellis believes that the Zionist state is doomed. These realities are (p. xv):

What Jews have done to the Palestinians since the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 is wrong.

In the process of conquering and displacing the Palestinian people, Jews have done what has been done to us over two millennia.

In this process Jews have become almost everything we loathe about our oppressors.

It is only in the confrontation with state power in Israel that Jews can move beyond being victim or oppressor.

The movement beyond victimization and oppression can only come through a solidarity with those whom we as Jews have displaced—the Palestinian people.

Implicit in this call, Ellis goes on, is a deeper metaphysical-religious question: “What is the essential mission of the Jewish people?” Is it simply to “build Israel as an exclusive Jewish state”?

Because of the well-documented record of mistreatment—including torture and murder—of the Palestinian people, Ellis argues, Jews can no longer “pretend to an innocence,” and warns that “the day of reckoning will come.” The only way to minimize, delay, “or better” avoid that day, he argues, is through a soul-searching, confessional act of Israeli redemption.

Ellis takes his iconoclastic examination even further by forthrightly questioning “still another almost sacred assumption, that of the relationship of the Holocaust to the state of Israel.” Since Zionism predated the Nazi era by some four decades, the grand assumption on the part of many historical persons that Israel’s existence was conditional on the catastrophe of the Holocaust must be called into question. (p. 42)

Ellis cites several thoughtful Jews who clearly foresaw the very serious problems inherent in narrow Zionist nationalism and a Zionist-Jewish takeover of Palestine.

Hannah Arendt, for one, opposed the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine (although she supported a “Jewish homeland” there, in the spirit of the Balfour Declaration). A Jewish state, she believed, would be a degeneration into a warlike state led by political terrorists. For Arendt, the building of a Jewish homeland “must never be sacrificed to the pseudo-sovereignty of a Jewish state.” (pp. 52 f.)

Jewish writers like Arendt, Ellis maintains, were “committed and generous” in their analysis. Their fear that an Israeli state would become another Jewish ghetto—rather than a final renunciation of the ghetto—has been borne out by events. Jewish spokesmen like Fackenheim, Wiesel, and Greenberg have lost, at least publicly, the ability to enunciate dissenting ideas about the State of Israel.

“A Tradition of Dissent”

Ellis echoes the concerns voiced over the years by other perceptive Jewish thinkers who have warned—so far with very little success—about the portent of disaster inherent in Zionist-Israeli policies. Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, for example, warned in 1961 that Israel’s racist policies were suicidal: “Only an internal revolution can have the power to heal our people of their murderous sickness of causeless hatred.”

Jewish author Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht wrote that “Judaism survived centuries of persecution without a state; it must now learn to survive despite a state.” (p. 56.) Howard Greenstein praised liberal Reform Judaism for its ecumenical stance wherein Jews could be at home anywhere in the world. He viewed Zionism as the antithesis of this movement. Rabbi Elmer Berger and a handful of others diligently

carried on in this same spirit. By the 1950s, though, this current of anti-Zionist dissent in Reform Judaism had been all but drowned out in the almost universal Jewish enthusiasm for Zionism.

Ellis devotes considerable attention to the shameful record of Zionist treatment of the Palestinians, who were dispossessed to make way for Israel. This grim record must be acknowledged and confronted, Ellis warns. If it is ignored, Jews stand to lose their moral bearings.

Ellis cites the words of the courageous William Zuckerman, who condemned the Israeli transfer of Palestinians after 1948. He wrote: "In what way does an 'Arab-rein' [Zionist] state differ from a 'Juden-rein' [German] state?" In April 1948, when Zionist terrorists massacred more than 200 Palestinians in the village of Deir Yassin, the Jewish government-to-be condemned the slaughter. Five years later, when the Israeli army committed a similar atrocity, the government muted the crime. (p. 63)

After the 1967 war, Noam Chomsky became a much vilified critic of Israeli aggression and atrocities. He argued that a plausible case could be made by both Jews and Palestinians for a valid claim to the disputed land. Chomsky envisioned a democratic socialist Palestine, in which both Jews and Palestinians would each benefit from a "law of return." (pp. 65 f.)

In Ellis' view, the zenith of Israeli power and the impact of Holocaust theology was the 1967-1982 period. The situation has changed quite a lot since then. Particularly in the aftermath of Israel's aggressive invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the Jewish state has lost its "innocence."

"Holocaust theology carries within itself the seeds of its own demise," Ellis argues, because it is unable to come to grips with an powerful Israel that is judged by the same moral standards we apply to every other state. (p. 73).

Albert Vorspan, senior vice president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, wrote (p. 74):

Beyond any issue in recent years, American Jews are traumatized by events in Israel. This is the downside of the euphoric mood after the Six-Day War, when we felt ten feet tall. Now, suffering under the shame and stress of pictures of Israeli brutality televised nightly, we want to crawl into a

hole. This is the price we pay for having made of Israel an icon—a surrogate faith, surrogate synagogue, surrogate God.

Ellis castigates Elie Wiesel for his silence about Israeli atrocities during the 1982 Lebanon war. When he did finally speak out, months later, he saw fit to condemn only those “vicious minds who dare to compare the state of Israel to Nazi Germany.” When Wiesel later met with some Palestinians, he seemed to be only slightly moved with compassion for their persecution. “A realistic solution—Israeli security and Palestinian self-determination—escapes him,” writes Ellis.

Ellis cites the extraordinary work of Israel Shahak, a courageous and outspoken critic of Israeli treatment of the Palestinians. After surviving internment during the war in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, Shahak made his way to Israel, where he worked for many years as a professor of chemistry at the Hebrew University, and served as chairman of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights.

Referring to his published collection of eyewitness testimony and articles in Israel’s Hebrew-language press on the brutality of the Zionist occupation (p. 85), Shahak comments:

It should be clear to everybody who reads this collection of testimonies, that the systematic use of the atrocities, which in their intensity and the special intention to humiliate *are* Nazi-like and *should* be compared to the analogous German Nazi methods, is intentional and in fact constitutes the Israeli method for ruling the Palestinians. There cannot be any doubt in my opinion that those Nazi-like methods, in whose effectiveness the stupid Israeli Army top command reposes a blind faith, have been devised by “experts,” in this case by the Israeli “Arabists” . . . together with the military psychologists. There should be also no doubt that those Nazi-like horrors can and probably will become worse, if not stopped from outside, and their use can lead to actual genocide, whether by a “transfer” [forcible mass expulsion] or by an extermination. Indeed, this is one of my reasons for assembling this collection: to show that the actual genocide of the Palestinians in the territories is now possible . . .

As Ellis notes, Israeli treatment of Palestinians includes bringing naked prisoners to open fields for “death parades,” tying suspects to electricity poles for hours and harassing

them with guard dogs, and the "almost standard" practice of beating fathers in the presence of their children. (p. 85)

"Toward an Inclusive Liturgy of Destruction"

Over the centuries, a divine Jewish liturgy has developed, one that governs the mindset of the Jewish cults. It is comprised of: 1) the sacred center (the burned Temple in 70 A.D.), 2) the sacred person (the death of martyrs), and, 3) the destruction of the holy community (the pogrom). To this has more recently been added: 4) Yom Hashoah (the Day of Holocaust). (pp. 94 f.)

Palestinians are now calling "the Jewish community to account," Ellis reports. A "Palestinian theology of Liberation" has developed among some Palestinian Christian theologians. It challenges Christians in the USA and Europe—who always seem to have bottomless compassion for Jewish persecution—to show a consistent comparable compassion for their fellow Christian Palestinians (as well as with a critical reflection of their enormous power and its consequences).

For their part, Ellis goes on, Jews must admit that they have wronged the Palestinians and that this mistreatment stems from Jewish arrogance and moral superiority. "Jews are becoming everything they protested against." (pp. 125, 129, 131, 132)

"Holocaust, Israel, and Christian Renewal"

In recent decades, Christians have joined Jews in an ecumenical partnership. At the same time, Ellis warns, Christians have thereby become "silent partners to Israeli policy and formed a barrier to an honest critique of the Middle East situation." (p. 134)

Robert McAfee Brown, a prominent American Christian theologian well-known for his marked sensitivity to Jewish concerns, focuses on the problem of Israel as seeming to be special but also to be criticized when its behavior is like that of other nations. Noting that the Torah requires hospitality to the stranger "within the gates," Brown rhetorically asks why Jews cannot show such concern for the Palestinians. (p. 145)

In their book *Wrath of Jonah* (1989), Christian writers Rosemary and Herman Ruether take on the difficult task of

commenting forthrightly about Jewish power while simultaneously trying to avoid being labeled anti-Jewish.

Ellis praises the Ruethers for their “honesty shorn of religious and political mystification.” They call “us” [Jews] to an intriguing and dangerous path, writes Ellis, because Jews and Israel need to move “beyond innocence and redemption.” He asks: “Can there be mutual conversions of Jew, Christian, and Palestinian toward one another?” (p. 155)

“Beyond Innocence and Redemption”

In the view of Jewish writer Roberta Feuerlicht, “Zionists executed the psychological coup of the century by taking Palestine from the Arabs and then pretending [that] Jews were Arab victims.” (p. 158)

Not long after the outbreak of the Palestinian uprising known as the Intifada, Israeli Army Chief of Staff Dan Shomron reportedly declared that the only ways to successfully bring an end to the uprising were “transfer, starvation or physical extermination.” (p. 156)

Ellis asks if there is a path for Jewish people that is not so self-involved as to become idolatrous: “One of the major problems that both Holocaust and neo-orthodox theology share in different ways is a self-defeating self-involvement—a preoccupation, as it were—with being authentically Jewish.” (p. 163).

Elie Wiesel may very well hold the title as the most fanatically obsessed Jewish writer. In his essay, “To Be a Jew,” Wiesel declares that “Whatever he chooses to do, the Jew becomes a spokesman for all Jews, dead and yet to be born, for all beings who live through him and inside him.” (p. 163).

Ellis writes of “the strained arguments, the twisted logic, the shrill voices” of Jews struggling with the fact that “the Holocaust is of course finished and waiting to be interpreted.”

Conclusion

Ellis concludes his book with some challenging remarks. Jews today, he writes, are “confused” about the essential issues, most of all because they accept “the myth of Israel’s weakness.” Jews must now “choose a new direction”—one that leads away from Jewish pride and power, and which

leads to confession and humility. A new “solidarity with the Palestinian people,” declares Ellis, must be at the starting point of a redemptive Jewish transformation. (p. 190)

Israel’s empowerment threatens the very foundations of Judaism, argues Ellis. (This recalls the immortal words of Proverbs 16:18: “Pride goes before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.”)

Ellis calls for open debate, strong dissent, and the relativizing of dogmatics. He anticipates the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Israel in 1998 as “a forbidding challenge.” Will it see a furthering of expansion of Jewish settlements at the expense of the basic humanity of the Palestinians? Will it see further military adventurism? He insists upon confrontation with Zionism and Holocaust theology as the only way to faithfulness in the Jewish tradition.

In the final pages of his book, Ellis writes:

The task before us to confront that which threatens the foundations of Jewishness, drawing strength from the tradition of dissent and raising up the liturgy of destruction to include both those who persecuted us and those whom Jews persecute today. This is the avenue to critical thought and activity that moves beyond innocence and redemption to recover the ethical tradition at the heart of Judaism.

“What is at stake,” he concludes, “is everything Jews have stood for, struggled for, and suffered for.”

Well and good. But in spite of pretensions to moral consistency, Ellis’ analysis is far from perfect.

While he concludes his book with a forthright and admirable call for “a confrontation with state power and the legitimizing force of that power—Zionism and Holocaust theology,” Ellis stops short of fully confronting the ideology of Zionism itself, or of asking skeptical questions about the reality of “the Holocaust.”

Ellis seems to suggest that Jews were first faced with an acute moral dilemma about Israel and Zionism in the aftermath of the 1967 war—in which Israel’s military forces quickly vanquished larger Arab armies and seized large tracts of Arab land—or perhaps in the wake of the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

But as Jewish historian Alfred Lilienthal has convincingly established (particularly in *The Zionist Connection*), the

Zionist “original sin” predates these pivotal events by many years. Long before the establishment of the Israeli state in 1948, Zionist leaders were insisting that the supranational “Jewish people” had a special destiny and mission. This dubious notion has always been fraught with great peril because it implies that Jews will not and must not be accepted as equal citizens anywhere except in a Zionist state of their own.

Moreover, Zionist contempt for the legitimate rights and concerns of native Palestinians predated the 1967 war, and even the founding of the Israeli state.

Zionism is based on the arrogant notion that people whose ancestors had not lived in the Middle East for centuries (if ever) somehow have a greater right to Palestine than the native people whose forefathers had been living there without interruption for centuries. On the face of it, this view is morally bankrupt.

By what right do Jews have to live in the Middle East at all? Does Ellis accept the notion that the Bible gives Jews the right to disposes the native Palestinians? If not, is he willing to accept that Zionist immigration to Palestine in the years between the two world wars (which the British rulers encouraged, or at least tolerated) was wrong? And just how realistic is Ellis’ proposed “democratic” Palestinian state, in which Jews and Arabs would live together as equals? In light of the failure of arguably more promising multi-ethnic experiments—such as Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union—Ellis’ vision seems far-fetched and even naive.

And just how real and significant is the Jewish “ethical tradition” that Ellis and other dissident Jewish writers like to cite? Clearly it has not been important enough to stop or even measurably slow down the full-throttle effort of world Jewry on behalf of Israel, or the campaign that Jewish historian Alfred Lilienthal has rightly called “Holocaustomania.”

All in all, though, this is a important and valuable work. Marc Ellis deserves praise for courageously raising highly important questions, for challenging sacred taboos, and for offering some very helpful—if perhaps unrealistic—solutions.

(From the Editor *continued from page 166*)

or anti-Semitic, he said that he had been told that it treats the Holocaust in a way that Jews find offensive. Managers of individual branches of the Whitcoulls chain are, however, still free to order Ellis' book for persistent customers, the store official added.

At a branch of another bookstore chain, Philip King Books, the manager said that although he knew nothing about the book, he considered the title far too provocative and therefore would not fill orders for it. The manager of yet another local area bookstore, Target Books, told our visitor that he had "read somewhere" that Ellis' book is "redactionist" (apparently meaning "revisionist"), and would not take orders for it.

The influence and power of the enemies of truth are truly amazing.

A reliable indication of the growing impact and acceptance of Revisionism—and specifically of the work of the Institute for Historical Review—are the respectful reviews of IHR books that have been appearing in reputable periodicals. In the lead item in this issue's "Historical News and Comment" section, we summarize a good selection of these reviews. Although by no means always favorable, they are nevertheless a gratifying reflection of real progress.

A skeptical view of the Holocaust story may be taboo or even illegal in some countries, but in the newly-free countries of Central and Eastern Europe a "revisionist" view of twentieth century history is virtually taken for granted. As the next item explains, the historian-president of Croatia publicly supports the revisionist view of the Six Million story.

We conclude the "Historical News and Comment" section with a short item that debunks a lurid story of Iraqi cruelty that played such an important role in solidifying political and

(continued on page 254)

Reviews of IHR Books Show Greater Acceptance of Revisionism

Books published by the Institute for Historical Review are gaining increasing acceptance, as indicated by reviews that have appeared in reputable journals and newspapers during the last several years. These respectful and often laudatory reviews show that the IHR is increasingly regarded as a legitimate publisher of serious works of history. Some highlights:

How I Survived the A-Bomb, Akira Kohchi's moving memoir, has received critical acclaim both in this country and in the author's homeland. In Japan, where the taboos against historical revisionism are not as stringent as in the United States, that country's leading English-language daily, *The Japan Times*, praised Kohchi's book as a "noteworthy" and "authentic" personal account in a lengthy review published December 11, 1990.

The Bookwatch, a monthly newsletter published by the Midwest Book Review—and distributed to about 600 community libraries in California and about 400 in Wisconsin—similarly praised Kohchi's memoir in its June 1990 issue as "a moving, gripping account." The complete text of the review:

U.N. finance officer Kohchi offers a personal, political and economic review of the atom bombing of Hiroshima as he recounts his survival of the nuclear attack, his observations of the radioactive city's recovery process, and the experiences of being a survivor and handling world reactions and explanations. A moving, gripping account.

Kohchi (Kawachi), a former United Nations finance officer, addressed the October 1990 IHR conference. His memoir was published by the IHR in 1989, and was reviewed in the Spring 1990 issue of the *IHR Journal*.

Leon Degrelle's memoir, *Campaign in Russia: The Waffen SS on the Eastern Front*, was hailed in *Our Town*, a paper serving readers in northern New Jersey (Jan. 9, 1991). Reviewer Wilfred Isepig began by empathizing with readers who might "find repugnant the idea of reading a book written by a man who voluntarily led his countrymen from Belgium into service with Hitler's 'deaths head' SS against the Communist allies of the United States and Britain during World War II." The reviewer then went on to comment:

In years of reading and writing history, this reviewer has never seen a more apt or truthful description of the horror of battle and its harvest of death than Degrelle.

As the focus of the world now turns to the Middle East and the possibilities of war there, it is well to read Degrelle so that we do not grow too fond of the possibility of war, and remember truly its horrors.

Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam will—on reading Degrelle's lines—remember their own experiences and acknowledge how truthfully Degrelle has rendered the horror, panic, brutality and heroism of battle. Politicians should read this book so they realize what they commit the young men and women of their country to when they decide for war.

The message of this "sobering book," the reviewer concluded, "should be learned by heart by everyone. . . For the truth it tells about war, read it."

Campaign in Russia received conditional praise from Matthew Gore of Western Kentucky University's history department in a review published in the *Daily News* of Bowling Green, Nov. 26, 1989. Describing the work as a "valuable first-person narrative of World War II's largest campaign," Gore added that Degrelle's "prose is quite readable." "Factually accurate in most respects," Gore went on, *Campaign In Russia* is "with reservations, [a] useful addition" to the existing literature.

US Army Brigadier General John C. Bahnsen had high praise for Degrelle's *Campaign in Russia* in a review published in the November-December 1986 issue of *Armor: The Magazine of Mobile Warfare* (published by the U.S. government's Department of the Army). Bahnsen first sets the stage with a few words about the author and the Wallonian SS combat formation:

Leon Degrelle rose from private to colonel in the Waffen SS based on his combat exploits and his brave survival on the Eastern front during World War II. This is a soldier's story with all the color and gore of the battlefield mixed extremely well . . .

Politics aside, this story tells about a legion of Belgian volunteers who fought bravely with Germany to the bitter end . . . The Wallonian Legion of volunteers, from all writings, had a sense of duty and a sense of humor in equal amounts. Based on the extraordinary losses suffered in combat, you cannot doubt their idealism.

This story covers 76 months of combat on the Eastern front by Belgian volunteers. Thousands of Belgians enlisted in the German army according to their languages: in a Flemish legion and a Wallonian legion. At first, two battalions; then, in 1943, two brigades; lastly, in 1944, two divisions, the Wallonian Division and the Flemish Langemarck Division.

Concluding his review, Bahnsen writes:

The pace of the writing is fast; the action is graphic, and a warrior can learn things from reading this book. I recommend its reading by students of the art of war. It is well worth the price.

By contrast, a review in the January-February 1987 issue of *Infantry* magazine, "a professional journal for the combined arms team," dismissed *Campaign in Russia* as a book that "leaves much to be desired." Reviewer William J. Fanning, Jr., is put off, for example, by the author's "incessant praise for a good 'lost cause'."

Degrelle's sweeping work, *Hitler: Born at Versailles* (published by the IHR in 1987), was given a respectful if not entirely laudatory appraisal in a review by Ludwig Schaefer of Carnegie Mellon University that appeared in the October 1988 *German Studies Review*, a prominent scholarly journal.

After noting that "sole German guilt [for the First World War] has long been discredited as has the purity of the shapers of the Treaty [of Versailles]," Schaefer expresses the view that "Degrelle's case, which has some basic merit, would have been better served by a more judicious balancing of the evidence."

The reviewer goes on: "This said, Degrelle's style has verve and at times a certain acid humor, notably in the first section of the book on the steps leading to the war. His comments on his childhood in German-occupied Belgium ring true, as do many of his reminiscences of people and events. . . . This general account often makes for exciting reading."

Hitler: Born at Versailles was acclaimed in the February 1988 issue of *The Bookwatch*, monthly newsletter of The Midwest Book Review for librarians and other bibliophiles:

A weighty, studious and essential (for Hitler researchers) undertaking [that] utilizes neglected documents and the author's personal relationship with Hitler to reveal facts and viewpoints not covered in previous ([and] more superficial) Hitler studies. Popular modern myths are refuted, little-known postwar atrocities by the West are exposed, and economic and political maneuvering revealed.

A critical and rather snide review of *Hitler: Born at Versailles* appeared in the Sunday Book Review section of the *Los Angeles Times*, March 13, 1988. In spite of its derisive and inaccurate disparagement of Degrelle's work as a "fascist interpretation of the history of the 20th Century," this serious critique by one of the most influential and widely read daily newspapers in the United States is itself a noteworthy indication of growing influence.

Matthew Gore, the university history teacher mentioned earlier, told readers of the Bowling Green *Daily News* (Sunday, January 27, 1991) that "*Hitler: Born at Versailles* is, perhaps, as interesting for its author as it is for its content." Leon Degrelle is "a romantic figure in a twisted right-wing sort of way. No doubt he would have been held up as a great hero had Germany been victorious in World War II."

Gore acknowledges that "Degrelle is correct to place a great deal of the blame for the Second [World] War on the First. World War I was a cataclysmic event that left the fabric of Europe tattered, with Germany absent from the great powers. The fault of the war could not be assigned just to the vanquished, yet it was."

Dr. Arthur Butz' book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, came under criticism from Matthew Gore in a review in the Bowling Green *Daily News*, October 28, 1990.

According to Gore, Butz argues that “the entire Holocaust was an elaborate propaganda tool of the Allies and Zionists.” For example, he explains, “the astonishing photographs of mass bodies resulted, Butz claims, from the typhus epidemic that swept the camps in 1945.” Without actually saying so, Gore suggests that Butz is wrong on this point. In fact, as any serious researcher can rather easily determine, the Northwestern University associate professor is absolutely correct.

Butz’ book, concludes Gore, is “a most dangerous volume because it appears respectable on the surface.” While it “seems well documented in both primary and secondary source material,” it should be regarded merely as “an interesting study and a valuable document of a bizarre point of view.”

Wilhelm Stäglich’s analysis, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, was respectfully reviewed October 17, 1990, on the weekly “Book Shelf” television program, which is produced by *The Midwest Book Review*. Reviewer Diane C. Donovan commented:

So many other titles have appeared on this subject that yet another examination might tend to get lost in the shuffle. But Stäglich offers a focus which is unique and startling, and this consideration should not be neglected merely because of a surface likeness to other similarly titled treatises.

Stäglich was a young German officer whose eyewitness experiences and memories challenged postwar revelations about Auschwitz atrocities.

This title is Stäglich’s attempt to reconcile his memories of a clean, orderly facility with the horror portrait which emerged at war’s end: it gathers documents, testimonies and confessions, and source materials in an effort to support a different view of both Auschwitz experiences and the camp’s reputation as a systematic extermination center.

Any who are concerned with World War II experiences and atrocities will want to read this with an open mind: it gathers more than personal opinion and creates a startlingly different view of Auschwitz which should, at the least, be considered.

The Forced War, Dr. David Hoggan’s monumental examination of the origins of the Second World War, was given a

respectful review by Diane C. Donovan, West coast representative of *The Midwest Book Review*:

Diplomatic historian Hoggan presents a weighty Revisionist study of the origins of World War II which defines the climate and influences upon Germany's role in the war.

Failures in international cooperation, European nations' internal power policies and attitudes towards Germany, and Hitler's peaceful intentions, as well as influences on other European nations' internal affairs are documented.

Hoggan reveals that Hitler sought peaceful revisionism of the borders imposed on Germany at Versailles, presenting extensive documented research to support his claims.

Hoggan's *Forced War* was the subject of a thoughtful and generally laudatory review by Stephen J. Sniegowski in the Summer 1991 issue of *Reflections*, a Roman Catholic periodical. Sniegowski, who holds a Ph.D. in history from the University of Maryland, has contributed articles and reviews to *Chronicles*, *The World and I*, and other scholarly journals.

The Forced War, writes Sniegowski, "is the most comprehensive and audacious revisionist account of the origins of World War II. It rejects the near-universal assumption that the aggressive policy of Hitlerian Germany was the sole cause of the Second World War in Europe."

Sniegowski goes on:

Originally published in 1961 in West Germany as *Der Erzwungene Krieg*, this book gained instant notoriety in that country although it was lambasted by the German political and academic establishments. No English-language press dared to publish this taboo-shattering history for over two decades. The book's American publisher, the Institute for Historical Review, specializes in promoting controversial books on World War II.

Sniegowski is fair in summarizing the book's argument:

Hoggan claims that Hitler's ambitions were limited to making Germany the preeminent power in Central Europe. Hitler did not seek world conquest, according to Hoggan, and his policies did not threaten Britain, the British empire, or Western Europe.

Leading British policymakers, however, opposed German hegemony in Central Europe on the basis of Britain's tradi-

tional balance of power policy . . . To achieve the goal [a pretext for war], Britain, in March 1939, gave Poland an unconditional guarantee of its border with Germany, and later promised that it would support Poland in any conflict with Germany. Britain, however, had neither the intent nor the capability of actually defending Poland militarily . . .

Hitler's demands on Poland, Hoggan emphasizes, were quite moderate. Hitler sought the return of the Free City of Danzig (detached from Germany by the Versailles Treaty) to the Reich, and German transit rights across the Polish Corridor . . . In return, Hitler pledged to allow the continuation of Polish economic privileges in Danzig and to guarantee the Polish boundary with Germany . . .

Emboldened by British promises, Polish Foreign Minister Jozef Beck was unwilling to make an effort to reach an understanding with Germany. Having an exaggerated view of Polish military capabilities, Beck even thought that a war with Germany would allow for Polish territorial gains.

It was Poland's aggressive intransigence, which included the persecution of the German minority in Poland, that ultimately led to war. Without the British pledge of support, however, Poland would not have been so bold, nor would a local conflict have escalated into a major war.

In Sniegoski's view:

Much can be said for Hoggan's thesis, and he backs it up with a massive amount of material, but it is not completely convincing . . . Had Hitler truly sought peace, he should have avoided even the appearance of aggressiveness.

In conclusion, Hoggan goes too far in exonerating Germany of guilt for the onset of World War II. But he does provide a needed antidote to the usual portrayal of exclusive German responsibility for the war. Responsibility for the outbreak of World War II is not a simple black-and-white matter, but should be pictured in shades of gray.

In a scathingly hostile review of *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, Prof. Henry Huttenbach of the City College of New York expressed alarm at what he regards as the great danger of Holocaust Revisionism for the Jewish people. His review appeared in the September-October 1984 issue of *Martyrdom and Resistance*, mouthpiece of the New York-based International Society of Yad Vashem. *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, Walter N. Sanning's carefully

researched statistical analysis of the “six million” question, was first published by the IHR in 1983.

“The danger of this book (and of those that will doubtlessly follow),” Huttenbach warns, “is its clever veneer of scholarship. The bibliography is international in scope and the text has the panache of objectivity.” Furthermore, he goes on,

It does not read like a shrill polemic, but has all the superficial attributes of a factual analysis. Not one in a thousand undergraduate students could find fault with it; only a few more graduates would be competent to identify its flaws and to convincingly question its credibility. The ultimate danger lies in the lack of a serious response to this continuing wave of attacks on history itself.

Huttenbach then seems to suggest that illegal and perhaps even violent measures should be taken against this “danger to the Jewish people”:

If this campaign to defame the Holocaust, to disprove and deny it, is to be fought at all, it must be done off campus and handled by those who understand that propaganda, vicious but well organized and generally financed propaganda, can best be fought by other than academic means. What these must be is not the subject of this review. It can only raise the topic and stress its urgency in the hopes that others will accept the challenge as they recognize the danger to the Jewish people as a whole.

Under the headline “Historia Pogromu—pogrom historii” (“History of a pogrom—a pogrom against history”), a highly critical review of the IHR book, *Flashpoint: Kristallnacht 1938* by Ingrid Weckert appeared in the November 16, 1991, issue of *Nowy Dziennik*, the leading Polish-language daily newspaper in the United States.

The new IHR edition of George Morgenstern’s classic study, *Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War* was given a laudatory review in the Summer 1992 issue of the *Journal of Civil Defense* (published by the American Civil Defense Association of Starke, Florida).

“When the book was [first] published at the end of 1946,” notes reviewer Stephen Sharro, “it prompted a firestorm of controversy. The central issue was the extent to which the

Roosevelt administration allowed the attack on Pearl Harbor to happen in order to overcome public resistance to becoming involved in another world war." Sharro goes on:

The popular history of America's role in World War II naturally emphasizes the struggle and the ultimate success the Allies achieved. What is frequently forgotten is the great opposition that many Americans felt in 1941 to becoming involved in another European war that did not seem likely to directly affect the United States.

Morgenstern's book has now been reprinted in conjunction with the 50th anniversary of Pearl Harbor. In light of Watergate, Irangate, and perhaps the October surprise, we are more jaded today, more cynical, and more willing to accept the possibility that a politician of Roosevelt's stature might do what Morgenstern implies.

For those who are still excited by this controversy, the book will be fascinating. It is well written, even scholarly. For the most part the facts contained in the book have never been refuted.

While these reviews suggest that the IHR's influence is growing, they do not reflect the actual impact of the IHR and Revisionism. As readers of the *IHR Newsletter* and *Journal* know, Revisionist books are often subject to boycott, media blackout, and blacklist. In some cases, bigoted reviewers, distributors and librarians categorically refuse to handle Revisionist works.

And yet, as the reviews cited here indicate, IHR books are like seeds that, in some cases at least, are taking root in fertile minds.

All of the books cited in this article are available from the IHR:

Why I Survived the A-Bomb
Hardcover, 230 pp., \$19.95

Campaign in Russia
Hardcover, 350 pp., \$17.95

Hitler: Born at Versailles
Hardcover, 535 pp., \$24.95

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century
Softcover, 369 pp., \$9.95

Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence
 Hardcover, 386 pp., \$19.95. Softcover, \$11.95

The Forced War
 Hardcover, 900 pp., \$35.00

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry
 Softcover, 239 pp., \$12.95

Flashpoint
 Softcover, 180 pp., \$15.95

Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War
 Softcover, 425 pp., \$14.95

(Please add 10 percent for packing and shipping costs. California residents: please also add 7.75 percent sales tax.)

Revisionism in Croatia

Croatia's President Rejects "Six Million" Story

While Holocaust Revisionism is suppressed in some countries, in Croatia it has official support from the highest level. Croatian President Franjo Tudjman publicly rejects the "Six Million" Holocaust story.

In a 500-page book entitled *Bespuca—Povjesne Zbiljnosti* ("Wastelands—Historical Truth"), which was published in 1988, and republished in 1989 and again in 1990, Tudjman comments in some detail on Second World War history. About the familiar Holocaust story he writes:

The estimated loss of up to six million [Jewish] dead is founded too much on both emotional, biased testimonies and on exaggerated data in the postwar reckonings of war crimes and squaring of accounts with the defeated . . . In the mid-'80s, world Jewry still has the need to recall its "holocaust" by trying to prevent the election of the former U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim as president of Austria!

Tudjman, who worked for many years as a university history professor, also suggests that many wartime Jewish deaths would not have occurred if German armed forces had prevailed over the Soviet Union, allowing for a "territorial solution" to the Jewish question such as a "reservation" in eastern Poland or in Madagascar. (*The New Republic*, Nov. 25, 1991, pp. 16, 18.; *Die Presse*, Vienna, Jan. 28, 1992.)

Tudjman reaffirmed his Revisionist outlook in a recent interview with Canadian television: "With regard to Jews, I'm inclined to agree with those scholars in the world who say that the figure of six million is exaggerated." (*The New Republic*, Jan. 20, 1992, p. 5.)

Tudjman's views are all the more noteworthy because they are by someone who cannot be regarded as a "Nazi" or "fascist." During the Second World War he fought against Croatia's pro-German Ustashe regime as a general in Tito's partisan army.

Tudjman readily acknowledges that Jews suffered "terrible hardships" during the war years. But, he adds, "the Jewish people soon afterward became so brutal and conducted a genocidal policy towards the Palestinians that they can rightly be defined as Judeo-Nazis."

In light of the harsh anti-Jewish policies of the wartime Croatian state, it is hardly surprising that Israel and Jews around the world have not been particularly friendly toward the new Croatia. In an effort to offset this bitter legacy, Tudjman sent a conciliatory letter to World Jewish Congress president Edgar Bronfman. "We deeply regret the tragic burden of the Holocaust that was endured by the Jewish people on Croatian territory," Tudjman wrote. (*Die Presse*, Vienna, Jan. 28, 1992.)

He has also sought to relieve the fears of Croatia's Jewish community. Indeed, the country's Jewish leaders have applauded Tudjman and his government for its unequivocal condemnation of neo-fascism.

In spite of such gestures, Tudjman's Revisionist statements may ultimately prove to be politically too costly. In that case, he may be obliged to "recognize reality" and repudiate them.

Tudjman also writes in his book about Jasenovac, a concentration camp run by the wartime Croatian government. Orthodox historians have insisted for decades that "at

least 700,000" people were killed there. According to an estimate cited by American Holocaust historian Nora Levin, for example, 770,000 Serbs, 40,000 Gypsies and 20,000 Jews were put to death in Jasenovac. (N. Levin, *The Holocaust*, 1973, p. 515.)

Croats have long maintained that about 60,000 perished in the camp, but Tudjman reckons that even this figure is too high. The most probable figure, he maintains, is between 30,000 and 40,000. Moreover, he goes on, Jewish inmates were largely responsible for the killings there. (*The New Republic*, Nov. 25, 1991, pp. 16, 18.; *Die Presse*, Vienna, Jan. 28, 1992.)

The anti-Croatian guerrillas—whether Tito's Communist "partisans" or Draža Mihailović's Royalist "Chetniks"—had no "death camps" before the war's end, because they normally murdered their captives. (The lucky ones were shot out of hand.) Tito's Communist forces—which were backed by the United States and Britain—carried out mass killings of German prisoners of war and native "collaborators" (most of them Croatian "Ustashe" soldiers and Slovenes) both during the war and in the period just afterwards.

Historians have estimated that Tito's forces shot between 70,000 and 100,000 people without trial within weeks of the war's end. (A few scholars have estimated that there may have been as many as 500,000 victims.) Most of these were people who had been trying to flee from Tito's grasp. Instead of finding freedom, though, they were forcibly returned by British troops from detention camps in Austria, or were turned back at the border by British occupation forces in southern Austrian and northern Italy.

One of the Tito execution sites was Sosice, located about 40 miles west of the Croatian capital of Zagreb. An estimated 40,000 people—many of them sick and wounded—were put to death there. It wasn't until 1990 that the grisly details of the Sosice killings finally emerged from 45 years of suppression. ("Pile of Bones in Yugoslavia," *New York Times*, July 9, 1990.; "Yugoslav Killing Fields," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 4, 1990.)

In recent articles about Croatia, American newspapers and magazines frequently refer to the Second World War Croatian government of Ante Pavelić as a dictatorial regime that was a "puppet" of Hitler's Third Reich. This is not accurate. The vast majority of Croats welcomed and strongly

supported Pavelic's wartime "Independent State of Croatia." If any regime in the region might properly be called a German "puppet," it would be the wartime Serbian government of Milan Nedic.

Meanwhile, Croatian television has reportedly decided that it will no longer broadcast motion pictures that depict Germans as evil Nazis or aggressors. In light of wartime Germany's staunch support for Croatian freedom, the television announced, showing such films would be in "poor taste." (*Der Standard*, Vienna, Jan. 4, 1992)

War Atrocity Propaganda Exposed

A tearful account of Iraqi barbarism, which stunned millions of Americans and fueled popular enthusiasm for war against Saddam Hussein's regime, has now been definitively exposed as a propaganda hoax.

In testimony before a US congressional committee, October 10, 1990, a young Kuwaiti woman, publicly identified only as "Nayirah," tearfully claimed to have personally seen Iraqi soldiers storm into a Kuwait hospital and brutally remove 15 babies from incubators, leaving them "on the cold floor to die." Her moving testimony enraged millions of Americans, who saw it broadcast and re-broadcast on television, and was cited later by seven US Senators in speeches they gave in support of their decision to authorize American military action against Iraq in the "desert storm" Gulf War.

As it turns out, the emotionally powerful testimony was a sham. The young woman never witnessed the alleged atrocity, and "Nayirah" is actually the daughter of Kuwait's ambassador in Washington, Sheik Saud al Nasir al Sabah, a member of Kuwait's ruling clan. Her testimony was part of an extensive public relations blitz organized by the large Washington-based public relations firm of Hill and Knowlton. The PR campaign was financed with millions of dollars from Kuwait's government in exile.

Independent human rights investigators were later unable to confirm the widely circulated atrocity story. After an investigation in April 1991, an Amnesty International

spokesman said: "We became convinced . . . that the story about babies dying in this way did not happen on the scale that was initially reported, if, indeed, it happened at all."

More reprehensible than the young woman's testimony was the deceit of US Congressman Tom Lantos (D-Calif.), who chaired the committee hearing. Although he knew that the young woman was actually the ambassador's daughter when he encouraged her fraudulent testimony, Lantos said nothing. (His deception has been confirmed by the *Los Angeles Times*, January 7, 1992, and in a CBS "60 Minutes" television broadcast, January 19.) It is no coincidence that Lantos also happens to be one of Capitol Hill's most vehement Zionists and vociferous Holocaust campaigners.

Of course, this particular Kuwaiti propaganda story has obvious parallels with atrocity tales from earlier wars, including Holocaust propaganda accounts of millions of Jews gassed to death, soap bars made from human corpses, "steam chamber" extermination, mass electrocutions, and so forth.

One of the most compelling works ever written about war propaganda is *Falsehood in Wartime*, a short but very readable work in which British MP Arthur Ponsonby dissects the most important First World War propaganda myths. A new IHR paperback edition of this classic work, with a foreword especially written for this edition, is available from the IHR for \$6.95, plus \$2.00 shipping. A more detailed overview of the sordid but fascinating history of war propaganda is Phillip Knightley's 468-page work, *The First Casualty*, which is available in paperback from the IHR for \$17.95, plus \$2.00 shipping.

Letters

“PAPPY” BOYINGTON AND THE “FLYING TIGERS” EPISODE

To the Editor:

With regard to your item in the Spring *Journal*, “Roosevelt’s Secret Pre-War Plan to Bomb Japan,” it is worth mentioning the experiences related by Gregory “Pappy” Boyington in his memoir, *Baa, Baa Black Sheep*. The Marine fighter pilot, who was a notorious womanizer and drinker, relates how amused he was when, during the sea journey to Asia to join the “Flying Tigers” squadron, he masqueraded, at the government’s demand, as a minister. He also relates that while ostensibly flying for the Chinese, he was on the US military payroll.

While Dr. Wesslerle has written a very provocative sketch, “The New World Order,” I believe he has touched too many bases. With his knowledge and writing ability, it might have been better if he had written a more narrowly focused account that dealt, for example, with American carnage in the Gulf war.

I hope all of you keep up your good work.

John R. McLaren, M.D.
Atlanta, Ga.

NEW THREAT AGAINST FREE SPEECH IN AUSTRALIA

To the Editor:

Jim Kennan, Attorney General of Victoria (Australia), announced in March his intention to work for a new “racial vilification” act. We have good reason to believe that, if enacted, this law would be used to try to suppress Historical Revisionism, with the usual pretext that anyone who

questions the “official” Holocaust story must be punished as “racist” and “anti-Semitic.”

We encourage interested persons to write to Kennan to urge that freedom of discussion and inquiry be upheld with regard to all aspects of Second World War history, including the Holocaust issue. (Kennan’s address: The Attorney-General’s Dept., ACI House, 200 Queen Street, Melbourne, Vic. 3000, Australia.)

Geoff. Muirden, Secretary
 Australian Civil Liberties Union
 P.O. Box 1137
 Carlton, Vic. 3053, Australia

THE HOLOCAUST ISSUE IN CHANGING SOUTH AFRICA

To the Editor:

[With regard to the] political situation in South Africa and the Holocaust and the New World Order: I have recently for the first time openly referred to the above matters in important circles.

The fact that two prestigious US newspapers [in recent editorials in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*] have taken the stand that students at universities should investigate these matters for themselves is a breakthrough after many years of toil, trouble and sweat on your part, and the way is now open for us to freely draw the attention of people in ever widening circles to the “hoax of the 20th century.”

South Africa is entering a time of troubles, and those of us who understand the forces that are ranged against us require only the facts and the proof, and the rest is then up to us.

It is very gratifying indeed to note how the truth of revisionism is breaking through.

Please accept our deepest appreciation for the great job you and your associates are doing.

Louis F. Stofberg
 Member of Parliament for Sasolburg,
 House of Assembly, Cape Town, South Africa

REMEMBERING AUSCHWITZ

To the Editor:

I was born in Czechoslovakia. Before I moved from Norway to Canada in the summer of 1968, I met several Czech refugees who had been inmates at Auschwitz. They were quite familiar with conditions in the camp, and they emphatically denied that “abuses” of any kind had been carried out against the inmates by the German camp personnel. Insofar as there were abuses, they said, these were carried out by inmates who acted when the German camp personnel were not able to intervene to prevent them.

Some of these former inmates were familiar with Rudolf Vrba and his “memoir” about Auschwitz, *I Cannot Forgive*. They agreed that Vrba had given in to pressures and had lied about the “extermination gas chambers” and similar stories.

In particular I should mention Mrs. Anna Kvapilova, who knew Vrba personally during the time they were both interned in Auschwitz. She was especially bitter about his lies. In Auschwitz Mrs. Kvapilova had been a sort of “Capo,” a prisoner overseer. She had distinguished herself by helping and aiding Norwegian women who were interned there. She returned to Czechoslovakia after the end of the war, but after the Communist putsch in 1948, she was warned by Western intelligence that she was on a list of persons to be arrested by the Communists in Prague. They therefore provided a guide to help her escape across the border into West Germany, from where she made her way to Norway. That’s where I got to know her.

A truly remarkable person of the highest caliber, she was regarded with affection and admiration by all who knew her. She held important and influential official positions in several organizations in Norway, including a post with the High Commissioner for Refugees, a United Nations agency.

Over the years I have met numerous former inmates of German wartime camps, but never a single one who believed that extermination “gassings” ever took place. Many former inmates have told me of the high standards of the German

camp personnel, and attested to the good organization, procedures and orderliness in all of the camps.

Jaromir J. Dan
P. O. Box 948
Helena, Mont. 59624

THE FATE OF AN AUSCHWITZ RESISTANT

To the Editor:

Thank you for publishing the informative essay by Enrique Aynat, "Auschwitz and the Exile Government of Poland," in the Fall 1991 *Journal*. The essay mentions Witold Pilecki, the Polish officer who organized an underground Resistance network in Auschwitz while he was a prisoner there. Readers may perhaps be interested to know about Pilecki's tragic fate after he escaped from the camp in 1943.

After taking part as an officer in the Warsaw Uprising of 1944, he was captured by the Germans and thus once again came into German custody. After the end of the war he lived for a few months in Italy, where he wrote a memoir.

In late 1945 he returned to his Polish homeland where he was arrested as an officer of the Polish resistance movement by the Soviet-controlled government. Pilecki was tried by a Communist court in 1948, sentenced to death, and executed in a Warsaw prison. His family was not permitted to bury his corpse.

My source for this information is an article in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (Jan. 28, 1980) and two follow-up letters by Polish readers (Feb. 20 and March 21, 1980). I am enclosing photocopies.

Hans Wahls
Cologne, Germany

A DOUBLE STANDARD

To the Editor:

The campaign by Bradley Smith, media representative of the IHR and director of the Committee for Open Debate on

the Holocaust, to place advertisements in student newspapers calling for open debate on the Holocaust issue points up a double standard that seems to prevail in much of the American media.

Consider this:

Rabbi Avahram Toledano, head of the Jewish-supremacist "Kach" movement founded by the late Meir Kahane, recently conducted a lecture tour in the US and Canada. Toledano advocates the forcible mass expulsion of Arabs from "greater Israel." He told a Heights Jewish Center meeting on November 14, 1991, that Arabs would be forced out of Israel. In response to the question, "What would the nations of the world say to Israel's expulsion of Arabs?," Toledano said: "I don't know and I don't care. We are proud to be Jews and to have a Jewish State." (*Cleveland Jewish News*, Nov. 22, 1991.)

In spite of his intolerant views, Toledano was given a respectful public forum in prominent Jewish synagogues throughout North America. In Cleveland, for example, his lecture was announced beforehand in the city's main Jewish community paper. (*Cleveland Jewish News*, Nov. 8, 1991, p. 12).

(This is nothing new. While he was still alive, this same paper also routinely announced the lecture appearances of Kahane, who was sentenced in 1975 to one year imprisonment as a result of his terrorist activities.)

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which is so alert to every expression of real and imagined anti-Semitism, has never protested against the advertisements in the *Cleveland Jewish News* announcing the appearances of Toledano and Kahane. Nor does the Zionist group condemn Rabbi Toledano's message of hate.

At the same time, though, "the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is urging college newspapers to reject ads by individuals or groups denying the reality of the Holocaust" (RNS dispatch of Nov. 27, 1991, in *Christian News*, Dec. 9, 1991, p. 16). To show that it means business, an ADL official was sent to the University of Texas to make sure that the student paper there did not publish Smith's ad. (*Houston Chronicle*, Dec. 19, 1991.)

While the ADL insists that the Holocaust issue is "not debatable" (*Christian News*, Dec. 9, 1991, p. 16), and works to deny Revisionists a public forum, this same organization

seemingly has no problem with advertisements in Jewish community papers by militant Zionists who demand brutal forcible expulsion of Arabs.

While it is true that the ADL has occasionally condemned the Kach movement and its views, neither the ADL nor any of the other prominent Jewish (and non-Jewish) groups that want to silence Smith have ever tried to deny a forum to arrogant supremacists like Toledano.

In Toronto, Toledano told an enthusiastic crowd of more than 300 at the Shaarii Tefilah synagogue: "The Jewish state, the Jewish land, belongs only to the Jewish people. There is no room for a people that doesn't recognize Jewish sovereignty." (*The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, July 1991, p. 58.) That's in the same city where German-Canadian publisher Ernst Zündel was put on trial and sentenced to imprisonment for publishing a booklet that questions the Holocaust extermination story.

Consider the utter hypocrisy here. It is legal in Canada for a militant Rabbi to openly put call for the expulsion of Arabs from Israel, an action that would cause horrible hardship and suffering for millions of people. Yet, it is a crime for a Gentile to present valid evidence showing that the "Holocaust" is not all it's cracked up to be.

Given this hypocritical double standard, it's hard to believe that even a single student newspaper in Canada would dare publish Smith's call for open debate on the Holocaust.

In a January 15, 1992, editorial, *The New York Times* castigated Smith's Revisionist views as "trash" and "ugliness." (The *Times* did not permit readers to judge Smith's words for themselves by publishing his advertisement.)

But in its issue of February 12, 1991, the *Times* published a letter that seriously argued that St. Paul, the Christian apostle who wrote much of the New Testament, was a deluded epileptic. Similarly, in the issue of March 9, 1991, *Times* editors published a letter insinuating that St. Paul was a homosexual. On another page of that same issue appeared an article that reported sympathetically on the "Jesus Seminar," a group of intellectuals that claims that much of the New Testament is grossly inaccurate or a patchwork of fabrications. The *Times* made no editorial condemnation of these views.

While simplistically dismissing the views of Holocaust Revisionists as "trash" and "ugliness," this highly influential

pro-Zionist paper has no qualms about providing a forum, and thus a measure of support, for views that are patently offensive to millions of Christians.

Paul Grubach
Lyndhurst, Ohio

REFLECTIONS ON A DEATH

To the Editor:

On the morning of May 12, I was called to inform me of the demise the previous day (night) of Pete Kuetzing. I am having a lot of trouble with that, and still can hardly believe it.

I had talked with Pete at some length a week earlier, and he had expressed great confidence in the progress of his medical treatment. As part of my regular routine, I read thousands of obituaries every year, but I must admit that an occasional one, especially of someone I consider young, vastly disturbs me.

I think it safe to observe that Pete did extremely valuable editing work on the first Noontide edition of the Rassinier work [currently available as an IHR book under the title *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*], and was a most sturdy supporter of revisionism for a considerable time—but unofficially as a consideration of his occupation. (I have been told that my review of Rassinier's book in the Oct. 9, 1978, issue of *The Spotlight* is still the only real review the book ever received.)

Profound disbelievers such as Paul Rassinier and Harry Elmer Barnes might have smiled a bit to see [a new edition of] Rassinier's book come out with an introduction by a theologian [Dr. Robert Countess]. One does not have to tread the sawdust trail to be a Holocaust revisionist, though a disbelieving temperament surely helps, as the Holocaustians have turned the whole thing into a new religion anyway.

To me there is a close relation between a racket like this one and spiritualism, for example. Holocaust zealots trap their revisionist critics in much the same way that the spiritualists treated their scoffers during their heyday

(roughly 1890-1930). When Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle were busy spreading the spiritualist message far and wide, they encountered the razzberry from doubters. Instead of proving that the levitating tables, the moaning voices and the wavering auras of the deceased were genuine, the spiritualists simply demanded that their skeptics prove otherwise.

The “Hoaxers” do much the same thing: the more outrageous of the Holocaust atrocities they endlessly circulate don’t have to be proven. Instead, it is up to those who deny they happened to prove that they did not. When we write about the October 1871 fire that burned down Chicago, I am glad that we don’t have to prove at the same time that Pittsburgh and Baltimore were not also consumed in flames. One of these days I should try to get a foundation to underwrite a trip to central Africa. After returning I would announce that I had encountered a tribe of talking monkeys, and then challenge anyone who does not believe me to prove otherwise.

It’s absorbing to watch two more Versailles mistakes—Yugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia—coming apart, while contemporary journalists are apparently in total ignorance of the antecedents of the current situation. Or perhaps they believe that modern imbecility cannot handle that whole burden of history.

Henry David Thoreau used to be quoted as saying that it took two to tell the truth: one to speak it and one to hear it. But I am afraid that things have reached the point where this is almost unattainable.

James J. Martin
Colorado Springs, Col.

The Editor welcomes letters from readers. Ideally, letters should be no more than about 500 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for style and space.



Bradley R. Smith

bares his soul again
in his all new edition of

Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist

Bradley Smith is writing autobiography, not history. He would probably point out, however, that such a work is history, and that with this book he is reporting on how his own history crossed paths with the most controversial historical event of the century, the alleged genocide of the European Jews.


Bradley R. Smith—Korean war combat vet, author, playwright, director of Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, and media project director and spokesman for the Institute for Historical Review—has appeared on some 300 radio and TV talk shows across the U.S. and Canada since 1986 telling millions about the rampant fraud and falsehood in the "Holocaust" story.

In 1991 Smith launched a brilliant campaign to take his message to major college and university campuses through full-page advertisements in campus newspapers calling for open debate on the "Holocaust." Igniting a firestorm of controversy and national media coverage including lengthy treatment by the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, CBS's *48 Hours* and PBS's *Frontline*, Smith's "Campus Project" continues to generate unprecedented attention for Revisionism. Every reasonably educated American now knows that there is an organization of scholars vigorously critiquing the very Holocaust that "everybody knows" happened.

In this brand new instalment of *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist*, Smith picks up where he left off in his original 1988 edition. Ornerly, compassionate, humorous, and earthy, Smith's *Confessions* is the account of how one man confronted and grappled with the most pervasive and closely-guarded taboo of our time. For all who search for personal and historical truth, and those attracted to the human element in Revisionism.

Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist
Second (Enlarged) Edition
by Bradley R. Smith
Softcover • 60pp. • \$6.00
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92627

**Just off press
All new material**



(From the Editor continued from page 230)

public support for President Bush's "Desert Storm" war against Iraq.

Although we have always welcomed thoughtful letters from readers, from now on we hope to be more conscientious about publishing them. We want the *Journal* to be a more lively forum for thoughtful commentary on pertinent historical and contemporary social-political issues. (Ideally, readers' letters should be no more than about 500 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for style and space.)

This is the first issue of our *Journal* produced entirely by computer "desktop" layout and publishing. While it greatly simplifies our work, we still have some exasperating glitches to work out.

With this issue we are pleased to welcome Professor Hideo Miki as a member of the *Journal's* Editorial Advisory Committee. Miki is a professor of history at Musashino Junior College, Sayamashi, a former professor of history at Japan's National Defense Academy, and a retired Lieutenant General of his nation's Ground Self-Defense Force. He lives in Tokyo.

He made a particularly striking impression as a speaker at the Ninth IHR conference. (His warmly received presentation was published in the Summer 1989 issue of the *Journal*.)

As we go to press, we are working hard to get ready for the Eleventh IHR conference in October. It promises to be a landmark Revisionist gathering that will underscore the remarkable progress that has been made in recent years to increase historical awareness and understanding. We also look forward to meeting again with some of our many good friends and faithful supporters, who make our work and progress possible.

About the Contributors

ANDREW ALLEN is an attorney who lives and practices law in the San Francisco bay area. He holds a bachelor's degree in history from the University of California at Berkeley. In 1988-1989, he represented the family of Martin Bartesch, an accused "Nazi war criminal," in a suit against the US Justice Department's "Office of Special Investigations" to clear Bartesch's name. In another case that recently came before the US Supreme Court, Allen successfully defended the right of Holocaust Revisionists to publicly present their views in spite of intimidation and threats by groups like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. As part of his extensive study of the Holocaust issue, Allen has visited Auschwitz, Belzec, Majdanek, Sobibor and Treblinka.

ROBERT COUNTESS holds master's and doctoral degrees in Religion, as well as a Master of Liberal Studies degree from Georgetown University (1978) for study in the Philosophy of History. His post-doctoral work has included study at the University of Georgia, Vanderbilt-Peabody University, and the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Among his numerous academic posts, he has served as chairman of the foreign languages department of Covenant College, and as Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Tennessee State University. He has taught history at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Dr. Countess is the author more than fifty published articles and book reviews. His book, *The Jehovah's Witnesses' New Testament*, is now in its second edition. He is a member of the IHR's Editorial Advisory Committee.

SAMUEL TAYLOR, a writer and business consultant, holds a bachelor's degree from Yale and a master's degree in international economics from the *Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris*. His writings include a critically acclaimed book about Japan, *Shadows of the Rising Sun* (William Morrow, 1983), and essays that have appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Boston Globe*, the *Baltimore Sun*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and other periodicals. A former contributing editor and west coast editor of *PC Magazine*, Taylor now lives in South Carolina. His essay on "multiculturalism" in this issue of the *Journal* is reprinted with permission from the February 1992 issue of *American Renaissance*, a monthly newsletter that he edits. (\$20/year. Write: P.O. Box 31964, Charleston, SC 29417.).

MARK WEBER studied history at the University of Illinois (Chicago), the University of Munich, and Portland State Universi-

ty, from where he received a bachelor's degree in history. He then did graduate work in history at Indiana University (Bloomington), where he served as a history instructor and received a master's degree in European history in 1977. In March 1988, he testified for five days in Toronto District Court as a recognized expert witness on Germany's wartime Jewish policy and the Holocaust issue. He moved to southern California in early 1991 to work for the IHR. He is now editor of the *Journal* and the *IHR Newsletter*.

Reserve Your Place for the
**ELEVENTH INTERNATIONAL
REVISIONIST CONFERENCE**
October 10-12, 1992 (Columbus Day Weekend)
in the Los Angeles metropolitan area

Internationally Renowned Revisionist Holocaust Scholar
Author of the forthcoming book *On the "Holocaust"*
PROF. ROBERT FAURISSON

The World's Leading Independent WWII Historian, Author of
Churchill's War, Hitler's War, The Destruction of Dresden,
Hess: The Missing Years
DAVID IRVING

Author of the Pathbreaking Revisionist classic
The Hoax of the Twentieth Century
PROF. ARTHUR R. BUTZ

Author of *The Man Who Invented Genocide,*
Revisionist Viewpoints, The Saga of Hog Island
and Other Essays in Inconvenient History
DR. JAMES J. MARTIN

Plus

IHR founder Willis A. Carto
Execution Gas Chamber Expert Fred A. Leuchter & his attorney Kirk Lyons
Moroccan Revisionist Ahmed Rami/Tunisia Muslim scholar Trab Zemzemi
IHR editor Theodore J. O'Keefe/IHR Media Project Dir. Bradley R. Smith
and a very special Mystery Speaker

Master of Ceremonies will be
Historian, Author, Lecturer
MARK WEBER

Come meet and hear these pathbreaking scholars and activists.
Enjoy three days of stimulating lectures and revisionist fellowship in a
comfortable setting with first class accommodations.
The \$325 registration fee includes attendance at all events and meals.
Lodging is available at additional charge.
Attendance is limited to space available. The IHR, sponsor of the
conference, reserves the right to refuse admittance to anyone.
Write today for more information and your registration application.

Institute for Historical Review
Post Office Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659