

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 14, Number 6

November / December 1994



*Spirited Meeting Marks Progress:
Twelfth IHR Conference Report*

*William Henry Chamberlin:
A Man Ahead of His Time*

Mark Weber

*The Crematories of Auschwitz:
A Critique of J.-C. Pressac*

Carlo Mattogno

*New Assault Against
Freedom of Speech in Canada*

Doug Collins

America's Second Crusade

William H. Chamberlin

*World War II, American "Defense"
Policy, and the Constitution*

Joseph Sobran

— And More —

The War that Never Ends

Nearly fifty years ago, the bombing and the shooting ended in the most total military victories, and the most annihilating defeats, of the modern age. Yet the war lives on, in the words—and the deeds—of the politicians, in the purposeful distortions of the professors, in the blaring propaganda of the media. The Establishment which rules ordinary Americans *needs* to keep World War II alive—in a version which fractures the facts and sustains old lies to manufacture phony justifications for sending America's armed forces abroad in one senseless, wasteful, and dangerous military adventure after another.

Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace is the most authoritative, and the most comprehensive, one-volume history of America's real road into World War II. The work of eight outstanding American historians and researchers, under the editorial leadership of the brilliant Revisionist historian Harry Elmer Barnes, this timeless classic demonstrates why World War II wasn't America's war, and how our leaders, from President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on down, first lied us into the war, then lied us into a maze of international entanglements that have brought America *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*.

More Than Just a History

But *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* is more than just a history: it's a *case history* of how politicians like FDR use propaganda, outright lies, and suppression of the truth to scapegoat patriotic opposition to war, to incite hatred of the enemy (*before* they're the enemy!), and to lure foreign nations into diplomatic traps—all to serve, not America's national interest, but *international* interests.

Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace gives you:

- Matchless, careful debunking of all the arguments that led us into World War II;
- Detailed, definitive historical sleuthwork exposing FDR's hidden treachery in preparing for war on behalf of Stalin's USSR and the British Empire—while falsely representing Germany and Japan as “aggressors” against America;
- Incisive, unmistakably American perspectives on how the U.S. made a mockery of its own professed ideals during the misnamed “Good War,” by allying with imperialists and despots to wage a brutal, pointless war culminating in the massacres of Dresden and Hiroshima and the Yalta and Potsdam betrayals;
- Inspired insight into how future wars have sprung and will continue to spring from the internationalist impetus that led us from World War II, through the “Cold War” (and the hot wars we fought in Korea and Vietnam against our WWII Communist “allies”) to the “New World Order”—until Americans, armed with the truth, force their leaders to return to our traditional non-interventionist foreign policy.

Eleven Books in One!

Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace is much, much more than a standard history book. Its *eleven* separate essays by *eight* different authors (average length 65 pages) make it a virtual encyclopedia on the real causes and the actual results of American participation in the Second

World War. You'll find yourself reading, and re-reading, concise, judicious and thorough studies by the leading names in American Revisionist scholarship.

Classic... and Burningly Controversial!



Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace, first published in 1953, represents Revisionist academic scholarship at its full and (to date) tragically final flowering in America's greatest universities—just before America's internationalist Establishment imposed a bigoted and chillingly effective blackout on Revisionism in academia.

Its republication by the Institute in 1983 was an event, and not merely because IHR's version included Harry Elmer Barnes' uncannily prophetic essay on “1984” trends in American policy and public life (considered too controversial for conservatives and anti-Communists in the early 50's). It was hailed by the international Revisionist community, led by Dr. James J. Martin, the Dean of living Historical Revisionists, who wrote:

It is the republication of books such as *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* which does so much to discommode and annoy the beneficiaries of the New World Order.

Discommode and annoy the enemies of historical truth and freedom of research it did—virtually the entire stock of *Perpetual War* was destroyed in the terrorist arson attack on the Institute's offices and warehouse on the Orwellian date of July 4, 1984.

Today, the Institute for Historical Review is proud to be able once more to make this enduring, phoenix-like classic available to you, and to our fellow Americans. It can silence the lies about World War II, and thus the bombs and bullets our interventionist rulers plan—for our own American troops no less than the enemy—in the Middle East, Europe, Africa, Asia, or wherever else the interventionist imperative imposed by World War II may lead us.



Editor: Mark Weber
Associate Editor: Greg Raven

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokespersons of
the educational institutions identified.

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

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

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

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

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (Ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

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

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Long Beach, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

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

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

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

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (Ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 14, Number 6

November/December 1994

IN THIS ISSUE

Spirited Twelfth IHR Conference: A Report 2

Further Progress and Renewed Commitment:
Conference Keynote Address 9
Mark Weber

Gerhard Rudolf's "Mystery Speaker" Statement 14

William Henry Chamberlin: A Man Ahead of His Time 16
Mark Weber

How Franklin Roosevelt Lied America Into War 19
William Henry Chamberlin

America's "Second Crusade" in Retrospect 22
William Henry Chamberlin

World War II, American "Defense" Policy, and the Constitution 31
Joseph Sobran

The Crematories of Auschwitz:
A Critique of J.-C. Pressac 34
Carlo Mattogno

Doug Collins Under New Fire for Holocaust Views 43

Letters 48

Cover: Speakers at the Twelfth IHR Conference (from left to right): Robert Faurisson, John Ball, Russ Granata, Carlo Mattogno, Ernst Zündel, Friedrich Berg, Greg Raven, David Cole, Robert Countess, Tom Marcellus, Mark Weber, David Irving and Jürgen Graf.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of 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 six times yearly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 4296, Torrance, CA 90510, USA. 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, 1991 and 1992, for \$35.00 each. 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 welcome are submissions on IBM-compatible or Macintosh computer diskette. Address all correspondence to P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659.

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.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: \$40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

Spirited Twelfth IHR Conference Brings Together Leading Revisionist Scholars and Activists

Defying Powerful Adversaries, Institute Marks Progress

From across the United States and several foreign countries, scholars, activists, and friends of the Institute for Historical Review met over the September 3-5 weekend in southern California for the IHR's landmark Twelfth International Revisionist Conference.

This Conference, one of the most spirited and successful ever, featured leading figures in the growing international revisionist movement. It was characterized, attendees agreed, by high morale and a confident sense of progress. About 125 men and women attended the Conference, which met in a pleasant hotel meeting hall in Irvine.

Leading revisionist activists provided attendees with the exciting inside story about major achievements, as well as the latest efforts of our adversaries, in the international campaign for greater historical awareness about the most hyped and taboo-laden chapters of history. In addition, prominent revisionist scholars shared new research discoveries and breakthrough insights that further shatter major icons of "official" history. (As usual, Conference presentations are available on audio and video-tape cassettes, and most will also be published in the *Journal*.)

Underscoring its international tone, Conference speakers arrived from Italy, France, Switzerland, Britain and Canada, as well as the United States, while attendees from Finland, Argentina, Britain and Switzerland were among those who traveled to southern California specifically to attend this meeting.

As at previous IHR conferences, attendees took advantage of this opportunity to meet personally and talk privately with the speakers and fellow attendees, many of whom are themselves important revisionist activists.

This gathering, one of the most informative, inspiring and memorable ever, was particularly important in light of the major developments since the last, Eleventh IHR Conference in October 1992.

David Irving

In his familiar riveting and entertaining style, best-selling British historian David Irving pre-

sented startling new facts and insights about Joseph Goebbels, based in large part on his headline-making research in Moscow archives of the Third Reich propaganda chief's long-hidden personal diaries.

At the last IHR Conference, Irving explained how he was able to gain access to the diaries, which were recorded on fragile glass plates. Having in the meantime carefully evaluated this priceless historical material, Irving related new findings and insights from this and other sources to present a fuller and more rounded portrait of Hitler's propaganda chief, and of the internal life of the Third Reich.

Contrary to the popular propaganda image, said Irving, Goebbels' animosity against the Jews, which was more severe than Hitler's, reached its full intensity only after, and in response to, the Jewish wartime propaganda campaign against Germany.

Spicing his presentation with anecdotes about Goebbels' private life, Irving discredited the propaganda image of him as a profligate womanizer. In fact, Irving related, Goebbels' sexual experiences were quite limited.

Speaking about the notorious *Kristallnacht* outburst of anti-Jewish violence in Germany on November 9, 1938, Irving pointedly took issue with the thesis of German revisionist historian Ingrid Weckert, who addressed the Sixth, 1985 IHR Conference. (On that occasion, Weckert presented evidence to suggest that Goebbels had no advance knowledge of the *Kristallnacht* outburst, and that the violence may have been incited by anti-German *agents provocateurs*. Weckert's thesis is detailed in her book *Flashpoint*, published by the IHR.)

In fact, said Irving, the evidence shows that Goebbels played the crucial role in inciting the anti-Jewish "Crystal Night" violence.

This disagreement between Irving and Weckert — which Irving referred to as "a revisionist revising a revisionist" — is precisely the kind of thoughtful disputation among revisionist scholars (including IHR conference speakers) that points up the intellectual vitality and integrity of the Institute for Historical Review.



Speakers at the Twelfth IHR Conference (from left to right): Robert Faurisson, John Ball, Russ Granata, Carlo Mattogno, Ernst Zündel, Friedrich Berg, Greg Raven, David Cole, Robert Countess, Tom Marcellus, Mark Weber, David Irving and Jürgen Graf.

Irving, one of the world's most prolific historians, also updated attendees on the ever more frantic international campaign to muzzle him — and all others who dare to defy the powerful worldwide Holocaust lobby. He told about his new lawsuit against the Canadian government for unlawful detention during his 1992 speaking tour — an arrest that was later cited by the New Zealand and Australian governments to justify their own bans against him.

As at previous IHR conferences, Irving sold and autographed copies of his books.

Ernst Zündel

German-Canadian publicist and civil rights activist Ernst Zündel delivered the Sunday evening banquet address. His appearance was particularly welcome because, although he attended the first IHR conference in 1979, he had been barred by the US State Department from entering this country to address several subsequent IHR conferences.

Zündel devoted the first part of his banquet presentation to an eloquent expression of gratitude for all those who, over the years, have contributed significantly to the revisionist cause. He expressed special appreciation for the role of the Institute for Historical Review, and took time to remember friends and supporters who are no longer alive, including Frank Walus, Joseph Burg, Dr. William Lindsey and IHR co-founder David McCalden. Zündel related all this to his two widely publicized "Holocaust trials" (1985 and 1988), which brought

major breakthroughs for historical revisionism and an important victory for free speech in Canada.

During the second portion of his presentation, he reported on his recent visit to Russia, where he met with important Russian nationalist figures, including Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, the prominent opposition political leader.

In the wake of the collapse of Communism, said Zündel, a process of full-scale historical revisionism is now taking place in Russia. People are enduring a drastic, soul-searching re-evaluation of their national

history and collective self-identity. This includes a dramatic reassessment of the Second World War. Oddly enough, said Zündel, many nationalist Russians view both Stalin and Hitler rather sympathetically.

Predicting that Russia would take a course that is neither Communist nor liberal-democratic/Capitalist, Zündel spoke with hope about the possibilities of future close collaboration between a revived, nationalist Russia and a revived, nationalist Germany.

Zündel, who was interviewed by journalist Mike Wallace for an appearance on a March 1994 broadcast of the popular "60 Minutes" television show, has been devoting considerable time in recent months to a new international television and radio broadcast outreach campaign.



Attendees enjoy dinner and fellowship during the Sunday evening Conference banquet.

Robert Faurisson

Robert Faurisson delighted attendees with a fascinating and witty description of his visit, just days earlier, to the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, where he met with Museum official Michael Berenbaum in his office.



At the Twelfth IHR Conference, Swiss educator Athur Vogt tells *Journal* editor Mark Weber about revisionist work in Europe.

Faurisson spoke with Berenbaum about the model on display at the Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau Crematory II, which shows an SS man pouring Zyklon B in vents on the roof of the supposed "gas chamber" and through perforated pillars. This model, the French scholar told Berenbaum, is preposterous because, as any visitor to Birkenau can determine for himself, there are no vents or regular holes in the roofs of the supposed "gas chamber." Berenbaum made no effort to defend the model, said Faurisson.

Faurisson asked Berenbaum why the Museum had not answered his challenge to "Show me or

draw me a Nazi [homicidal] gas chamber!" (See the Jan.-Feb. 1994 *Journal*, p. 23.) After some prodding, Berenbaum eventually related that "the decision has been made not to give any physical representation of the Nazi gas chambers."

In response to Faurisson's pointed questions and comments, Berenbaum angrily lost control of himself. "I thought he was going to smack me," said Faurisson.

Faurisson, a French university professor (and frequent *Journal* contributor), was the first person to dig up and publish key documents from the Auschwitz construction department archives. After attempting for years to ignore this evidence, his hard-pressed enemies are now obliged to offer responses, albeit confused ones.

For years he has been the victim of vicious media attacks and a campaign of legal persecution in his native France, where it is a crime publicly to challenge the currently fashionable view of the Holocaust extermination story.

Carlo Mattogno

Carlo Mattogno, Italy's foremost revisionist scholar, explained that newly-uncovered German records held for years in Soviet archives, supported with other documentary and forensic evidence he has collected in years of research, thoroughly discredit claims of mass extermination of Jews at Auschwitz. His presentation summarized findings and conclusions of his new 150-page book, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend: A Critique of J. C. Pressac*, which was published by the IHR just in time for sale at this Conference. Mattogno autographed numerous copies of the book for attendees.

Mattogno, a scholar of rare precision and exactitude with an impressive command of languages, cited copious evidence collected during years of meticulous research to explain that the crematories at Auschwitz simply were not capable of handling the number of corpses alleged to have been produced from the supposed extermination process. Even if operated at maximum capacity, the crematory ovens could not possibly have handled anything like the numbers of corpses alleged.

Appearing with Mattogno as his translator was Russ Granata, a retired southern California teacher who provided critical help in making possible the publication of *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*.

Jürgen Graf

Jürgen Graf, a Swiss educator with an impressive command of languages and an author of several carefully researched revisionist works, spoke about the perverse social-psychological role that the Holocaust story has come to play in Western political, social and cultural life. Graf has been active not

only in the Holocaust revisionist movement, but also in the campaign to halt further non-European immigration into Switzerland.

Speaking with verve and wit, and in impressively-delivered English, Graf said that the Holocaust story has become a major weapon in the growing campaign to discredit Western culture and to break down European racial-cultural consciousness. It is used to subvert national sovereignty, and promote massive Third World immigration into North America and western Europe.

In Switzerland and other western European countries, as well as in the United States and Canada, popular sentiment overwhelmingly favors a halt to further Third World immigration. The refusal of elected public officials and the mass media to reflect this popular sentiment points up a profound failure of political institutions in the Western World, said Graf.

Referring to the well-organized effort to introduce a legal ban on Holocaust revisionism in his own country (similar to such prohibitions in neighboring France and Germany), Graf boldly announced that he will openly defy any such ban.

In March 1993, following the publication of his 112-page book *Der Holocaust auf dem Prüfstand* ("The Holocaust on the Test Stand"), Graf was summarily dismissed from his post as a secondary school teacher of Latin and French, in spite of support from his students and colleagues. His firing came on orders of high-level Swiss authorities. Graf is also author of several other revisionist books, copies of which were available for sale, and which he autographed for attendees.


John Ball

John Ball, a western Canadian geologist who specializes in interpreting aerial photos used in mineral exploration, explained that much can be learned from Second World War aerial reconnaissance photographs. Ball has collected, studied and published scores of long suppressed reconnaissance photographs of German camps, including Auschwitz, Majdanek and Plaszow (featured in "Schindler's List"), as well as Babi Yar.

Illustrating his presentation with numerous slides of aerial photos, maps and diagrams, he provided devastating new insights into the suppressed history of Auschwitz and other alleged German extermination camps. Speaking with the confidence of a specialist, Ball showed a rare ability to make a rather technical subject easily understandable to lay persons.

Ball spent considerable time throughout the three-day Conference patiently answering questions by inquisitive attendees, inviting them to examine reconnaissance photos under a magnifying

glass. Ball also displayed wall-mounted photo enlargements and diagrams, and he autographed copies of the unabridged edition of *The Ball Report*.



Master of Ceremonies Greg Raven kept the Twelfth Conference on track throughout the hectic three-day schedule.

Friedrich Berg

Friedrich P. Berg, an engineer who has devoted extensive effort to researching technical aspects of the Holocaust story, pointed out that wartime Germany ironically did have an immense quantity of lethal gas at its disposal: wood- and coal-derived "producer" gas, which was widely used to power trucks and buses. However, Berg noted, not even the most hysterical Holocaust propagandists have ever suggested that toxic "producer" gas was used to kill people.

Making use of color slides, and spicing his talk with humor, Berg told the fascinating story of how petroleum-starved wartime Germany was able to continue moving people and goods with "producer" gas vehicles. This story, he said, is a tribute to the nation's remarkable improvisational ability, in spite of tremendous adversity.

Berg is the author of three important *Journal* articles, including a path-breaking essay (Spring

1984 issue) in which he shows the absurdity and technical infeasibility of the widely-repeated story that hundreds of thousands of Jews were killed with diesel engine exhaust fumes.



Mark Weber delivers the Conference Keynote address.

Mark Weber

Journal editor Mark Weber dedicated this Conference to the memory of William Henry Chamberlin, an American historian and journalist who has not been properly appreciated because he was a fervent and knowledgeable anti-Communist writer when it was not fashionable.

As he has at numerous previous IHR conferences, Weber also delivered this year's keynote address. He noted the tremendous progress that has been made in the decade since the devastating arson attack against the IHR office-warehouse on July 4, 1984, which destroyed virtually the entire IHR stock.

In spite of relentless opposition from powerful adversaries such as the Anti-Defamation League, the IHR is today vastly more influential than ever, Weber noted. In large part due to the efforts of the IHR, historical revisionism is now an acknowledged part of America's social-cultural landscape.

In his review of the recent progress of the international revisionist movement and the IHR, Weber cited numerous specific examples. An important sign of the growing impact of the IHR since the last IHR conference, said Weber, has been the publication in 1993 of no fewer than four books attacking Holocaust revisionism and, in particular, the Institute for Historical Review.

Another important sign of impact is the widespread (albeit almost invariably hostile) media coverage of the IHR. A notable example, he said, was a March 1994 broadcast of the widely-viewed "60 Minutes" television show, during which the front cover of the Nov.-Dec. 1993 IHR *Journal* was shown to millions of viewers.

Weber paid tribute to the many men and women

who have selflessly supported the IHR and its work over the years, calling attention to several who were attending the Conference.

Greg Raven

Journal Associate Editor Greg Raven made his first appearance as Master of Ceremonies at an IHR Conference. Peppering his introductions with wit and humor, he also did a first-rate job keeping the speakers on time and the Conference on schedule.

Germar Rudolf

In a statement read to the Conference, this year's "Mystery Speaker," Germar Rudolf, explained the reasons — including police raids and eviction as a result of political pressure — why he was not able to participate. Rudolf, a chemist who lives in southwest Germany, is the author of a technical study of the alleged mass-murder "gas chambers" at Auschwitz that confirms that these facilities were not and could not have been used to kill people as claimed.



Attendees watch a video-tape screening of the "Donahue" show, which originally aired in March 1994, on which David Cole (shown on the screen) appeared as a guest along with Bradley Smith and Michael Shermer.

David Cole

Speaking with verve and humor (often self-deprecating), youthful Jewish filmmaker David Cole enthralled his audience with a passionate response to a lengthy polemic against Holocaust revisionism (in which the work of the IHR and Cole were prominently featured) in a recent issue of *Skeptic*, a magazine published and edited by Michael Shermer. (Shermer, who had attended the previous day's Conference sessions, was not present during Cole's address.)

After Cole and other revisionists supplied the Occidental College associate professor with abundant evidence discrediting the Holocaust gas chamber story, an exasperated Shermer declared that the existence or non-existence of Nazi gas chambers

doesn't really matter. With biting sarcasm, Cole commented: "If the gas chambers don't matter, then why are we revisionists being persecuted for trying to revise such a 'minor detail'? Try telling the ADL or the Wiesenthal Center that it's a 'minor detail!'"



David Irving and Ernst Zündel take a break during the Conference.

Cole, who had delighted attendees at the IHR's Eleventh Conference, has proven himself an effective spokesman for the revisionist view in several nationally-broadcast television appearances, including an appearance in March 1994 (with Shermer and Bradley Smith) as a guest on the "Donahue Show." (See the May-June 1994 *Journal*, pp. 19-20).

In Cole's first blockbuster revisionist video, the curator of the Auschwitz State Museum admitted to Cole on film that the "gas chamber" shown to tourists there is actually a fraudulent postwar reconstruction. Cole is now working on a promising second video exposing fraudulent claims about alleged wartime German killing facilities.

Bradley Smith

Bradley Smith, America's most prominent revisionist activist, reported on his successful headline-

making campaign, in defiance of malicious smear tactics and ADL censorship, to bring revisionist facts and arguments to students and professors by placing advertisements in dozens of student papers across the United States. (See the July-August 1994 *Journal*, pp. 18-24)

Speaking in his familiar wry, soft-spoken and anecdotal style, Smith amused attendees with a description of his "special relationship" with adversaries Deborah Lipstadt and Jeffrey Ross of the Anti-Defamation League.



Robert Faurisson and Michael Shermer, editor-publisher of *Skeptic* magazine, exchange views during a Conference break.

Dr. Robert Countess

Dr. Robert Countess, the IHR's "roving ambassador" and a member of the *Journal's* Editorial Advisory Committee, updated attendees on his revisionist activities since the last Conference. As a college history instructor, he related, he assigned students to read Dr. Arthur Butz's revisionist classic, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Countess also reported on recent radio and television appearances, and suggested new ways to get out the word about Holocaust revisionism.

Tom Marcellus

At the conclusion of this Conference, Institute Director Tom Marcellus hosted a special session for interested attendees about IHR business and organizational development in recent years, including the background and current situation arising from the termination in September 1993 of the IHR's association with Willis Carto.

Along with Mark Weber, Marcellus recounted the internal crisis that led to the termination, and reported on Carto's relentless campaign of outrageous lies against the IHR, above all through *The Spotlight* weekly that he controls. Marcellus and Weber also reported on Carto's efforts to destroy the Institute through lawsuits, and on the IHR's current legal action against Carto to recover millions of dollars that he illegally diverted from the IHR.

During this special session, Robert Faurisson explained how Carto's lies and deceit to him personally in the Spring and Summer of 1993 finally convinced him that Carto's continued involvement with IHR affairs was no longer tolerable.



Guillermo Coletti, who was responsible for Conference security, with speaker Carlo Mattogno during a break in the proceedings.


Marcellus has been with the IHR since its founding in 1978, and has served as its Director since 1981 — except for an 18-month break in 1986 and 1987 during which the *IHR Journal* ceased publication and no new books were published. By contrast — and as Raven pointed out in his introduction of

Marcellus — during the past twelve months, and in spite of intense legal harassment and media smears, the IHR — under Marcellus' leadership — brought out five issues of the *Journal*, four books, a new catalog, and was able to organize this Twelfth IHR Conference.



Robert Countess chats with Jürgen Graf

In past years, members of the criminal Jewish Defense League attempted to sabotage several IHR conferences. This year, five agents of Willis Carto showed up to make a feeble attempt to wreck the gathering. Their efforts were entirely inconsequential, however, and after a short time they were escorted away by police.



Are you reading a borrowed copy of **The Journal of Historical Review?**

Why not have your own copy of *The Journal* delivered regularly to your home or office?

Now in its exciting new full-sized bi-monthly format, *The Journal's* scope has been expanded to embrace a broader revisionism. We're taking on a wider range of issues with the same high regard for facts and the same keen analysis on which *Journal* and *IHR Newsletter* readers have come to rely.

And now that *The Journal* incorporates the *IHR Newsletter*, you have a single source for an abundance of interesting, insightful news and thoughtful commentary on issues that affect you, your loved ones, your community and the world around you. And you'll be kept right up to date as well on the vital activities of the world's foremost institution dedicated to setting the record straight and keeping it that way, the Institute for Historical Review.

The new *Journal* is now published more frequently, it's easier to read, more visually appealing, and addresses a broader range of your interests. But most important is what has *not* changed — the distinctive qualities that have always distinguished the *The Journal*: its taboo-smashing iconoclasm, its independent, scholarly perspective on issues and events, and its uncompromising devotion to historical honesty.

Subscriptions are still only \$40 per year, \$65 for two years, or \$90 for three years (foreign subscribers please add \$10 per year). Please remit by check, money order, VISA or MasterCard. (California Residents must add 7.75% state sales tax.)

So why not subscribe today or why not give a gift subscription to a friend, local public or college library?
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW • P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Further Progress and Renewed Commitment

MARK WEBER

Adapted from the keynote address at the Twelfth IHR Conference, September 1994.

There are many ways to measure progress and success. A corporation, for example, normally measures progress by its record of annual profit. Because of the special nature of its work, the Institute for Historical Review measures success differently. Our main measure of success is the impact we have on society at large; but more than that, given the reality of the powerful forces aligned against us, we can also measure it in terms of basic survival.

1984 Arson Attack

Our meeting here this weekend of this Twelfth International Revisionist Conference is taking place ten years after a milestone event in the history of the IHR. On the Fourth of July 1984, unknown terrorists fire-bombed our office-warehouse complex in an attempt to destroy the Institute for Historical Review.

These criminals nearly succeeded. In an emergency letter to supporters following the attack, Director Tom Marcellus reported:

As a physical entity, the Institute for Historical Review has virtually ceased to exist. Ninety percent of our book and tape inventory — the largest collection of revisionist literature to be found anywhere — has been wiped out. Every last piece of office equipment and machinery — including desks, chairs, files and shelves — lay in charred heaps of useless, twisted scrap.

Manuscripts, documents, artwork, galleys and film negatives — products of more than six long years of a tough, dedicated effort to bring suppressed historical data to people the world over — no longer exist. Tens of thousands of books ... estimated at over \$300,000 in value, are gone ... More than 2,500 square feet of space that was once the world's most controversial publisher lies blackened in chaos and total ruin.

As we know, of course, the attack failed to finish

off the IHR. Under Tom Marcellus' directorship, and with the generous support of friends across America and in many foreign lands, we were able to rebuild.

Today — ten years later — the Institute for Historical Review is vastly more influential than ever. Particularly during the last two years — and in spite of an relentless barrage of media smears and lies — the IHR and its work have become widely known across America and around the world.

While media coverage of our work continues to be overwhelming hostile, historical revisionism and the IHR are now grudgingly accepted as an established part of the American social-cultural landscape.

References to the IHR and its work have been appearing with greater frequency than ever in newspapers and magazines. Just recently, for example, *The Los Angeles Times* described the IHR as a "think tank that critics call the 'spine of the international Holocaust denial movement'." Indeed, and as everyone in this hall knows, the IHR is at the center of a worldwide network of scholars and activists who are working — sometimes at great personal sacrifice — to separate historical fact from propaganda fiction by researching and publicizing suppressed facts about key, socially-politically relevant chapters of twentieth century history.

Growing Impact

An important sign of the growing impact of the IHR during the past few years was the appearance last year, to the accompaniment of much media publicity and hype, of no fewer than four books — including Deborah Lipstadt's widely promoted but mendacious polemic, *Denying the Holocaust* — attacking Holocaust revisionism and, in particular, the Institute for Historical Review.

Not only is the IHR featured prominently in each of these books, one of them, a work published by American Jewish Committee entitled *Holocaust Denial*, states, "the IHR is the spine of the international Holocaust denial movement, and, according to Leonard Zeskind, a research director of the Center for Democratic Renewal, the IHR's influence now is only a fraction of what it will be."

Another indication of our growing impact was the mention of the IHR during a broadcast in March of "60 Minutes," one of America's most widely viewed television programs. Millions were introduced to the IHR's *Journal of Historical Review*, when the front cover of the November-December 1993 issue was shown on the screen.

Articles from the our *Journal* are widely reprinted and circulated, including in translation in numerous foreign countries. *Journal* articles, IHR leaflets and other IHR material are being disseminated to many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people throughout the world through the international computer network, and specifically through such systems as GENie, CompuServe, Prodigy and the Internet.

Steadily growing numbers of scholars and educated lay persons — in the United States, throughout Europe, and in Asia, Latin America and northern Africa — support the work of the IHR. Unfortunately, although for very understandable reasons, not many of them are yet willing publicly to express this support.

Until recently, the standard operating procedure in dealing with revisionism was either to ignore the phenomenon, or stridently to dismiss revisionists as crackpots, neo-Nazis, hate-mongers, flat earth types, and so forth. Now there is widespread recognition that that approach just won't work any more.

Thus, along with growing effectiveness has come, inevitably, ever more fevered opposition from formidable enemies. As our influence grows, and as the great social-cultural struggle of the Western world intensifies, so also does the fury and desperation of our adversaries. This, too, is a sign of our growing impact.

As Robert Faurisson, David Irving and Ernst Zündel — three of our speakers here this weekend — are able personally to attest, the traditional enemies of free historical inquiry have become so anxious and desperate that in some countries they have resorted to repressive and even laughably absurd laws to punish those who express dissident, revisionist views about twentieth century history.

We must be doing something right.

Inevitability of Revisionism

At the same time, the natural and inevitable process of historical revisionism continues — that is, reevaluating and reassessing the past in the light of new historical evidence, and new insights and perspectives, and through overcoming of old prejudices and hatreds.

One expression of this process came in July 1993, when — in the face of compelling evidence — Israel's Supreme Court was obliged to acquit Ukrainian-American John Demjanjuk of the hideous

charge that he helped to kill hundreds of thousands of Jews at the Treblinka camp in 1942-1943.

This widely-publicized acquittal was a devastating indictment of the so-called "Office of Special Investigations," the US government agency established to track down "Nazi war criminals." In its zeal to "get" Demjanjuk, the OSI, it turned out, suppressed and threw aside — in at least one case, literally — evidence that OSI officials knew could have helped to exonerate this naturalized American citizen.

This acquittal was an important vindication of the cause of historical revisionism because, for one thing, revisionists were again confirmed in our long-standing insistence that "eyewitness" testimony — even of Jewish "Holocaust survivors" — must be regarded with the greatest skepticism. In his highly-publicized trial in Jerusalem, which had many of the elements of a show trial, five Jewish "Holocaust" survivors declared under oath that they recognized Demjanjuk as the mass murderer of Treblinka known as "Ivan the Terrible." During the earlier trial of Demjanjuk, the Israeli judges had cited this "eyewitness" testimony as the most compelling evidence in declaring the accused guilty.

Suppressed History Comes to Light

Nowhere is the natural and inevitable process of historical revisionism more acute or manifest than in the former Communist world, particularly Russia and the countries of eastern and central Europe. Anyone who does not understand the importance of historical revisionism, or the relationship between political freedom and historical awareness, should look to the full-scale historical revisionism that has swept across eastern Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union in recent years.

This process of historical revisionism is based in large part on the coming to light of long-suppressed information from eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. This includes, for example, the facts about Communist-run death camps for ethnic Germans in Poland in the period just after the end of the Second World War, in which many ethnic Germans were put to death. This shocking story is detailed, for one, in the book *An Eye for an Eye* by American Jewish writer John Sack [available from the IHR].

It is only in recent years that startling evidence has emerged to show that Soviet dictator Stalin was preparing to invade and conquer Germany and all of Europe, and that his invasion plan was thwarted by the German-led Axis attack launched against Soviet Russia on June 22nd, 1941. This evidence does not merely force a rewriting of history textbooks, but compels a drastic and profound reassessment of our understanding of the basic nature of the Second

World War, and of the roles of the major players in that conflict.

Holocaust Revisionism

We are sometimes asked why we devote so much time and effort to the Holocaust story and the issues involved with it. Many people are completely bored with this subject. Millions of Americans are sick of hearing still more about the tragic fate of just one particular people in Europe during the Second World War. Well, frankly, we're sometimes bored with it ourselves.

But we are obliged to deal with this issue because it is objectively important: it has come to play an enormously significant role in American cultural and political life, virtually that of a perverse, ersatz secular religion.

This is perhaps most concretely manifest in the opening, in April 1993, of the enormous United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC. Opened to great fanfare and publicity, this \$160 million monument to misguided priorities and illicit power was built and is maintained by a taxpayer funded, federal government agency, the US Holocaust Memorial Council. The decision to build this great monument was made, at least in part, deliberately to respond to the growing revisionist challenge.

Another sign of the role now played by the Holocaust story in our society is the phenomenon of "Schindler's List" — and by this I mean not merely the motion picture, as widely promoted as it was, but by the campaign surrounding it, including the push to makes its showing obligatory in school classrooms.

We also devote so much time to the Holocaust issue because no one else is doing so, or at least not as consistently and as conscientiously as the Institute for Historical Review. And finally, it is a pleasure to keep hammering away on this issue because, more obviously than ever, we are winning.

New Journal Format

Since the last IHR Conference, there have also been some important changes here at the IHR. For one thing, there has been a change in the format and frequency of publication of *The Journal of Historical Review*. We are pleased that the new format, which was first proposed by Tom Marcellus in 1992, has been very well received by the great majority of our readers. This format change, we believe, has made the *Journal* more inviting and attractive, especially to new readers, and seems to have helped contribute to a gratifying increase in paid circulation during the last two years.

It also seems that the *Journal* is more carefully read than ever, not only by subscribers, but by our

adversaries at the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Anti-Defamation League who, we are reliably informed, carefully comb through every sentence.

Accountability

No cause can win the trust and support of generous, open, honest and idealistic men and women unless the leaders of that cause are themselves generous, open, honest and idealistic. Cynicism, small-mindedness and narrow self-interest is cancer in any organization, particularly one such as ours — dedicated as it is to ideals of exactitude, truthfulness and free, open inquiry.

There must be a strong relationship, particularly in an enterprise like the IHR, between authority and accountability. It is not only ethically wrong, but ineffective and ultimately suicidal for any organization to operate in such a way that those who make decisions and give orders insist that others are made legally and publicly responsible. To be successful over the long haul, the IHR must operate in a professional, accountable and responsible manner. In our day-to-day operation, we are proud to employ our modest financial resources cost-effectively. For every dollar we lay out, adversaries such as the ADL are obliged to spend a hundred.

Obligation and Commitment

Without the staunch, on-going support of its many friends and supporters across the United States, in Canada, and in many other countries around the world, the Institute for Historical Review would not be possible. Moreover, the support we have received over the years from thousands of individuals, most of whom have never attended an IHR Conference, imposes on those of us who are responsible for the IHR on a day-to-day basis, as trustees or stewards, a solemn obligation to do all we can to insure that the IHR conscientiously and consistently maintains high standards of exactitude and truthfulness, and to make sure that it is operated in a responsible, accountable and above-board way, true to the principles it proclaims.

We are committed to doing everything in our ability to insure the survival and success of the Institute for Historical Review. With a profound sense of gratitude to all those who have made our success possible, and a sense of obligation to uphold the standards of the IHR, we pledge to carry on the mission of the IHR in helping to make this a better world for us all. With the continued support of our friends, together we will see to it that the next ten years will be our most successful ever.

IHR's Twelfth Revisionist Conference

A Spectacular Line-up Now Available on Video and Audiotape



Faurisson, Europe's leading Holocaust scholar, is fighting French laws that criminalize dissent on the Holocaust story

Prof. ROBERT FAURISSON: The intrepid French academic and dean of revisionist critics offers a simple challenge to the Exterminationists: "Show me or draw me a Nazi gas chamber." Fresh from the Washington DC Holocaust Museum, he declares it a "historical fiasco" – though not a business fiasco, he adds, because "there's no business like *Shoah* business!" While there, Faurisson paid a visit to Museum chief Michael Berenbaum, who became enraged at Faurisson's questions ("I thought he was going to smack me!"). Faurisson demands that the Holocausters depict a complete homicidal gas-chamber – not a wall, not a "testimony," not a pile of shoes or toothbrushes, but an honest-to-God gas chamber of the kind in which Berenbaum and his ilk so fervently believe. Audio A142 / Video V113



Zündel won his 10-year Holocaust battle when Canada's Supreme Court struck down an anti-Revisionist "False News" law. / Video V114

As seen on "60 Minutes"

ERNST ZÜNDEL barred by the U.S. Department from . . . previous IHR conf legendary German-Canadian arrives to tell about the effect Canadian Supreme Court dec favor. He offers thank-yous to and dead, including Prof. Rev late Leon Degrelle, and David the freewheeling IHR co-found talks about his recent visits wit and revisionist personalities in explains the nationalists' vener Stalin (an admiration which doe preclude similar reverence for their sensitivity toward the Thirc disrespect for Slavic peoples. A / Video V114

MARK WEBER: IHR director Tom Marcellus and associate *Journal* editor and conference MC Greg Raven welcome attendees to the Twelfth Conference and note the Institute's achievements and difficulties of the past year. *Journal* editor Weber keynotes the meeting with a rousing dedication to American journalist and historian William Henry Chamberlin, author of *The Russian Revolution and America's Second Crusade*. Weber points out that Chamberlin's biting criticism of American "crusades for righteousness" is as apt today — during the latest American invasion of Haiti — as it was in the 1940s and 50s. Weber then cites the important gains made by revisionism since the last conference, and what lies ahead. Audio A134 / Video V108



Journal of Historical Review editor Weber details the important gains we've made since the last conference

As seen on "Montel Williams"

FRIEDRICH BERG: An engineer by training and technical historian by vocation, Berg was among the first to point out that mass murder by diesel fumes (a feat attributed to the Germans) is not technically feasible. Diesel exhaust, unlike gasoline exhaust, contains very little carbon monoxide. Ironically, wartime Germany *did* have an immense quantity of lethal gas at its disposal: wood- and coal-derived "producer" gas, used not for mass-murder but *mass-transit!* But not even the most hysterical Holocaust propagandists have ever proposed that this gas or these vehicles were used for sinister purposes. With ample humor and visual aids, Berg shows how the Third Reich powered itself for years on little more than coal and ingenuity. Audio A137 / Video V109



American engineer Berg, expert on "the other gas chambers," exposes the myth within *The Myth* in a fascinating slide show



Cole's dramatic video documentary featuring an interview with Auschwitz Museum director rocked the Holocaust Lobby

As seen on "Donahue"

DAVID COLE: A self-described atheist Jewish high school dropout "who sounds like Jerry Lewis," Cole has the audience in stitches. He turns his wit on *Skeptic* magazine editor Michael Shermer, who in 1993 speculated on whether there was any hard evidence to refute the "Nazi gas chamber" stories. Shermer got his evidence, of course — by the carload! After perusing it, he then declared that the existence or nonexistence of these killing rooms really doesn't matter. Cole's response: "If the gas chambers don't matter, then why are we [Revisionists] being persecuted for trying to revise such a 'minor detail'? Call up the ADL or the Wiesenthal Center and try telling them it's a 'minor detail!'" (Shermer appeared opposite Cole and Smith on the "Donahue" show.) Audio A143 / Video V111



Italian document expert Mattoigno's devastating critique of Jean-Claude Pressac was recently published by IHR

CARLO MATTOIGNO (with Russ Granata): A specialist in textual criticism, this longtime IHR editorial advisory board member and author of *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, presents a detailed scholarly analysis of the obfuscatory writing of French Holocaust enthusiast Jean-Claude Pressac. Pressac is best known for his responses to and condemnations of Robert Faurisson's investigations into the extermination myth. To counter one major thesis of Pressac, Mattoigno calculates the number of corpses that could have been cremated in Auschwitz if the ovens had worked at maximum capacity, and finds it falls far short of the millions of dead presumed by exterminationist writers. Russ Granata smoothly translates Mattoigno's presentation. Audio A141 / Video V110

Quality Recordings of All Conference Lectures From the World's Most Controversial Research Center

Take 20% off all audiotapes and videos from previous IHR conferences when ordering any tape from the 12th Conference. See next page and IHR catalog.



Britain's leading independent historian is battling and beating organized Zionist efforts to ban him from Western countries

DAVID IRVING: The world's most popular WWII historian, the controversial Irving again takes on the Holocaust establishment. He tells of his new lawsuit against the Canadian government for unlawful detainment during his 1992 speaking tour, an arrest later cited by the New Zealand and Australian governments to justify their banning him as an "undesirable." The bestselling English writer discusses his latest major research project — the "missing" passages from the diaries of Dr. Joseph Goebbels, which he discovered on glass plates in Moscow. Irving offers a rounded, sometimes surprising picture of Goebbels, who loathed vulgar racism and anti-semitism. Goebbels' animosity against the Jews did not fully develop until the Jewish propaganda campaign began going full blast against Germany. Audio A138 / Video V112



As seen on "Donahue"

Smith's successful campaign to place revisionist ads in campus newspapers has created media uproars from Seattle to Miami

BRADLEY SMITH: In his trademark wry, soft-spoken manner, Smith recounts his recent adventures as America's foremost popularizer of Holocaust revisionism. He tells of his many radio and TV appearances (he calls his *Donahue* show appearance "flashy" but not really important) and his far-reaching "campus project" that has placed ads calling for open debate on the Holocaust in college and university newspapers across America. Smith explains his relationships with Washington DC Holocaust Museum historian Michael Berenbaum; the ADL's campus point-man, Jeffrey Ross; the Smith-obsessed Deborah Lipstadt; and a fellow named Curtis Whiteway, a onetime army sergeant who claims to have discovered a heretofore unknown Nazi death camp — only he forgets where it was! Audio A139 / Video V111



Swiss educator Graf reveals links between the Third World immigration invasion and Holocaust propaganda campaign

JÜRGEN GRAF: A Swiss revisionist offers a stinging critique of "multi-culturalism" propaganda in Europe. Initially, Graf says, he thought the main purpose of the Holocaust story was to extort reparations. Now he sees it as a ploy against the indigenous populations of Western countries by encouraging Third World immigration and silencing debate on racial policies. Furthermore, this continued focus on events (and non-events) of a half century ago keeps the populace distracted from present day problems. Even left wingers who oppose "anti-racist" restrictions on free speech are now being branded "racists" and "Nazis" by the popular press. Graf, a classics teacher, was suspended from his job by Swiss officials because he published a 112-page book criticizing the Holocaust story. Audio A136 / Video V110



Aerial photography expert Ball shows in slides how the famous wartime aerial photos of Auschwitz debunk The Myth

JOHN BALL: A professional geologist and air-photo-interpretation specialist leads the audience on a spellbinding slide tour of Eastern Europe during the Second World War. We look at reconnaissance photographs of Katyn, Babi Yar, and the concentration camps at Auschwitz and Majdanek — and even Plaszow of *Schindler's List* fame. Auschwitz aerial photos taken during the war reveal obvious retouching, evidently added in recent years to make the reconnaissance photographs conform more neatly to postwar mythology! Audio A135 / Video V109

**5 x 7-inch glossy photo of any speaker — \$10.
All 11 speakers — \$69**



Revisionist diplomat extraordinary Countess has traveled the world making new friends for revisionism and IHR

Dr. ROBERT COUNTESS: IHR's "Ambassador at Large" recalls his experiences as a college teacher (he made *The Hoax of the 20th Century* required reading), radio interviewee, and veteran critic of the exterminationist thesis. He proposes redefining the basic issue as: "The troubled Holocaust story — what remains for the rational mind to accept?" and suggests ways to get out the word about Holocaust revisionism. Audio A139 Video V113

You'll play these tapes again and again for friends and family. Order the complete set from this landmark IHR conference

AUDIO CASSETTES \$9.95 each

Set of 10 Twelfth Conference audiotapes in a handsome, durable cassette binder — \$69 (save \$30)
Enclose \$1 shipping for 1st audiotape, 50¢ per additional tape

VHS VIDEOTAPES \$29 each

(some videos include two speakers)

Set of 7 Twelfth Conference videos — \$129 (save \$74)

Highlights of the Twelfth Conference (VHS, 2 hrs.) — \$29

Enclose \$1.50 shipping for 1st video, \$1 per additional video
(All videos available in European PAL format. Add \$10 per tape)

Set of 5 x 7-inch glossy photos of all speakers—\$69

Check, Money Order, Visa and Mastercard accepted
California residents please add 7.75% sales tax

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

Post Office Box 2739
Newport Beach, California 92659

“A form of collective insanity is now sweeping Germany” Rudolf’s “Mystery Speaker” Statement

Germar Rudolf, the “mystery speaker” who was scheduled to address the Twelfth IHR Conference (Sept. 3-5, 1994), explained why he was regrettably not able to attend in the following statement, which was read to the Conference by Master of Ceremonies Greg Raven:

Usually the whole audience is eager to learn who the mystery speaker will be. This time, unfortunately, the IHR must deny you the satisfaction of seeing this mystery solved in person. For reasons that are, regrettably, not very mysterious, I am not able to appear for this Conference. I want to tell you the reasons for this, but to maintain some air of mystery, I will withhold my name for the time being. As I tell the story, perhaps one or more of will sooner or later guess my identity.

I don’t need to explain to you that Holocaust revisionists are subject to social ostracism, and in some countries even to criminal prosecution. Therefore, I do not need to go into the details of my own story, which is not so very different from that of others.

It began with my dismissal, without notice, from my position at the Max Planck Institute. Then came the refusal by the University of Stuttgart to allow me, at the completion of my studies, to stand for my doctoral examinations. After this came the first police search of my home, which involved seizing my computer, all my papers, my correspondence, and so forth, leading to my criminal indictment on a charge of “incitement of race hatred.” Just two weeks ago police from the prosecution attorney’s office again showed up at my door, confiscating my new computer, the printer, my address file, my calendar and planner, and much more.

The town I live in, not to be outdone, sent an official representative to my landlord to open his eyes to what an “evil” person he had been renting an apartment to. He was so intimidated that just recently, with all sorts of great regrets and numerous excuses, he threw us out — a happy event for both me and my wife in her ninth month of pregnancy. And all this happening under the cloud of a press campaign of lies against me that has gone on

since this spring.

But I am not one to complain, because I knew in advance what would await me — and I would do it all over again. After all, a German revisionist is not considered reliable and trustworthy unless he has undergone at least one house search! And whoever has not come before a German court at least once must be suspected of being an agent of the German “state security” counterpart of the old East Berlin *Stasi* [secret police].

Such blows of fate are worn like medals on the chest by German revisionists. Nevertheless, the most recent blows against me by our self-styled “government of justice” prevent me, for numerous reasons, from joining you as I had wished — to



Germar Rudolf at Auschwitz-Birkenau, taking samples from the ruins of the mortuary cellar room (the supposed “gas chamber”) of Crematory II.

report to you on the work going on in Europe in recent years. The publication of a written account of all our battles has also been greatly delayed by the same interference. I am certain, though, that Messrs. Graf, Mattogno and Faurisson will be able to give a sense of our activities, which I would like

to merely sketch out for you now.

If the district prosecuting attorney does not foul our plans again, an anthology will appear this year in Germany, a detailed study by a team of 13 authors of the most important aspects of the Holocaust story. In addition to an investigation of the purported gas chamber witnesses of Auschwitz, it will contain several legal studies, including critical examinations of Holocaust trials, among them one against an alleged perpetrator (Weise) and a "denier" (Lüftl). This anthology will also deal with the problem of statistics, through a comparison of two already-existing works (by Benz and Sanning). Also in this work will be critical treatments of documents, including the Wannsee Protocol, documents on "diesel gas wagons," and purported photo documentation. The technical portion of this anthology will include an analysis of aerial reconnaissance photos, the chemistry and architecture of a working gas chamber, a thermo-technical study of the claims of mass cremation, and analyses of the alleged diesel gassings and the purported mass burnings in the Treblinka camp. This detailed collective work will conclude with a look at the Babi Yar case, which involves many aspects of the work cited above.

But something is missing in this study. All our work up until now has aimed to show that things were not as portrayed. It was, in effect, "destructive" research. What we will need in the future is less carping about traditionalist portrayals of history, and much more work toward a holistic alternative. Our challenge must be to write a comprehensive history of the persecution of the Jews in the area ruled by the Third Reich: one that says not merely what did not happen, but above all tells what really did happen.

I do not know whether I will be able to tackle this very ambitious task in the near future, or even to coordinate it. Since the recent ominous conviction of Günter Deckert, chairman of the right-wing NPD party in Germany, it has become obvious to everyone that the German justice system is no longer truly independent [of political pressure]. A judge now knows that handing down a mild sentence against a revisionist means that he may be removed from the bench and socially ostracized. Germany's most respected daily newspaper, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, regards "incitement to ethnic hatred" as a much worse transgression when it occurs in an academic, scholarly guise. Our entire media and all our politicians sing a rare choral song of agreement that the Holocaust is in effect the foundation stone of the Federal Republic of Germany.

A form of collective insanity is now sweeping the country. It seems as if pyres and stakes are being set to fire, this time to burn Holocaust revisionists. I don't know where all this will end, but I do know

this: the truth may go under, but it cannot drown. In this spirit, I wish you all a pleasant and instructive time at this Conference.

Germer Rudolf's problems began in 1993 following the publication of his chemical-technical report about the supposed mass killing "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, and especially Auschwitz-Birkenau. He wrote this detailed report on the basis of an on-site investigation, chemical analyses of samples, and meticulous research.

"For chemical-physical reasons, the claimed mass gassings with hydrocyanic acid in the alleged 'gas chambers' in Auschwitz did not take place," he concluded. "The supposed facilities for mass killing in Auschwitz and Birkenau were not suitable for this purpose." The "Rudolf Report" corroborates and strengthens the findings of earlier forensic investigations of purported Auschwitz "gas chambers," including the one by American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter.

At the time he wrote this report, Rudolf — a certified chemist — was working at the renowned Max Planck research center in Stuttgart, and was a doctoral candidate at the University of Stuttgart. The "Rudolf Report" was published in 1993 in a handsome, 110-page, magazine-size glossy paper edition, with numerous photographs (several in color), charts, diagrams, and more than 200 reference notes. (For more, see the Nov.-Dec. 1993 Journal, pp. 25-26.)

Georgi K. Zhukov
From Moscow to Berlin
Marshal Zhukov's
Greatest Battles



The greatest Soviet commander tells how he directed the Red Army's bitter last-ditch defense of Moscow, master-minded the encirclement and defeat of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad, smashed the last great German counteroffensive of Kursk-Orel, and led the climatic assault on Hitler's Berlin. Must reading for every student of military history.

Hardcover, 304 pp., photos, maps, \$18.95, plus \$3 for shipping.

Available from
Institute for Historical Review

“The Iron Logic of Facts”

William Chamberlin: A Man Ahead of His Time

MARK WEBER

Adapted from the dedication address at the Twelfth IHR Conference, September 1994.

Every IHR Conference has been dedicated to the memory of an outstanding revisionist historian or writer, who, in his life and work, represents the ideals of the Institute for Historical Review. This Twelfth IHR Conference is no different, and we dedicate it to the memory of American journalist and revisionist historian William Henry Chamberlin.

Born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1897, and reared in Philadelphia, after high school and college education he went into journalism. Chamberlin's worldview as a young man was idealistic and strongly leftist. He was, in the words of one reference work, an “enthusiastic radical.” In 1922, at the age of 25, he was named correspondent in Russia of the daily *Christian Science Monitor*. Later he also served as Moscow correspondent of the liberal British daily *Manchester Guardian*.

It didn't take long, living in what many at the time liked to call the “first state of workers and peasants,” for Chamberlin to lose his wide-eyed enthusiasm for the Bolshevik experiment. Soon, and for the rest of his life — until his death in 1969 — he was a bitter opponent of Communism, and particularly of the form it took in Soviet Russia.

Beginning with *Soviet Russia*, a volume published in 1930, Chamberlin began writing books exposing what he regarded as the evil and fraud of Soviet Communism. His principal works about Russia in the early 1930s also included *The Soviet Planned Economic Order*, which appeared in 1931, and *Russia's Iron Age*, which came out in 1934.

Probably his most impressive work was *The Russian Revolution: 1917-1921*, a scholarly two-volume study first published in 1935. For years it remained the best single English-language work covering the overthrow of the Tsarist regime, the Bolshevik takeover, the Russian Civil War and the consolidation of Soviet power in Russia.

This masterful two volume study received widespread acclaim. Typical was the praise of the reviewer for *The New York Times*, who wrote:

Mr. Chamberlin's intimate knowledge of Soviet conditions, the soundness and fairness of his judgment, his intellectual integrity and courage, his ability to present his findings to the general public in an attractive form without sacrificing any of the essentials, the straightforward simplicity and charm of his style have received the recognition they deserve ... [These volumes] are no longer the work of Chamberlin the journalist, but of Chamberlin the historian. And in this new capacity Mr. Chamberlin succeeds in making a contribution of the highest order.

A tribute to the quality and durability of his scholarship, *The Russian Revolution* was reprinted in 1987 by Princeton University Press.

After twelve years of outstanding work as a journalist in Soviet Russia, in 1935 *The Christian Science Monitor* transferred him to the Far East, from where he reported until 1939, when he was transferred to France. Following the French declaration of war against Germany, and the subsequent German defeat and occupation of France, he returned to the United States.

Between 1937 and 1940 appeared additional books by Chamberlin, including *Collectivism: A False Utopia*, two acclaimed books about Japan, as well as a somewhat autobiographical work, *Confessions of an Individualist*. Chamberlin lectured on world affairs at Haverford College, Yale University and Harvard University, and during the early 1950s he wrote a regular column for the *Wall Street Journal*.

Along with many other thoughtful Americans, Chamberlin was disgusted by the role played by the United States in the Second World War. He gave eloquent and scathing voice to his bitterness about the hypocrisy of western Allied leaders in that terrible conflict, above all, President Franklin Roosevelt, in a book that was his most important work in the postwar period. Entitled, *America's Second Crusade*, this 372-page historical study, which was originally published in 1950 by Henry Regnery Company, has held up very well as an outstanding

work of revisionist scholarship. Harry Elmer Barnes praised it as “the ablest revisionist study of the background, course and results of the Second World War. It will long remain the best survey for the general reader.” [*America’s Second Crusade* is available from the IHR for \$10.50, postpaid.]

The past, as they say, is prologue, and an attentive reading of *America’s Second Crusade* helps provide an understanding of the same arrogant and self-deluding thinking that is manifest in the eagerness of recent American presidents to use military might in foreign adventures, and, in the process, spend billions of the American people’s money and take the lives of many young American men.

We see this thinking in the recent and misguided attempts by American presidents to impose, by military force, currently fashionable notions of democracy and equality in such far-flung lands as Somalia, Bosnia and Haiti. If ever an understanding of history can tell us something about the future, it should be in such cases. To anyone with even a superficial awareness of 20th



William Chamberlin

century history, the notion, for example — which President Clinton seems to hold — that the United States military can somehow impose what we call “democracy” in a place like Haiti is obvious idiocy.

Chamberlin opens *America’s Second Crusade* with the words: “Americans, more than any other people, have been inclined to interpret their involvement in the two great wars of the twentieth century in terms of crusades for righteousness.” In the pages that follow, Chamberlin deftly and devastatingly tears apart the folly of such arrogance. He exposes the mendacity of American leaders such as Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, the fraud of the Nuremberg trials, and the hypocrisy and bad faith of the Allied leaders in their Second World War “crusade.”

It is all the more appropriate that we remember Chamberlin because today it is glaringly obvious that his was a voice of warning years ahead of its time. The collapse of Communism in Russia and eastern and central Europe in recent years has thoroughly exposed the basic bankruptcy and fraud of this great historical experiment in fashioning an international, egalitarian society.

Only now are a few members of America’s supposedly enlightened and progressive academic elite beginning to search their souls to consider what all this means. One such person is Eugene Genovese,

who for years has been one of America’s most prominent historians. For five years as a young man he was a member of the Communist Party and, later, in his own words, “a supporter of the international [Communist] movement and of the Soviet Union until there was nothing left to support.”

In a remarkable essay in the summer 1994 issue of the leftist journal *Dissent*, which has caused some comment around the country (including a full page article in *Time* magazine, August 22, 1994), Genovese boldly accuses his fellow leftist scholars of bearing some of the responsibility for the terrible suffering and oppression, death and misery of Communism. He accuses these academics of the political left of complicity in the greatest mass murders of the 20th century — and perhaps of any century.

Unlike many others on the left who still regard the so-called ideals of Marxism as essentially valid, and blame Stalin or other individuals for supposedly distorting these principles, Genovese contends that the “ideal” of Communism itself is terribly wrong. He points out:

The horrors did not arise from perversions of radical ideology but from the ideology itself. We were led into complicity with mass murder and the desecration of our professed ideals not by Stalinist or other corruptions of high ideals, much less by unfortunate twists in some presumably objective course of historical development, but by a deep flaw in our understanding of human nature — its frailty and its possibilities — and by our inability to replace the moral and ethical baseline long provided by the religion we have dismissed with indifference, not to say contempt.

Our whole project of “human liberation” has rested on a series of gigantic illusions. The catastrophic consequences of our failure during this century — not merely the body count but the monotonous recurrence of despotism and wanton cruelty — cannot be dismissed as aberrations ... They have followed in the wake of victories by radical egalitarian movements throughout history. We have yet to answer our right-wing critics’ claims, which are regrettably well documented, that throughout history, from ancient times to the peasant wars of the sixteenth century to the Reign of Terror and beyond, social movements that have espoused radical egalitarianism and participatory democracy have begun with mass murder and ended with despotism.

As it turned out, Communism proved to be much more terrible than all but a tiny number realized. And yet, for years America’s intellectual and cultural elite routinely vilified staunch anti-Comm-

nists as McCarthyites, political Neanderthals, reactionaries, bigots, and so forth. The view of Communism and anti-Communism that prevailed among liberal, supposedly “enlightened” Americans during the 1930s and 1940s was perhaps best summed up by Arnold Forster, for many years a top official of the mis-named Anti-Defamation League. In his revealing memoir, *Square One* (p. 171), Forster wrote: “The civilized world was more revolted by McCarthyism than by Communism.” [Also quoted in a review in the Nov.-Dec. 1993 *Journal*, p. 42.]

Contributing to the great deception were such writers as Walter Duranty, *The New York Times* correspondent in Soviet Russia, who provided readers of America’s most influential daily paper with intentionally deceitful reports about the reality of the Soviet regime. In 1933, during the height of the state-induced mass famine in Ukraine, Duranty assured *Times* readers that “there is not actual starvation or deaths from starvation ...”

At this very same time, Chamberlin was one of the few western journalists in Moscow who tried to provide truthful reporting about the imposed famine. However, it was Duranty who was awarded the Pulitzer prize for his deceitful reporting, while Chamberlin was castigated. Because of his factual reporting about the Soviet reality, William Chamberlin was, as historian Robert Conquest has put it (in *Harvest of Sorrow*, p. 321), “under continuous and violent attack by pro-Communist elements in the West over the next generation.”

Finally, it is appropriate that we remember William Henry Chamberlin because the school of historical revisionism that he and others once represented has been shamefully abandoned by what passes for intellectual “conservatism” in America today, particularly the so-called “neo-conservative” movement.

Chamberlin concludes *America’s Second Crusade* with these words: “The point of view set forth in this book will challenge powerful intellectual and emotional interests, but the iron logic of facts will, I believe, confirm these interpretations with the passing of time.”


This sentiment applies with equal validity to the work of the IHR. Just as it took decades for the revisionist views of men such as Chamberlin about Communism to become generally accepted, so also will it take time for Chamberlin’s revisionist, dissident views about the Second World War, and other issues, to become generally accepted. Ultimately, though, as William Henry Chamberlin put it, the “iron logic of facts” will prevail.

“The point of view set forth in this book will challenge powerful intellectual and emotional interests, but the iron logic of facts will, I believe, confirm these interpretations with the passing of time.”

—WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

“The ablest revisionist study of the background, causes, course, and results of the Second World War. It will long remain the best survey of the subject for the general reader. Mr. Chamberlin’s long and close contact with world conditions gives him special competence to assess the effects of the Roosevelt foreign policy upon the state of the world in our time.” —HARRY ELMER BARNES

As Chamberlin points out in his opening to *America’s Second Crusade*, “Americans, more than any other people, have been inclined to interpret their involvement in the two great wars of the twentieth century in terms of crusades for righteousness.” Then in the pages that follow, he deftly and devastatingly tears apart the folly of such arrogance, exposing the mendacity of American leaders such as



and Franklin Roosevelt, the fraud of the Nuremberg Trials, and the rank hypocrisy and bad faith of the Allied leaders in their Second World War “crusade.”

Chamberlin, award-winning journalist and historian of the Russian Revolution, takes an early, critical look at the consequences of America’s bent for self-righteous moralizing during and after World War II.

The past, as they say, is prologue, and *America’s Second Crusade* describes the same arrogant and self-deluding thinking manifest in the eagerness of recent American presidents to use US might in foreign military adventures and, in the process, waste billions of taxpayer dollars and sacrifice the lives of young American men.

America’s Second Crusade has stood the test of time as an outstanding work of revisionist scholarship.

America’s Second Crusade

by WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN
Quality Softcover • 372 pages • \$10.50 postpaid

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

How Franklin Roosevelt Lied America Into War

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Excerpted from the anthology Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace, pp. 485-491.

According to his own official statements, repeated on many occasions, and with special emphasis when the presidential election of 1940 was at stake, Franklin D. Roosevelt's policy after the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939 was dominated by one overriding thought: how to keep the United States at peace. One of the President's first actions after the beginning of hostilities was to call Congress into special session and ask for the repeal of the embargo on the sales of arms to belligerent powers, which was part of the existing neutrality legislation. He based his appeal on the argument that this move would help to keep the United States at peace. His words on the subject were:

Let no group assume the exclusive label of the "peace bloc." We all belong to it ... I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today ... Our acts must be guided by one single, hardheaded thought — keeping America out of the war.

This statement was made after the President had opened up a secret correspondence with Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty and later Prime Minister in the British government. What has been revealed of this correspondence, even in Churchill's own memoirs, inspires considerable doubt as to whether its main purpose was keeping America out of the war.

Roosevelt kept up his pose as the devoted champion of peace even after the fall of France, when Great Britain was committed to a war which, given the balance of power in manpower and industrial resources, it could not hope to win without the involvement of other great powers, such as the United States and the Soviet Union. The President's pledges of pursuing a policy designed to keep the

United States at peace reached a shrill crescendo during the last days of the 1940 campaign.

Mr. Roosevelt said at Boston on October 30: "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

The same thought was expressed in a speech at Brooklyn on November 1: "I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars. And I will keep on fighting."

The President told his audience at Rochester, New York, on November 2: "Your national government ... is equally a government of peace — a government that intends to retain peace for the American people."

On the same day the voters of Buffalo were assured: "Your President says this country is not going to war."

And he declared at Cleveland on November 3: "The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war."

So much for presidential words. What about presidential actions? American involvement in war with Germany was preceded by a long series of steps, not one of which could reasonably be represented as conducive to the achievement of the President's professed ideal of keeping the United States out of foreign wars. The more important of these steps may be briefly listed as follows:

1. The exchange of American destroyers for British bases in the Caribbean and in Newfoundland in September, 1940.

This was a clear departure from the requirements of neutrality and was also a violation of some specific American laws. Indeed, a conference of top government lawyers at the time decided that the destroyer deal put this country into the war, legally and morally.

2. The enactment of the Lend-Lease Act in March, 1941.

In complete contradiction of the wording and intent of the Neutrality Act, which remained on the statute books, this made the United States an unlimited partner in the economic war against the Axis Powers all over the world.

3. The secret American-British staff talks in Washington in January-March, 1941.

Extraordinary care was taken to conceal not only the contents of these talks but the very fact that they were taking place from the knowledge of Congress. At the time when administration spokesmen were offering assurances that there were no warlike implications in the Lend-Lease Act, this staff conference used the revealing phrase, "when the United States becomes involved in war with Germany."

4. The inauguration of so-called naval patrols, the purpose of which was to report the presence of German submarines to British warships, in the Atlantic in April, 1941.

5. The dispatch of American laborers to Northern Ireland to build a naval base, obviously with the needs of an American expeditionary force in mind.

6. The occupation of Iceland by American troops in July, 1941. This was going rather far afield for a government which professed as its main concern the keeping of the United States out of foreign wars.

7. The Atlantic Conference of Roosevelt and Churchill, August 9-12, 1941.

Besides committing America as a partner in a virtual declaration of war aims, this conference considered the presentation of an ultimatum to Japan and the occupation of the Cape Verde Islands, a Portuguese possession, by United States troops.

8. The orders to American warships to shoot at sight at German submarines, formally announced on September 11.

The beginning of actual hostilities may be dated from this time rather than from the German declaration of war, which followed Pearl Harbor.

9. The authorization for the arming of merchant ships and the sending of these ships into war zones in November, 1941.

10. The freezing of Japanese assets in the United States on July 25, 1941.

This step, which was followed by similar action on the part of Great Britain and the Netherlands East Indies, amounted to a commercial blockade of Japan. The warmaking potentialities of this decision had been recognized by Roosevelt himself shortly before it was taken. Addressing a delegation and explaining why oil exports to Japan had not been stopped previously, he said:

It was very essential, from our own selfish point of view of defense, to prevent a war from starting in the South Pacific. So our foreign policy was trying to stop a war from breaking out down there.... Now, if we cut the oil off, they [the Japanese] probably would have gone down to the Netherlands East Indies a year ago, and we would have had war.

11. When the Japanese Prime Minister, Prince Fumimaro Konoye, appealed for a personal meeting with Roosevelt to discuss an amicable settlement in the Pacific, this appeal was rejected, despite the strong favorable recommendations of the American ambassador to Japan, Joseph C. Grew.

12. Final step on the road to war in the Pacific was Secretary of State Hull's note to the Japanese government of November 26. Before sending this communication Hull had considered proposing a compromise formula which would have relaxed the blockade of Japan in return for Japanese withdrawal from southern Indochina and a limitation of Japanese forces in northern Indochina.

However, Hull dropped this idea under pressure from British and Chinese sources. He dispatched a veritable ultimatum on November 26, which demanded unconditional Japanese withdrawal from China and from Indochina and insisted that there should be "no support of any government in China other than the National government [Chiang Kai-shek]." Hull admitted that this note took Japanese-American relations out of the realm of diplomacy and placed them in the hands of the military authorities.

The negative Japanese reply to this note was delivered almost simultaneously with the attack on Pearl Harbor. There was a strange and as yet unexplained failure to prepare for this attack by giving General Short and Admiral Kimmel, commanders on the spot, a clear picture of the imminent danger. As Secretary of War Stimson explained the American policy, it was to maneuver the Japanese into firing the first shot, and it may have been feared that openly precautionary and defensive moves on the part of Kimmel and Short would scare off the impending attack by the Japanese task force which was known to be on its way to some American outpost.

Here is the factual record of the presidential words and the presidential deeds. No convinced believer in American nonintervention in wars outside this hemisphere could have given the American people more specific promises than Roosevelt gave during his campaign of 1940. And it is hard to see how any President, given the constitutional limitations of the office, could have done more to precipitate the United States into war with Germany and Japan than Roosevelt accomplished during the 15 months between the destroyer-for-bases deal and the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce found the right expression when she charged Roosevelt with having lied us into war. Even a sympathizer with Roosevelt's policies, Professor Thomas A. Bailey, in his book, *The Man in the Street*, admits the charge of deception, but tries to justify it

on the following grounds:

Franklin Roosevelt repeatedly deceived the American people during the period before Pearl Harbor ... He was like the physician who must tell the patient lies for the patient's own good ... The country was overwhelmingly non-interventionist to the very day of Pearl Harbor, and an overt attempt to lead the people into war would have resulted in certain failure and an almost certain ousting of Roosevelt in 1940, with a complete defeat of his ultimate aims.

Professor Bailey continues his apologetics with the following argument, which leaves very little indeed of the historical American conception of a government responsible to the people and morally obligated to abide by the popular will:

A president who cannot entrust the people with the truth betrays a certain lack of faith in the basic tenets of democracy. But because the masses are notoriously shortsighted and generally cannot see danger until it is at their throats, our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long-run interests. This is clearly what Roosevelt had to do, and who shall say that posterity will not thank him for it?

Presidential pledges to "keep our country out of war," with which Roosevelt was so profuse in the summer and autumn of 1940, could reasonably be regarded as canceled by some new development in the international situation involving a real and urgent threat to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

But there was no such new development to justify Roosevelt's moves along the road to war in 1941. The British Isles were not invaded in 1940, at the height of Hitler's military success on the Continent. They were much more secure against invasion in 1941. Contrast the scare predications of Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and General Marshall, about the impending invasion of Britain in the first months of 1941, with the testimony of Winston Churchill, as set down in his memoirs: "I did not regard invasion as a serious danger in April, 1941, since proper preparations had been made against it."

Moreover, both the American and British governments knew at this time that Hitler was contemplating an early attack upon the Soviet Union. Such an attack was bound to swallow up much the greater part of Germany's military resources.

It is with this background that one must judge the sincerity and realism of Roosevelt's alarmist speech of May 27, 1941, with its assertion: "The war is approaching the brink of the western hemisphere

itself. It is coming very close to home." The President spoke of the Nazi "book of world conquest" and declared there was a Nazi plan to treat the Latin American countries as they had treated the Balkans. Then Canada and the United States would be strangled.

Not a single serious bit of evidence in proof of these sensational allegations has ever been found, not even when the archives of the Nazi government were at the disposal of the victorious powers. The threat to the security of Great Britain was less serious in 1941 than it was in 1940. There is no concrete evidence of Nazi intention to invade the American hemisphere in either year, or at any predictable period.

One is left, therefore, with the inescapable conclusion that the promises to "keep America out of foreign wars" were a deliberate hoax on the American people, perpetrated for the purpose of insuring Roosevelt's re-election and thereby enabling him to proceed with his plan of gradually edging the United States into war.

Debunking the Churchill Myth Two Iconoclastic Books

CHURCHILL'S WAR: The Struggle for Power, by David Irving. Savage debunking of the Winston Churchill myth by the world's most widely read Revisionist historian. Working as usual from rare primary sources, Irving reveals a Churchill far removed from the carefully constructed legend served up for popular consumption: a drunkard, a blustering coward, and in the pay of non-British interests. Hardcover, 665 pages, \$39.95 + \$4 shipping.

TEN DAYS TO DESTINY: The Secret Story of the Hess Peace Initiative and British Efforts to Strike a Deal with Hitler, by John Costello. The British historian establishes that British Intelligence lured Rudolf Hess into making his fateful May 1941 peace flight, and that members of Churchill's own cabinet and the Royal family sought peace with Hitler. Costello also documents underhanded and illegal efforts by FDR and Churchill to bring the USA into the war. Only Churchill's insistence on continuing the war, says Costello, prevented the conclusion of peace between Britain and Germany in the summer of 1940. Hardcover, 600 pages, \$24.95 + \$3 shipping.

Both titles available from IHR
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

California residents add 7.75% sales tax

America's "Second Crusade" in Retrospect

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Excerpted from the concluding chapter of America's Second Crusade, pp. 337-353.

America's Second Crusade belongs to history. Was it a success? Over two hundred thousand Americans perished in combat and almost six hundred thousand were wounded. There was the usual crop of postwar crimes attributable to shock and maladjustment after combat experience. There was an enormous depletion of American natural resources in timber, oil, iron ore, and other metals. The nation emerged from the war with a staggering and probably unredeemable debt in the neighborhood of one quarter of a *trillion* dollars. Nothing comparable to this burden has ever been known in American history.

Were these human and material losses justified or unavoidable? From the military standpoint, of course, the crusade was a victory. The three Axis nations were completely crushed. American power on land and at sea, in the air and in the factory assembly line, was an indispensable contribution to this defeat.

But war is not a sporting competition, in which victory is an end in itself. It can only be justified as a means to achieve desirable positive ends or to ward off an intolerable and unmistakable threat to national security. When one asks for the fruits of victory five years after the end of the war, the answers sound hollow and unconvincing.

Consider first the results of the war in terms of America's professed war aims: the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. Here surely the failure has been complete and indisputable. Wilson failed to make his Fourteen Points prevail in the peace settlements after World War I. But his failure might be considered a brilliant success when one surveys the abyss that yawns between the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms and the realities of the postwar world.

After World War I there were some reasonably honest plebiscites, along with some arbitrary and unjust territorial arrangements. But the customary method of changing frontiers after World War II was to throw the entire population out bag and baggage

— and with very little baggage.

No war in history has killed so many people and left such a legacy of miserable, uprooted, destitute, dispossessed human beings. Some fourteen million Germans and people of German stock were driven from the part of Germany east of the Oder-Neisse line, from the Sudeten area of Czechoslovakia, and from smaller German settlements in Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania.

Millions of Poles were expelled from the territory east of the so-called Curzon Line and resettled in other parts of Poland, including the provinces stolen from Germany. Several hundred thousand Finns fled from parts of Finland seized by the Soviet Union in its two wars of aggression. At least a million East Europeans of various nationalities — Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Yugoslavs, Letts, Lithuanians, Estonians — became refugees from Soviet territorial seizures and Soviet tyranny.

Not one of the drastic surgical operations on Europe's boundaries was carried out in free consultation with the people affected. There can be no reasonable doubt that every one of these changes would have been rejected by an overwhelming majority in an honestly conducted plebiscite.

The majority of the people in eastern Poland and the Baltic states did not wish to become Soviet citizens. Probably not one person in a hundred in East Prussia, Silesia, and other ethnically German territories favored the substitution of Polish or Soviet for German rule. What a mockery, then, has been made of the first three clauses of the Atlantic Charter: "no territorial aggrandizement," "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

The other clauses have fared no better. The restrictions imposed on German and Japanese industry, trade, and shipping cannot be reconciled with the promise "to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world."

The terrific war destruction and the vindictive



President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill sing “Onward Christian Soldiers” during their August 10, 1941, meeting on board a British battleship anchored off of Newfoundland.

In the great conflict then raging between Germany and the other Axis nations, on one side, and the British Empire and Soviet Russia, on the other, the United States was officially still neutral. Nevertheless, and violating both international law and repeated pledges to the American people, Roosevelt had already plunged the United States into the war. At this meeting he publicly committed the US to “the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny.” Just weeks earlier, and on his order, US forces had occupied Iceland.

At this meeting Roosevelt and Churchill announced the “Atlantic Charter,” which proclaimed “the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live.” The Allied leaders were never sincere about such pledges. Britain was already violating it in the case of India and other imperial dominions, and later Roosevelt and Churchill would betray it in the case of Poland, Hungary and other European nations.

peace have certainly not helped to secure “for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security.”

In the year 1950, five years after the end of the Second Crusade, “all men in all lands” are not living “out their lives in freedom from fear and want.” Nor are “all men traversing the high seas and oceans without hindrance.”

The eighth and last clause of the Atlantic Charter holds out the prospect of lightening “for peace-

loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.” But this burden has become more crushing than it was before the crusade took place. The “peace-loving peoples” have been devoting ever larger shares of their national incomes to preparations for war.

All in all, the promises of the Charter seem to have evaporated in a wraith of Atlantic mist.

Nor have the Four Freedoms played any appreciable part in shaping the postwar world. These, it may be recalled, were freedom of speech and expres-

sion, freedom of religion, and freedom from fear and want. But one of the main consequences of the war was a vast expansion of Communist power in eastern Europe and in East Asia. It can hardly be argued that this has contributed to greater freedom of speech, expression, and religion, or, for that matter, to freedom from want and fear.

The fate of Cardinal Mindzenty, of Archbishop Stepinac, of the Protestant leaders in Hungary, of the many priests who have been arrested and murdered in Soviet satellite states, of independent political leaders and dissident Communists in these states, offers eloquent testimony to the contrary.

In short, there is not the slightest visible relation between the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms and the kind of world that has emerged after the war. Woodrow Wilson put up a struggle for his Fourteen Points. There is no evidence that Franklin D. Roosevelt offered any serious objection to the many violations of his professed war aims.

It may, of course, be argued that the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms were unessential window dressing, that the war was not a crusade at all, but a matter of self-defense and national survival. However, there is no proof that Germany and Japan had worked out, even on paper, any scheme for the invasion of the American continent.

In his alarmist broadcast of May 27, 1941, Roosevelt declared:

Your Government knows what terms Hitler, if victorious, would impose. I am not speculating about all this ... They plan to treat the Latin American countries as they are now treating the Balkans. They plan then to strangle the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada.

But this startling accusation was never backed up by concrete proof. No confirmation was found even when the Nazi archives were at the disposal of the victorious powers. There has been gross exaggeration of the supposed close co-operation of the Axis powers. General George C. Marshall points this out in his *Report on the Winning of the War in Europe and the Pacific* [Simon & Schuster, pp. 1-3], published after the end of the war. This report, based on American intelligence reports and on interrogation of captured German commanders, contains the following statements:

No evidence has yet been found that the German High Command had any over-all strategic plan ...

When Italy entered the war Mussolini's strategic aims contemplated the expansion of his empire under the cloak of German military success. Field Marshal Keitel reveals that Italy's declaration of war was contrary to her

agreement with Germany. Both Keitel and Jodl agree that it was undesired ...

Nor is there evidence of close strategic coordination between Germany and Japan. The German General Staff recognized that Japan was bound by the neutrality pact with Russia but hoped that the Japanese would tie down strong British and American land, sea and air forces in the Far East.

In the absence of any evidence so far to the contrary, it is believed that Japan also acted unilaterally and not in accordance with a unified strategic plan.

Not only were the European partners of the Axis unable to coordinate their plans and resources and agree within their own nations how best to proceed, but the eastern partner, Japan, was working in even greater discord. *The Axis as a matter of fact existed on paper only.* [Italics supplied.]

So, in the judgment of General Marshall, the Axis did not represent a close-knit league, with a clear-cut plan for achieving world domination, including the subjugation of the American continent. It was a loose association of powers with expansionist aims in Europe and the Far East.

Of course the United States had no alternative except to fight after Pearl Harbor and the German and Italian declarations of war. But the Pearl Harbor attack, in all probability, would never have occurred if the United States had been less inflexible in upholding the cause of China. Whether this inflexibility was justified, in the light of subsequent developments in China, is highly questionable, to say the least.

The diplomatic prelude to Pearl Harbor also includes such fateful American decisions as the imposition of a virtual commercial blockade on Japan in July 1941, the cold-shouldering of Prince Konoye's overtures, and the failure, at the critical moment, to make any more constructive contribution to avoidance of war than Hull's bleak note of November 26.

The war with Germany was also very largely the result of the initiative of the Roosevelt Administration. The destroyer deal, the lend-lease bill, the freezing of Axis assets, the injection of the American Navy, with much secrecy and double-talk, into the Battle of the Atlantic: these and many similar actions were obvious departures from neutrality, even though a Neutrality Act, which the President had sworn to uphold, was still on the statute books.

It is sometimes contended that the gradual edging of the United States into undeclared war was justified because German and Japanese victory would have threatened the security and well-being of the United States, even if no invasion of this

hemisphere was contemplated. This argument would be easier to sustain if the war had been fought, not as a crusade of "a free world against a slave world," but as a cold-blooded attempt to restore and maintain a reasonable balance of power in Europe and in Asia.

Had America's prewar and war diplomacy kept this objective in mind, some of the graver blunders of the Second Crusade would have been avoided. Had it been observed as a cardinal principle of policy that Soviet totalitarianism was just as objectionable morally and more dangerous politically and psychologically than the German and Japanese brands, the course of American policy would surely have been different. There would have been more favorable consideration for the viewpoint artlessly expressed by Senator Truman when he suggested that we should support Russia when Germany was winning and Germany when Russia was winning.

It was the great dilemma of the war that we could not count on winning the war without Russia and certainly could not hope to win the peace with Russia. But there was at least a partial solution for this dilemma. One of the ablest men associated with the American diplomatic service suggested this to me in a private conversation: "We should have made peace with Germany and Japan when they were too weak to be a threat to us and still strong enough to be useful partners in a coalition against the Soviet Union."

But such realism was at a hopeless discount in a crusading atmosphere. The effect of America's policy was to create a huge power vacuum in Europe and in Asia, and to leave the Soviet Union the one strong military power in both these continents. Then the United States belatedly began to offer resistance when the Soviet leaders acted precisely as anyone might have expected them to act in view of their political record and philosophy.

An old friend whom I met in Paris in 1946, a shrewd and witty British journalist, offered the following estimate of the situation which followed the Second Crusade: "You know, Hitler really won this war — in the person of Stalin."

President Roosevelt declared in his speech of May 27, 1941: "We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom from want and freedom from terrorism." The war into which he was steadily and purposefully steering his country was apparently supposed to assure such a world.

The argument that "we cannot live in a totalitarian world" carried weight with many Americans who were not impressed by lurid pictures of the Germans (who were never able to cross the narrow English Channel) suddenly frog-leaping the Atlantic and overrunning the United States. Both in the hectic days of 1940-41 and in the cooler retrospect of

1950 it seems clear that a Nazi Germany, dominant in Europe, and a militarist Japan, extending its hegemony in Asia, would be unpleasant neighbors and would impose disagreeable changes in the American way of life.

It could plausibly be argued that in such a world we should have to assume a heavy permanent burden of armament, that we should have to keep a constant alert for subversive agents, that our trade would be forced into distorted patterns. We would be exposed to moral corruption and to the erosion of our ideals of liberty because the spectacle of armed might trampling on right would be contagious.

These dangers of totalitarianism were real enough. But it was a disastrous fallacy to imagine that these dangers could be exorcised by waging war and making peace in such fashion that the power of another totalitarian state, the Soviet Union, would be greatly enhanced.

Failure to foresee the aggressive and disintegrating role which a victorious Soviet Union might be expected to play in a smashed and ruined Europe and Asia was the principal blunder of America's crusading interventionists. Those who secretly or openly sympathized with communism were at least acting logically. But the majority erred out of sheer ignorance and wishful thinking about Soviet motives and intentions. They were guilty of a colossal error in judgment and perspective, and almost unpardonable error in view of the importance of the issues at stake.

After Pearl Harbor and the German declaration of war, the United States, of course, had a stake in the success of the Red Army. This, however, does not justify the policy of one-sided appeasement which was followed at Teheran and Yalta.

If one looks farther back, before America's hands were tied diplomatically by involvement in the conflict, there was certainly no moral or political obligation for the United States and other western powers to defend the Soviet Union against possible attacks from Germany and Japan. The most hopeful means of dealing with the totalitarian threat would have been for the western powers to have maintained a hands-off policy in eastern Europe.

In this case the two totalitarian regimes might have been expected to shoot it out to their hearts' content. But advocates of such an elementary common-sense policy were vilified as appeasers, fascist sympathizers, and what not. The repeated indications that Hitler's ambitions were Continental, not overseas, that he desired and intended to move toward the east, not toward the west, were overlooked.

Even after what General Deane called "the strange alliance" had been concluded, there was room for maneuvering. We could have been as aloof

toward Stalin as Stalin was toward us. There is adequate evidence available that the chance of negotiating a reasonable peace with a non-Nazi German government would have justified an attempt, but the "unconditional surrender" formula made anything of this sort impossible. With a blind optimism that now seems amazing and fantastic, the men responsible for the conduct of American foreign policy staked everything on the improbable assumption that the Soviet Government would be a cooperative do-gooder in an ideal postwar world.

The publicist Randolph Bourne, a caustic and penetrating critic of American participation in its First Crusade, observed that war is like a wild elephant. It carries the rider where it wishes to go, not where he may wish to go.

Now the crusade has ended. We have the perspective of five years of uneasy peace. And the slogan, "We are fighting so that we will not have to live in a totalitarian world," stands exposed in all its tragic futility. For what kind of world are we living in today? It is not very much like the world we could have faced if the crusade had never taken place, if Hitler had been allowed to go eastward, if Germany had dominated eastern Europe and Japan eastern Asia? Is there not a "This is where we came in" atmosphere, very reminiscent of the time when there was constant uneasy speculation as to where the next expansionist move would take place. The difference is that Moscow has replaced Berlin and Tokyo. There is one center of dynamic aggression instead of two, with the concentration of power in that one center surpassing by far that of the German-Japanese combination. And for two reasons their difference is for the worse, not for the better.

First, one could probably have counted on rifts and conflicts of interest between Germany and Japan which are less likely to arise in Stalin's centralized empire. Second, Soviet expansion is aided by propaganda resources which were never matched by the Nazis and the Japanese.

How does it stand with those ideals which were often invoked by advocates of the Second Crusade? What about "orderly processes in international relations," to borrow a phrase from Cordell Hull, or international peace and security in general? Does the present size of our armaments appropriation suggest confidence in an era of peace and good will? Is it not pretty much the kind of appropriation we would have found necessary if there had been no effort to destroy Nazi and Japanese power?

Secret agents of foreign powers? We need not worry about Nazis or Japanese. But the exposure of a dangerously effective Soviet spy ring in Canada, the proof that Soviet agents had the run of confidential State Department papers, the piecemeal revelations of Soviet espionage in this country during the

war — all these things show that the same danger exists from another source.

Moral corruption? We have acquiesced in and sometimes promoted some of the most outrageous injustices in history: the mutilation of Poland, the uprooting of millions of human beings from their homes, the use of slave labor after the war. If we would have been tainted by the mere existence of the evil features of the Nazi system, are we not now tainted by the widespread prevalence of a very cruel form of slavery in the Soviet Union?

Regimentation of trade? But how much free trade is there in the postwar world? This conception has been ousted by an orgy of exchange controls, bilateral commercial agreements, and other devices for damming and diverting the free stream of international commerce.

Justice for oppressed peoples? Almost every day there are news dispatches from eastern Europe indicating how conspicuously this ideal was not realized.

The totalitarian regimes against which America fought have indeed been destroyed. But a new and more dangerous threat emerged in the very process of winning the victory. The idea that we would eliminate the totalitarian menace to peace and freedom while extending the dominion of the Hammer and Sickle has been proved a humbug, a hoax, and a pitiful delusion.

Looking back over the diplomatic history of the war, one can identify ten major blunders which contributed very much to the unfavorable position in which the western powers find themselves today. These may be listed as follows:

(1) The guarantee of "all support in their power" which the British Government gave to Poland "in the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence." This promise, hastily given on March 31, 1939, proved impossible to keep. It was of no benefit to the Poles in their unequal struggle against the German invasion. It was not regarded as applicable against Russia when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied eastern Poland, with the full understanding and complicity of Hitler.

All this ill-advised guarantee accomplished was to put Great Britain and France into war against Germany, to the great satisfaction of Stalin, for an objective which the western powers could not win. Poland was not freed even after the United States entered the war and Hitler was crushed. It was only subjected to a new tyranny, organized and directed from Moscow.

There is no proof and little probability that Hitler would have attacked the west if he had not been challenged on the Polish issue. The guarantee, more than any other single action, spoiled the best politi-

cal opportunity the western powers possessed in 1939. This was to canalize German expansion eastward and to keep war out of the West.

(2) The failure of the American Government to accept Konoye's overtures for a negotiated settlement of differences in the Far East. The futility of the crusade for China to which the American Government committed itself becomes constantly more clear.

(3) The "unconditional surrender" slogan which Roosevelt tossed off at Casablanca in January 1943. This was a godsend to Goebbels and a tremendous blow to the morale and effectiveness of the underground groups which were working against Hitler. It weakened the American and British position in relation to Russia, since Stalin did not associate himself with the demand. It stiffened and prolonged German resistance.



Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin at the February 1945 Yalta Conference. At this meeting, the Allied coalition leaders decided the fate of millions of people around the world.

(4) The policy of "getting along" with Stalin on a basis of all-out appeasement. The Soviet dictator was given everything he wanted in the way of munitions and supplies and was asked for nothing in return, not even an honest fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter, of which he was a cosignatory. The disastrous bankruptcy of this policy is evident from one look at the geographical, political, and moral map of the world today.

(5) Failure to invade the Balkans, as Churchill repeatedly urged. This mistake was the result partly of the policy of appeasing Stalin and partly of the narrowly military conception of the war which dominated the thinking of the War Department. There was a tendency to regard the war as a kind of bigger football game, in which victory was all that mattered.

(6) The public endorsement by Roosevelt and Churchill in September 1944 of the preposterous Morgenthau Plan for the economic destruction of Germany. To be sure, the full extravagance of this scheme was never put into practice, but enough of its vindictive destructionist spirit got into the Potsdam Declaration and the regulations for Military Government to work very great harm to American national interests and European recovery.

(7) The bribing of Stalin, at China's expense, to enter the Far Eastern war and the failure to make clear, until the last moment, that unconditional surrender, for Japan, did not mean the elimination of the Emperor. These were grave mistakes, fraught with fateful consequences for American political interests in the Orient. Had the danger from Russia, the undependability of China, and the desirability of enlisting Japan as a satellite ally been intelligently appreciated, a balance of power far more favorable to the United States would now exist in East Asia.

(8) The failure, for political reasons, to exploit the military opportunities which opened up in the last weeks of the struggle in Europe, notably the failure to press on and seize Berlin and Prague. Closely linked with this error was the failure to insist on direct land access to Berlin in the negotiations about the postwar occupation of Germany.

(9) The persistent tendency to disregard the advice of experts and specialists, and base American foreign policy on "hunches" inspired by amateurs and dilettantes. Conspicuous examples of unfitness in high places were Harry Hopkins as adviser on Russia, Edward R. Stettinius as Secretary of State, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., as policy framer on Germany, and Edwin W. Pauley as Reparations Commissioner. A parallel mistake was the laxness which permitted American and foreign Communist sympathizers to infiltrate the OWI, OSS, and other important strategic agencies.

(10) The hasty launching, amid much exaggerated ballyhoo, of the United Nations. The new organization was not given either a definite peace settlement to sustain or the power which would have made it an effective mediator and arbiter in disputes between great powers. It was as if an architect should create an elaborate second story of a building, complete with balconies, while neglecting to lay a firm foundation.

These were unmistakable blunders which no future historical revelations can justify or explain away. In these blunders one finds the answer to the question why complete military victory, in the Second Crusade as in the First, was followed by such complete political frustration. Perhaps the supreme irony of the war's aftermath is that the United States becomes increasingly dependent on the good

will and co-operation of the peoples against whom it waged a war of political and economic near extermination, the Germans and the Japanese, in order to maintain any semblance of balance of power in Europe and in Asia.

Primary responsibility for the involvement of the United States in World War II and for the policies which characterized our wartime diplomacy rests with Franklin D. Roosevelt. His motives were mixed and were probably not always clear, even to himself. Frances Perkins, Secretary of labor in his Cabinet and a personal friend, described the President as "the most complicated human being I ever knew."

Certainly Roosevelt was far from being a simple and straightforward character. In an age when Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini played the role of the popular tyrant, of the dictator whose grip on his people is maintained by a mixture of mass enthusiasm and mass terrorism, Roosevelt showed what could be done in achieving very great personal power within the framework of free institutions. His career after his election to the presidency stamps him as a man of vast ambition, capable, according to Frances Perkins, of "almost childish vanity."

There were probably three principal motives that impelled Roosevelt to set in motion the machinery that led America into its Second Crusade. First was this quality of ambition. What role could be more tempting than that of leader of a wartime global coalition, of ultimate world arbiter? Second was the necessity of finding some means of extricating the American economy from a difficult position. Third was a conviction that action against the Axis was necessary. This conviction was greatly strengthened by the first two motives.

Roosevelt's first Administration, which began at the low point of a very severe depression, was brilliant political success. He was re-elected in 1936 by an enormous majority of popular and electoral votes. But dark clouds hung over the last years of his second term of office. For all the varied and sometimes contradictory devices of the New Deal failed to banish the specter of large-scale unemployment. There were at least ten million people out of work in the United States in 1939.

The coming of the war in Europe accomplished what all the experimentation of the New Deal had failed to achieve. It created the swollen demand for American munitions, equipment, supplies of all kinds, foodstuffs which started the national economy on the road to full production and full employment.

There was the same economic phenomenon at the time of the First World War. The vast needs of the Allies meant high profits, not only for munitions makers (later stigmatized as "merchants of death"),

but for all branches of business activity. It brought a high level of farm prices and industrial wages. As the Allies ran out of ready cash, loans were floated on the American market. The United States, or at least some American financial interests, acquired a direct stake in an Allied victory.

Now, the purely economic interpretation of our involvement in World War I can be pressed too far. There is neither evidence nor probability that Wilson was directly influenced by bankers or munitions makers. He had given the German Government a public and grave warning of the consequences of resorting to unlimited submarine warfare. When the German Government announced the resumption of such warfare, Wilson, with the assent of Congress, made good his warning.

Yet the lure of war profits (not restricted, it should be noted, to any single class of people) did exert a subtle but important influence on the evolution of American policy in the years 1914-17. It worked against the success of the mediation efforts launched by House as Wilson's confidential emissary. The British and French governments counted with confidence on the absence of any strong action to back up periodic protests against the unprecedented severity of the blockade enforced against Germany. The American economy had become very dependent on the flow of Allied war orders.

After the end of the war, after depression and repudiation of the greater part of the war debts, the majority of the American people reached the conclusion that a war boom was not worth the ultimate price. This feeling found expression in the Neutrality Act. Roosevelt himself in 1936 described war profits as "fools' gold."

Yet the course of American economic development in World War II followed closely the pattern set in World War I. First the Neutrality Act was amended to permit the sale of munitions. Then, as British assets were exhausted, the lend-lease arrangement was substituted for the war loans of the earlier period. As an economic student of the period [Broadus Mitchell in *Depression Decade*] says:

The nation did not emerge from the decade of the depression until pulled out by war orders from abroad and the defense program at home. The rescue was timely and sweet and deserved to be made as sure as possible. Whether the involvement of the United States in the war through progressive departure from neutrality was prompted partly by the reflection that other means of extrication from economic trouble had disappeared, nobody can say. No proponent did say so. Instead, advocates of "all-out aid to Britain," conveying of allied shipping and lend-lease took high ground of patriotism

and protection of civilization.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the opposition of business and labor groups to involvement in the war was softened by the tremendous flood of government war orders. It is an American proverb that the customer is always right. Under lend-lease and the immense program of domestic arms expansion the government became the biggest customer.

Ambition certainly encouraged Roosevelt to assume an interventionist attitude. He unmistakably enjoyed his role as one of the "Big Three," as a leading figure at international conferences, as a mediator between Stalin and Churchill. There is a marked contrast between Roosevelt's psychology as a war leader and Lincoln's.

The Civil War President was often bowed down by sorrow over the tragic aspects of the historic drama in which he was called to play a leading part. His grief for the men who were dying on both sides of the fighting lines was deep and hearty and unaffected. One finds little trace of this mood in Roosevelt's war utterances. There is no Gettysburg Address in Roosevelt's state papers. The President's familiar mood is one of jaunty, cocksure, sometimes flippant, self-confidence.

Another trait in Roosevelt's personality which may help to explain the casual, light-hearted scrapping of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms is a strong histrionic streak. If he originated or borrowed a brilliant phrase, he felt that his work was done. He felt no strong obligation to see that the phrase, once uttered, must be realized in action.

When did Roosevelt decide that America must enter the war? There was a hint of bellicose action in his quarantine speech of October 5, 1937. Harold Ickes claims credit for suggesting the quarantine phrase, which did not appear in earlier drafts of the speech which had been prepared in the State Department. It was like Roosevelt to pick up and insert an image which appealed to him. However, the quarantine speech met such an unfavorable reception that it led to no immediate action.

Various dates are suggested by other observers. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, who enjoyed substantial influence and many contacts in Administration circles, asserted in a Roosevelt memorial address at Harvard University in April 1945:

There came a moment when President Roosevelt was convinced that the utter defeat of Nazism was essential to the survival of our institutions. That time certainly could not have been later than when Mr. Sumner Welles reported on his mission to Europe [March 1940].

That Roosevelt may have been mentally commit-

ted to intervention even before the war broke out is indicated by the following dispatch from Maurice Hindus in the *New York Herald Tribune* of January 4, 1948:

Prague — President Eduard Benes of Czechoslovakia told the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt on May 29, 1939, that war would break out any day after July 15 of that year, with Poland as the first victim, and Mr. Roosevelt, in reply to a question as to what the United States would do, said it would have to participate because Europe alone could not defeat Adolf Hitler.

A suggestion by Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle that Roosevelt should have become the leader of the free world against Hitler is believed to have influenced the President's psychology. [Davis and Lindley, *How War Came*, p. 65.]

Admiral James O. Richardson, at that time Commander in Chief of the Pacific fleet, talked at length with Roosevelt in the White House on October 8, 1940. He testified before the Congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor [*Report of the Congressional Joint Committee*, Part I, p. 266] that he had asked the President whether we would enter the war and received the following answer:

He [Roosevelt] replied that if the Japanese attacked Thailand, or the Kra peninsula, or the Netherlands East Indies, we would not enter the war, that if they even attacked the Philippines he doubted whether we would enter the war, but that they could not always avoid making mistakes and that as the war continued and the area of operation expanded sooner or later they would make a mistake and we would enter the war.

It is clear from these varied pieces of evidence that the thought of war was never far from Roosevelt's mind, even while he was assuring so many audiences during the election campaign that "your government is not going to war." During the year 1941, as has been shown in an earlier chapter [of *America's Second Crusade*], he put the country into an undeclared naval war in the Atlantic by methods of stealth and secrecy. This point was made very clear by Admiral Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, in his reply to Representative Gearhart during the Pearl Harbor investigation:

Technically or from an international standpoint we were not at war, inasmuch as we did not have the right of belligerents, because war had not been declared. But actually, so far as the forces operating under Admiral King in certain areas were concerned, it was against any German craft that came inside that area. They

were attacking us and we were attacking them.

Stark also testified that, by direction of the President, he ordered American warships in the Atlantic to fire on German submarines and surface ships. This order was issued on October 8, 1941, two months before Hitler's declaration of war.

It is scarcely possible, in the light of this and many other known facts, to avoid the conclusion that the Roosevelt Administration sought the war which began at Pearl Harbor. The steps which made armed conflict inevitable were taken months before the conflict broke out.

Some of Roosevelt's apologists contend that, if he deceived the American people, it was for their own good. But the argument that the end justified the means rests on the assumption that the end had been achieved. Whether America's end in its Second Crusade was assurance of national security or the establishment of a world of peace and order or the realization of the Four Freedoms "everywhere in the world," this end was most certainly not achieved.

America's Second Crusade was a product of illusions which are already bankrupt. It was an illusion that the United States was at any time in danger of invasion by Nazi Germany. It was an illusion that Hitler was bent on the destruction of the British Empire. It was an illusion that China was capable of becoming a strong, friendly, western-oriented power in the Far East. It was an illusion that a powerful Soviet Union in a weakened and impoverished Eurasia would be a force for peace, conciliation, stability, and international co-operation. It was an illusion that the evils and dangers associated with totalitarianism could be eliminated by giving unconditional support to one form of totalitarianism against another. It was an illusion that a combination of appeasement and personal charm could melt away designs of conquest and domination which were deeply rooted in Russian history and Communist philosophy.

The fruit harvested from seeds of illusion is always bitter.

I believe that much of "knowledge" is indeed merely "memory," and this is why so many misconceptions persist for such a long time in the human population. For example, science is rife with error. Because so many people are so thoroughly schooled in the common misconceptions, however, only the most brilliantly skeptical of them will ever discover a mistake. And even then, it will likely be denied for generations to come. If the error has cultural importance too — such as the belief that emotions arise from the heart — generations stretch into centuries.

— Marilyn Vos Savant

Parade magazine, Feb. 6, 1994, p. 11.

**The Most Ambitious Book-length
Debunking to Date of the Works of
Jean-Claude Pressac**

AUSCHWITZ **The End of a Legend** by Carlo Mattogno

Mattogno is a learned man in the mold of his ancestors of the Renaissance. He is meticulous and prolific; in the future he will be in the first rank of Revisionists. —Prof. Robert Faurisson

Jean-Claude Pressac's *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* was published in 1989 to resounding worldwide media hosannas. It was followed in 1993 by his second opus, *The Crematoria of Auschwitz: The Machinery of Mass Killing*.

Pressac's principal volume, more than 500 pages with hundreds of illustrations, promised conclusive evidence of the existence and use of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Headlines proclaimed that the revisionists were finally vanquished, that Pressac had proven what the immense resources of the Holocaust industry had failed to prove in more than 40 years.

But in the mad rush to herald the news, the pundits hadn't bothered to *read* the book, presuming that the French pharmacist had accomplished what his publisher—the Klarsfeld Foundation—claimed he had. He hadn't.

So Pressac's second volume was published, promising, in his own words, "*the definitive rebuttal of revisionist theories.*" This dog wouldn't hunt, either.

As you read *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend* you'll find out why. Here, Italian documents specialist Carlo Mattogno demolishes the boldest attempt to date—Pressac's back to back volumes—to answer the revisionist critique of the Auschwitz extermination story.

Mattogno shows how Pressac misinterpreted his own data in such a way as to assist not his fellow exterminationists, but the very revisionists he had set out defeat.

Mattogno demonstrates that Pressac's confused arguments confirm his ignorance of the structure and functioning of crematory ovens and gas chambers, and of the nature and use of the disinfectant Zyklon B; that Pressac's use of available statistics was arbitrary and largely fanciful, resulting in a *down-sizing* of the number of alleged victims; and that where information did not exist, Pressac simply invented it, often with mutually contradictory arguments in different parts of his thesis.

Mattogno's relentless deconstruction of Pressac's assertions and interpretations not only reveals the Holocaust Lobby hero's incompetence, it's a case study of the pathetic sloppiness the media can be counted on to overlook in the crusade against Holocaust Revisionism.

AUSCHWITZ: The End of a Legend

Softcover • 150 pp. • index • illustrated
\$12.95 + \$2 postage

—Published by—

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

World War II, American “Defense” Policy, and the Constitution

JOSEPH SOBRAN

Rethinking the Holy War

We learn now of the likelihood that several top physicists on the Manhattan Project may have been passing helpful information along to Joseph Stalin. The story is startling but, on reflection, hardly amazing.

In his book *Special Tasks*, the former Soviet spy-master Pavel Sudaplatov makes a sensational disclosure: He says proudly that the Soviets’ acquisition of the atomic bomb was facilitated by the nuclear insider trading of Enrico Fermi, Leo Szilard, Niels Bohr, and — surprise! — Robert Oppenheimer.

If Sudaplatov’s story is true, Joe McCarthy was living in a fool’s paradise. But there are more serious implications.

Oppenheimer’s loyalty to the United States had long been suspect; there is much in his life, his family, his circle of friends, to suggest the Soviet sympathies that were common enough in those days. During what is now called “the McCarthy Era,” his security clearance was suspended with much apologetic coughing from the government that suspended it, which was at pains to stress that nobody doubted his loyalty. Ever since then, Oppenheimer had been a certified Victim of McCarthyism, like Alger Hiss.

But the more important point is that Oppenheimer and others like him (including Hiss) may also have felt that Soviet sympathies were not necessarily anti-American. If he was helping Stalin, after all, he was doing no more than Franklin Roosevelt himself, whose obsession with destroying Germany led him into alliance with the most murderous regime in history (except, possibly, for Communist China).

Joseph Sobran is a nationally-syndicated columnist, author and lecturer. He is a former senior editor of *National Review*, and currently Washington, DC, correspondent for *The Wanderer* and the *Rothbard-Rockwell Report*. He edits a monthly newsletter, *Sobran’s* (c/o Griffin Communications, P.O. Box 565, Herndon, VA 22070). These essays first appeared in the June 2, July 21, and August 11, 1994, issues of *The Wanderer*, a traditionalist Roman Catholic weekly.

And Bohr several times urged Roosevelt to share nuclear technology with the Soviets. We may also think of the Israeli spy, Jonathan Pollard, who still insists, probably in all sincerity, that he never meant to be disloyal to this country when he turned its secrets over to an “ally.”

Though much disputed, Sudaplatov’s story merely underscores what should have become obvious by now: The antiwar Americans — the “isolationists” and “America Firsters” — were right about World War II. The United States should have stayed out.

It is time we stopped treating World War II as a holy war and took its measure rationally.

The net result of the war, apart from hundreds of thousands of dead young Americans (very nearly including my father, who saw pieces of his friends retrieved from the ocean with grapples after a kamikaze attack), was to leave much of Europe in Communist hands, with the Soviets in possession, only four years after the war’s end, of something Germany and Japan hadn’t had: the means of annihilating us.

There were other drawbacks and disgraces. American freedoms were sharply curtailed, most flagrantly the rights of Americans of Japanese descent; the federal government consolidated its power over us, ceasing to be “federal” in any meaningful sense. American planes bombed cities in a deliberate campaign of killing civilians, abetted by war propaganda inciting race-hatred against the Japanese. And of course the military draft meant that everybody, not just draftees, could be forced to participate in one way or another. It was total war, which necessitates something like a totalitarian state. “It’s a free country” yielded to “Don’t you know there’s a war on?”

Neither the Japanese nor the Germans wanted war with us; Roosevelt did his utmost to provoke them while lying to the citizens of the country again and again and again. Roosevelt’s defenders don’t deny that he lied; showing their dedication to democracy, they defend the lies themselves as “far-sighted.”

Roosevelt’s defenders also don’t deny that the

Soviets murdered tens of millions of Christians, mostly Orthodox (one scholar [R. J. Rummel in *Lethal Politics*] puts the total number of dead at 61.9 million, including non-Christians). It's just that, for liberals, tens of millions of Christians are as nothing against the sacred imperative of stopping Hitler. And to this day there is no public memorial in the United States or, as far as I know, in the new, democratic Russia to the myriads of persecuted Christians, whose churches were razed, whose culture was destroyed, whose children were taken from them, and whose lives ended in torment and oblivion. There are sharp limits to liberal compassion.

As the 50th anniversary of D-Day is commemorated, think of the millions we have been quietly allowed to forget.

Afraid to be Popular

Do you, dear reader, ever ask yourself: "In just what sense does the Department of Defense defend me? Why does it — still — keep military bases in far-flung places like South Korea and Turkey?"

Good questions. The truth is that you are not being defended much at all. And if you look at American history, you'll find that your ancestors weren't defended much either. They may have been involved in fighting, but it almost certainly wasn't within our borders, which is where you'd naturally expect "defense" to occur.

It's startling to reflect that the U.S. government has probably killed more people outside its own borders, in proportion to the number killed by foreign powers within its borders, than any government in history. Our wars may be defensible, but they're not always "defense."

Still, no President has ever been elected by promising to take us to war. Several, like Franklin Roosevelt, have been elected after promising not to. I don't recall whether Bill Clinton ever promised not to, but it doesn't matter, because he would have explained afterward, the way he always does, that he never actually said what everyone thought they heard him say. The man talks extemporaneously in fine print.

Even so, it was reasonably assumed that, as President, he wouldn't send American boys to the fate he had so adroitly side-stepped during his college years; his unofficial campaign slogan in 1992 was: "He kept himself out of war." And as President, he has conducted a popular foreign policy. At least it would be popular if he weren't afraid to call attention to it. He doesn't want to admit it, but he has kept us out of war — in Bosnia, Korea, and the Middle East.

Which raises an interesting question. Here is a President who can use all the popularity he can get, yet he doesn't want to point out that he has kept us at peace. And as I write, he appears about to launch a mini-war in Haiti. What gives? Why this foreign policy that dares not speak its name? If the Haitian War comes to pass, it won't be "defense," any more than the Gulf War and the Panama War were. The Haitian rulers aren't threatening us. The war will be fought because someone other than the great mass of the American people insists upon it.



Joseph Sobran

Here I yield the floor to a source I don't usually turn to for enlightenment, Richard Cohen of *The Washington Post*. In a passage that could be profitably studied in a political science course, he has explained why Clinton, as a practicing politician, has no choice but to invade Haiti: "The American public may not give a damn about foreign policy, but the various elites (political, journalistic, business,

etc.) do. For a widely popular President, the judgment of the elites would not matter. But Clinton is far from popular. His margin for error is virtually nonexistent."

My only quibble is with Cohen's parenthetical identification of these "elites." It's interesting that he names journalists among them; so much for the idea that journalists are neutral observers. But he leaves out the ethnic lobbies that do so much to drive American policy. In the case of Haiti, it's the black lobby — especially the Black Caucus in Congress — that is pushing for war.

Of course all this has nothing to do with defending you, Mr. Doe. That's why you aren't especially being consulted, even indirectly. Your representative won't be asked to declare war, as prescribed by the Constitution, which has so little to do with how we are actually ruled anyway. Ordinary Haitians are already pining under a savage U.S. blockade; the people who are starving aren't the ones with the guns.

What our elites call "isolationism" our ancestors called "neutrality" — and most Americans still instinctively prefer it to intervention and war. It tells you something about our democracy that Clinton feels than in order to survive, he has to do something that may make him even more unpopular than he already is.

The Constitutional Prejudice

Gosh! My one-man campaign to revive the Tenth Amendment seems to be paying off! All over the nation, Americans are discovering the part of their constitutional heritage liberals hoped they wouldn't find out about.

Nancy Roman reports in *The Washington Times* that the forgotten Tenth is now being invoked all over the place. It's being cited by states rejecting federal orders (known as "unfunded mandates") to clean up their water and air, hire more police, jail illegal aliens — and to bear the costs themselves; by law enforcement officers who refuse to do background checks on gun purchasers, as demanded by the (unconstitutional) Brady Bill; by various champions of both states' and individuals' rights.

Colorado, followed by other states, is suing the federal government to "cease and desist" issuing unfunded mandates. Jim Abbott, chairman of the state's Tenth Amendment Committee, notes that under the historical understanding of the Constitution, the federal government has no power to create departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, Transportation, Energy, Education, and Commerce, or the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, to name a few of the many federal regulatory agencies.

The Tenth is usually thought of as the states' rights amendment, but it's more than that. It says simply: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Put otherwise, "We the People" have "delegated" certain powers to "the United States" (i.e., the federal government). These powers are listed in the Constitution. And any powers not listed remain with the separate states or with Us the People.

There was a good reason for this amendment. Many of those who hesitated to ratify the Constitution didn't feel that the powers it conferred were tyrannical; but they feared that if the federal government had those powers, it would also be strong enough to claim and exert powers that hadn't been conferred — and at that point nothing would be able to stop it from taking all the powers it wanted. So the Tenth nailed down the point that the people were granting the federal government only those powers mentioned in the Constitution, and no others.

You can see this point more clearly by contrasting the Tenth Amendment with its companion, the Ninth Amendment: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to

deny or disparage others retained by the people." Put otherwise, the Constitution does not attempt to list all the people's rights, but it does list all the federal government's powers. There is thus a constitutional prejudice in favor of rights retained by the people, but against any new power claimed by the federal government.

Today the operative prejudice is just the reverse. We think we don't have a right unless it's listed in the Constitution, but we assume that the federal government can claim just about any unlisted power it wants to. If the framers found out about this state of affairs, they'd reach for the smelling salts.

How did the central principle of the Constitution get stood on its head? In 1940 Roosevelt's rubber-stamp Supreme Court declared the Tenth Amendment a mere "truism," of no force or effect. And since then the court has never struck down a single major power grab by the federal government, while it has extirpated hundreds of state laws. The court has "expanded" — distorted and inflated, actually — the First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments (not to mention the interstate commerce clause), but never the Tenth or, interestingly, the Second. On the contrary, these two amendments have been contracted almost to nothingness.

More radical than Jefferson

Who Was John Randolph?

Here's an authoritative biographical treatment of a great American political maverick in the almost vanished tradition of rugged individualism. Described by Thomas Jefferson as "unrivaled as leader of the House," Randolph's influence was so great that Henry Clay once said "his acts came near shaking the Union to the centre, and desolating this fair land." In the view of historian Samuel Flagg Bemis, Randolph was an "extraordinary man, perhaps the most spectacular personality that ever sat in the Congress of the United States." "For a stimulating introduction to intellectual history,"

**JOHN RANDOLPH
OF ROANOKE**
A STUDY IN AMERICAN POLITICS
RUSSELL KIRK



commented the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "for acquaintance with a mental giant who rebelled against the trends of his times, **John Randolph of Roanoke** will move its reader pleasantly through a chapter of American history that too commonly is told only from the dominant, Jeffersonian, side of the record."

Softcover. 588 pp. Index. \$5.95, plus \$2.00 for shipping from Institute for Historical Review.

The Crematories of Auschwitz

A Critique of Jean-Claude Pressac

CARLO MATTOGNO

French Professor Robert Faurisson deserves credit for being the first to research the technical aspects of alleged homicidal gas chambers in wartime German camps, particularly in Auschwitz-Birkenau. He noticed that in none of the many trials of so-called Nazi war criminals had anyone ever called for an expert technical examination of the alleged weapon of the crime, which in this case would mean a technical study of one of the many "gas chambers" alleged to have been used by the Nazis for homicidal purposes. Therefore, Faurisson himself undertook such a technical study, even visiting a genuine execution gas chamber in an American penitentiary.

Faurisson's methodology in this field is very important because "exterminationist" historiography, which predominates in this field, is rooted in dogmatism. The virtually theological nature of this dogmatism is pointed up in a declaration by 34 French scholars published in the French daily newspaper *Le Monde* on February 21, 1979, in which they stated:

The question of how *technically* such a mass murder was possible should not be raised. It was technically possible because it occurred.

Carlo Mattogno, a specialist in text analysis and critique, is Italy's foremost Holocaust revisionist scholar. Born in 1951 in Orvieto, Italy, he has carried out advanced linguistic studies in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. He is the author of numerous books and monographs, several of which have been published in this *Journal*. Mattogno has been a member of this *Journal's* Editorial Advisory Committee since 1988. He lives with his family in a suburb of Rome.

This article is an edited transcript of Mattogno's presentation at the Twelfth (1994) IHR Conference. It was translated by Russ Granata, a Second World War US Navy veteran and retired California educator, and is copyright 1994 by Granata Publishing Corporation.

The points and arguments made in this article are developed in much greater detail in Mattogno's 150-page softcover book, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, published by the IHR in September 1994. It is available from the IHR for \$12.95, plus \$2 shipping.

This is the necessary starting point for all historical investigation on the subject.

Rejecting this unscholarly axiom, French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac set out on a technical study of the gas chambers, as well as of the crematories. In this, Pressac directly challenged Faurisson and his findings.

Pressac's first work, which appeared in English in 1989, is entitled *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*. His second, published in French in 1993, bears the title *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz: La machinerie du meurtre de masse* ("The Crematories of Auschwitz: the machinery of mass murder"). In 1994 an adaptation of this second work appeared as a chapter in the English-language anthology, *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (published by Indiana University Press in association with the US Holocaust Memorial Museum).

Pressac's 1993 book, which was given tremendous worldwide promotion, was portrayed as a total and unquestionable refutation of Holocaust revisionism, and moreover one that beats the revisionists on their own favorite field, namely, the technical. As a result, Pressac achieved international fame as a unique specialist of the alleged Nazi extermination techniques.

In reality, both of Pressac's books display a surprising deficiency of documentation, both with regard to the chemical-physical properties, use, and purpose of hydrocyanic acid gas (from a pesticide known commercially as Zyklon B, which was widely used throughout Europe to disinfest clothing and buildings), and the structure and functioning of crematory ovens. Pressac's incompetence in these two essential aspects of the problem inevitably leads him to unfounded conclusions. All the same, his 1989 book should be recognized for its considerable documentation and for its critical spirit, which are uncommon among mainstream historians. Pressac also deserves credit for having the courage to overcome, or at least the intention to go beyond, the established historiographic technique with regard to this issue, which essentially has been a non-critical acceptance of "eyewitness testimony." Even

though he did not intend it, his 1989 book has furnished so much useful material for revisionists that it might be considered crypto-revisionist.

Pressac's 1993 book was supposed to complement and advance his earlier work because it was said to be based on his study of a vast trove of hitherto unavailable documents in Soviet archives, particularly those from the Auschwitz construction department, or *Bauleitung*, which fell intact into the hands of the Soviets when they overran the camp. In reality, within those eighty thousand documents housed in Moscow, most notably the *Bauleitung* documents, Pressac did not find a single proof of the existence of even one homicidal gas chamber at Auschwitz-Birkenau. This must have troubled Pressac who, returning to the clichés of the worst "exterminationist" historiography, found himself in the difficult situation of having to cite documents as saying what they do not say.

This might explain Pressac's openly specious approach, characterized by an unscrupulous use of sources, and by arbitrary and unfounded affirmations woven throughout the body of the text in such a way as to give the impression that they are based on documents. He forces connections between the various documents, and twists interpretations of the documents to support his preconceived notions about the alleged gas chambers.

Because Pressac purports to present a total and definitive refutation of revisionism on a technical level, a simple historical critique of Pressac's thesis is insufficient. Accordingly, I present here a historical-technical critique of Pressac's thesis. (This critique is developed in much greater detail in my recently-published book, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*.)

Some Background

Before laying out the most important aspects of this critique, I want to indicate how and why a scholar with a foundation in the humanities came to concern himself with complex technical questions, and to discuss the scholarly merit of my conclusions.

When I began my study of this issue, I felt that revisionists had not yet conducted adequate technical studies of alleged Nazi homicidal gas chambers; if, at Auschwitz-Birkenau, there really had been a mass extermination of Jews and others whose bodies were cremated, then the weapon of the crime, the homicidal gas chamber, must have had an indispensable accessory, namely, the crematory oven.

Faurisson's principal investigative methodology has been to demonstrate the technical impossibility of homicidal gassing (as alleged), thereby also demonstrating the material impossibility (and therefore the historical unreality) of mass extermination in homicidal gas chambers. This principle is also valid

regarding cremation. If one demonstrates the technical impossibility of mass cremation of hundreds of thousands of corpses, one also demonstrates the material impossibility (and therefore the historical unreality) of mass extermination in homicidal gas chambers or by any other means.



Carlo Mattogno (left), with translator Russ Granata, presents his critique of the work of Pressac at the Twelfth IHR Conference (Sept. 1994).

It was on the basis of this principle that in 1987 I became interested in the technology of cremation. I delved into this question with the valuable collaboration of two talented engineers: Franco Deana of Genoa, Italy, and a German engineer, who died in 1991. After long years of research in German libraries, we have collected an extensive bibliography comprising practically all of the technical articles concerning cremation that appeared in Germany from the 1920s through the 1940s. Moreover, in the archives of the Auschwitz State Museum in Poland, we examined photocopies of unpublished documents from the Moscow archives concerning the crematory ovens manufactured during the war by the Topf company of Erfurt, Germany. In addition, we made on-site studies of the Topf crematory ovens still in existence at the concentration camps at Dachau, Mauthausen, Gusen and Buchenwald. We also studied the crematory ovens made by the Kori

company of Berlin at the concentration camps at Dachau, Mauthausen and Majdanek.

Our on-site study of these installations is important because the two-chambered crematory oven at Mauthausen is of the same design as those installed in Crematory I at the Auschwitz main camp, and the three-chambered ovens at Buchenwald are of the same design as those installed in Crematories II and III at Auschwitz-Birkenau. The two Topf ovens in the Auschwitz crematory, however, were so poorly reconstructed after the war by the Poles that one cannot understand anything of their functioning. As they now stand, these ovens could not function.

The result of all this study is a book on the technical aspects of cremation that is being published in Italy. The demonstrative procedures and conclu-

sions of this work have been examined by a group of German engineers who have confirmed their scientific value. We expect to publish an English-language summary of our findings in the United States.

In addition to the cremation problem, we have delved deeper into the details of alleged homicidal gas chambers, collecting a valuable bibliography on hydrocyanic acid and disinfestation chambers, and, like German chemist Germar Rudolf, carrying out chemical testing. To this, we have added a very careful inspection of sites at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

On the basis of my seven years of study, I feel I have acquired the requisite technical knowledge competently to judge Pressac's thesis.

The Problem of Cremation

A scientific study of the Auschwitz-Birkenau crematory ovens must confront and resolve two fundamental thermal-technical problems: cremation capacity and coke consumption.

Pressac does not adequately deal with either of these two problems. Instead, he contents himself with a series of affirmations scattered throughout his work meant to establish that the cremation capacity in Crematory II and Crematory III each at Birkenau was 800 or 1,000 bodies per day, with the possibility of as many as 1,440, while the cremation capacity each of Crematory IV and Crematory V at Birkenau was 500 bodies per day, with the possibility of as many as 768. These higher figures are based on a purported *Bauleitung* letter dated June 28, 1943, according to which as many as 4,756 corpses were cremated every 24 hours in the 52 muffles of the five crematories at Auschwitz and Auschwitz-Birkenau. This works out to one body every 15 minutes, or four bodies per hour. Pressac considers this possible. [See also Dr. Arthur Butz's comment on this purported letter in the May-June 1993 *Journal*, p. 35, n. 15.]


Crematory Capacity

The Topf ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau, which were designed and constructed to hold one corpse at a time, required an average of approximately one hour to cremate each corpse. In fact, because of their limited heat potential it was not economically feasible to cremate two or more bodies together, from the point of view both of duration and of coke consumption. A simultaneous cremation of four bodies per hour, in accordance with Pressac's view, was therefore thermo-technically impossible.

The maximum capacity of the Auschwitz-Birkenau ovens could have been no more than 1,040 (adult) bodies per day. Taking into account the percentage of infants and children among those alleged to have been homicidally gassed, and considering



“One Louse, Your Death!” This bilingual (German-Polish) poster graphically warned Auschwitz inmates of the danger of typhus-bearing lice. Other measures taken by camp authorities to combat typhus included camp quarantines, routine delousings of barracks and clothing with “Zyklon” gas, quarantine of newly arriving prisoners, disinfection baths for inmates, and inspections of barracks. In spite of such measures, the dread disease claimed the lives of many tens of thousands of inmates. German camp personnel also fell victim, including garrison physician Dr. Schwela and other SS officers.



Enlargement of a portion of an Allied aerial reconnaissance photograph of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp, taken on May 31, 1944. As Mattogno and other revisionist scholars have pointed out, this photo shows no trace of the mass extermination of Jews that supposedly was being carried out there on that day.

average weight as a function of age, the daily cremation capacity could have been augmented by 20 percent, resulting in a theoretical maximum capacity of 1,248 bodies per 24-hour day. Of course, this does not mean that the Auschwitz SS ordered the cremation of 1,248 or 1,040 bodies per day; these are simply maximum theoretical figures.

Several practical considerations significantly lower the actual cremation capacity. First, proper functioning of the ovens required a break of at least four hours each day to clean coke slag from the furnace grilles.

Second, the ovens were programmed to function for twelve hours per day. Moreover, past experience with the two-chambered ovens at the Auschwitz main camp crematory had shown that these installations wore out rapidly and were subject to frequent breakdowns. Therefore, they could not have been expected to function continuously, or to be bet-

ter than other ovens of that era. Consequently, it was necessary to arrange for the installation of more ovens than efficient cremation would dictate. (Similarly, at Majdanek, one of the five crematory ovens built by the Kori company in the new crematory was meant as a reserve oven.)

We also need to consider that the decision to build the four crematories at Birkenau (with their 46 oven chambers) was made on August 19, 1942, following Himmler's inspection of Auschwitz on July 17 and 18, after which he ordered a drastic increase in the capacity of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp from 125,000 to 200,000 prisoners.

Finally, we must consider the impact of the terrible typhus epidemic during the summer of 1942, with its huge death toll in the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp. During the first 20 days of August, in the male sector alone there were 4,113 deaths of registered inmates, for an average of 216 male deaths

per day. During the third trimester of 1942, the death rate was 20.5 percent of the average camp population, which did not exceed 25,000 during this period.

Taking all these factors into consideration, we can maintain that the Auschwitz camp construction department (*Bauleitung*) ordered those 46 crematory oven chambers from the Topf company on the basis of a projected "worst case" mortality rate of approximately 500 prisoners per day from among an average projected camp population of 200,000. This corresponds to a monthly mortality rate of approximately eight percent. The capacity of the crematories therefore was quite adequate for the increase of the camp population anticipated by Himmler, even in the event of a typhus epidemic.

Abstractly, it might seem that a cremation capacity of 1,040 bodies per day was excessive. In August 1942 an average of 269 prisoners were dying each day at Auschwitz, which means that this maximum cremation capacity was almost four times greater than needed. This figure could perhaps be cited to demonstrate homicidal intentions on the part of the Auschwitz SS. By comparison, in 1939 in Germany there were 131 crematories with approximately 200 ovens, for a maximum cremation capacity of 4,000 corpses per day. However, during that entire year approximately 102,000 persons died in Germany (or about 280 per day). German crematories thus had a maximum capacity 14 times greater than the number of deceased: perhaps this shows that the Nazis intended to exterminate Germany's civilian population?

A study of the crematory ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau offers three additional important proofs that refute the mass-gassing thesis.

SS Estimates

The first proof can be found in the SS projection of the number of cremations for March 1943. The *Bauleitung* file entry of March 17, 1943, estimates the projected consumption of coke for the four Birkenau crematories. The document indicates that the time period of activity of the crematories is twelve hours, and mentions a projected coke consumption. Therefore, one may calculate that it was possible to cremate approximately 360 emaciated adult corpses per day. From March 1 to 17, 1943, the average mortality at Birkenau was 292 prisoners per day, which in terms of crematory coke consumption represents 80 percent of the SS projection. This means that this projection is calculated on the basis of the average mortality, plus a 20 percent margin of error. Note that there is no allowance for the cremation of those alleged to have been homicidally gassed during this period, which were averaging 1,100 per day according to the supposedly authori-

tative *Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-1945* (compiled by Danuta Czech, and published by I.B. Tauris, London, 1991).

If the homicidal gassing claims were true, the daily death rate during this period would have been approximately 1,400, or almost four times the SS forecasts. This would have had to include 26,000 Greek Jews who, according to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, were gassed and cremated between March 20 and April 28. The complete lack of any provision by the SS camp officials for dealing with these many additional corpses shows that there were no homicidal gasings.

Coke Consumption

The second proof concerns the consumption of coke in the Auschwitz-Birkenau crematories during 1943. In *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Pressac maintains that from April to October of 1943, the crematories of Birkenau cremated between 165,000 and 215,000 bodies using 497 tons of coke, resulting in an average consumption of 2.6 kilograms of coke per body. To determine the validity of Pressac's claims, let us examine coke consumption more closely.

At Gusen (a sub-camp of Mauthausen), 677 adult corpses were cremated in the crematory's Topf two-chambered oven during the period from October 31 to November 13, 1941, with a total consumption of 20,700 kilograms of coke, or an average of 30.5 kilograms of coke per body. Because there were 52 cremations per day on average, and the oven remained in constant thermal equilibrium, the average consumption of coke was the minimum obtainable with that type of crematory oven. This data can also be assumed to be valid for the three Topf double-chambered ovens at the Auschwitz main camp crematory.

The design of the Topf three- and eight-chambered ovens at the Birkenau crematories represented a significant thermo-technical advantage, in that they dramatically reduced fuel consumption. For the cremation of each emaciated adult corpse, the three-chambered oven required 20 kilograms of coke, while the eight-chambered oven required approximately 15 kilograms of coke. This means that in disposing of corpses from hypothetical Nazi homicidal gasings, in which are included infant and child corpses among those alleged to have been gassed, the minimum theoretical coke consumption at the Birkenau crematories would have averaged 13 kilograms, as against the 2.6 kilograms assumed by Pressac.

From March 1 to October 25, 1943, the crematories of Auschwitz-Birkenau were supplied with a total of 641.5 tons of coke. During this same period, the number of prisoner deaths from natural causes



Detail from an Allied aerial reconnaissance photo, taken on August 25, 1944, shows Crematoriums II and III at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

was approximately 27,300. The number of those alleged to have been gassed, according to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, was approximately 118,300, making a total of approximately 145,600.

For the prisoners who died of natural causes, the average coke consumption is 23.5 kilograms per corpse, which agrees with the actual crematory oven requirements. After adding those alleged to have been homicidally gassed, the average consumption drops to 4.4 kilograms of coke, which is thermo-technically impossible. (Keep in mind that according to the "exterminationist" historiography, so-called "cremation pits" were not used during this period.) Therefore, the quantity of coke supplied to the crematoriums from March to October of 1943 also demonstrates that the crematoriums handled only the corpses of registered prisoners who died from natural causes.

Recapitulating, Pressac assumes a maximum cremation capacity for the ovens of Auschwitz-

Birkenau that is approximately four times what is realistically possible, and a coke consumption for each cremation that is approximately one-fifth of the average real effective requirement. This shows that Pressac's declarations regarding mass cremations of individuals alleged to have been homicidally gassed are technically and historically unfounded.

Crematory Endurance

The third proof concerns the durability or endurance of the fire-brick masonry of the crematory ovens. In his 1989 book, Pressac asserts that a total of 938,000 corpses were cremated at Auschwitz-Birkenau: 781,000 in crematoriums and 157,000 in "cremation pits." These numbers refer only to those alleged to have been killed by poison gas, and do not include the bodies of registered prisoners who died from natural causes. In his 1993 book, Pressac reduces his estimate of Auschwitz dead to 775,000, of whom at least 675,000 were cremated at

Birkenau. Pressac's revision of the numbers of persons alleged to have been homicidally gassed has no connection with the Moscow documents he examined.

Engineer Rudolf Jakobskötter, speaking in 1941 of electrically-heated Topf ovens that were used in the crematory in Erfurt, stated with considerable pride that the second oven successfully carried out 3,000 cremations, while normally the durability of (flame) crematory fire-brick masonry permitted 2,000 cremations. The Topf two-chambered oven at Gusen lasted for approximately 3,200 cremations, after which it was necessary to dismantle it and replace its fire-brick masonry walls. The duration of one cremation chamber was therefore 1,600 cremations.

Even assuming the endurance of the Auschwitz-Birkenau oven masonry reached the extreme limit of 3,000 cremations per chamber, the highest possible number of corpses that could have been cremated would have been approximately 156,000. (Incidentally, according to Pressac, the total number of victims among the registered prisoners was 130,000.) The cremation of 675,000 bodies at Auschwitz-Birkenau would have required at least four complete replacements of the fire-brick masonry of all the camp's cremation chambers. For Crematories II and III, that would have required 256 tons of heat-resistant building materials, plus a labor time of approximately 7,200 man hours.

Yet, in the Auschwitz *Bauleitung* archives, which were captured intact and which Pressac has thoroughly examined, not a trace exists of such extensive construction work. The only possible conclusion is that this work was never carried out because it was not needed. Because it was technically impossible to cremate anything like 675,000 bodies at Birkenau, given what we know about crematory endurance, it follows that no mass extermination could have taken place there.

Hungarian Jews

Another important proof that specifically refutes the thesis of mass homicidal gassing at Birkenau — in this case of Hungarian Jews — are Allied military aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of the camp on May 31, 1944. On that day, during the supposedly crucial period of the alleged extermination, 15,000 Hungarian Jewish deportees supposedly arrived at Birkenau. According to Pressac, during a 14-day period in May-June 1944 an average of approximately 13,000 Hungarian Jews arrived daily at Birkenau, while 110,000 of the 184,000 deportees were gassed at a rate of 7,800 per day.

But the aerial photographs of Birkenau do not show the least indications of this alleged mass extermination. No smoke; no cremation pits (burn-

ing or not); no traces of the earth that would have to have been dug out of the pits; no piles of wood to fuel the pits; no traces of vehicles, or of any activity in the critical zone of the courtyard of Crematory V, nor in the grounds around Bunker 2, nor in areas of Crematories II or III. These photographs provide irrefutable proof that the story of the extermination of the Hungarian Jews is historically unfounded.

Pressac claims that 292,000 Hungarian Jews were homicidally gassed and cremated in Birkenau at Crematories II, III, and V, and in "cremation pits," during a 70-day period in May-July 1944, at a rate of approximately 4,200 per day. In reality, the deportation of Hungarian Jews lasted only 39 days, and Crematories II, III, and V could cremate, at the maximum, only 900 bodies per day. "Cremation pits" are a technical absurdity, because combustion is impossible in a pit due to the lack of sufficient oxygen.

Thus, during the 39-day-long deportation of the Hungarian Jews, Birkenau's crematories could have cremated a maximum of 35,000 bodies. This leaves 257,000 bodies that would have to be stored somewhere. This is further evidence that the story of the mass homicidal gassing of the Hungarian Jews is historically false.

Gas Chambers

Pressac's basic thesis is that Crematories II and III in Birkenau were planned and constructed as normal hygienic-sanitary installations, but were subsequently transformed into homicidal gas chambers. There is no doubt that up to the end of 1942, various changes were made in the basements of Crematories II and III deviating from the initial design plans. Likewise there is no doubt that the oven rooms were not altered from the original design regarding their number and their capacity for cremation. How is this apparent inconsistency to be explained?

If Crematories II and III had been designed as sanitary installations adequate for the natural mortality rate of the camp, their transformation into instruments of mass extermination would have required alterations permitting a corresponding increase in the cremation capacity of the ovens — that is to say, the installation of extra ovens. But this did not occur. So Pressac has no choice but to triple or quadruple the cremation capacity of the ovens, and to declare that ovens designed for normal, hygienic-sanitary purposes could, without difficulty, have coped with mass extermination.

The reality is very different. The installation of a 210-square-meter gas chamber (the size of *Leichenkeller* [mortuary cellar] 1), in Crematories II and III — in which, according to Pressac, it was possible homicidally to gas 1,800 victims at a time

without difficulty (eyewitness testimony even speaks of 3,000 victims) — would have required 75 crematory oven muffle chambers instead of the actual 15 for the cremation of the corpses produced in just one day. It would have required five days to cremate the bodies of the victims of one gassing — a major impediment to the alleged extermination process. The fact that the oven room was not altered shows that the basement alterations had nothing to do with mass murder.

According to Pressac, the final SS project was to turn *Leichenkeller* (“corpse cellar”) 1 into a homicidal gas chamber, and to turn *Leichenkeller* 2 into an undressing room. Of course this would mean that *Leichenkeller* mortuary cellars for storing bodies awaiting cremation would no longer be available in Crematories II and III. So where would the SS have stored all the bodies of the registered prisoners who had died of natural causes, including typhus, prior to cremation? This question is significant because Crematories II and III originally were conceived with three mortuary rooms for each: a total of 671 square meters reserved exclusively for hygienic-sanitary use. In support of his thesis, Pressac puts forward a series of conjectures, the most important of which deal with the ventilation systems of the crematories, and the “gas testers.”

Ventilators

It is well known that because of the extreme toxicity of hydrocyanic acid — the gas contained in Zyklon B — ventilation was of vital importance in the safe operation of disinfestation gas chambers. Pressac claims that an important element of the criminal transformation of a morgue into a homicidal gas chamber was an increase of the ventilator capacity in the alleged gas chamber from 4,800 to 8,000 cubic meters of air per hour. This alteration was supposedly decided on because the original ventilation installation had been planned and constructed for a normal mortuary chamber, and because a homicidal gas chamber would require much more efficient ventilation. Pressac cites this alteration as proof that the mortuary chamber was transformed into a homicidal gas chamber. Apparently for balance or symmetry, Pressac also declares that the capacity of the ventilators of the alleged undressing room was increased from 10,000 to 13,000 cubic meters of air per hour.

As evidence of this change of ventilator capacity, Pressac cites Topf company invoice number 729, of May 27, 1943, for Crematory III. [Published in facsimile in *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, p. 110.] However, a study of the ventilation installations in Crematories II and III demonstrates to the contrary that *Leichenkeller* 1 was *not* transformed into a homicidal gas chamber.

First, the Topf invoice cited by Pressac projected for the alleged homicidal gas chamber a ventilator with capacity of 4,800 cubic meters of air per hour, not of 8,000, and for the alleged undressing area a ventilator with a capacity of 10,000 cubic meters, not of 13,000. Pressac has therefore misrepresented the contents of this document.

Second, considering the volume of the two rooms, it is clear that for the alleged homicidal gas chamber, the SS had projected 9.5 exchanges of air per hour, but for the alleged undressing room 11 exchanges per hour: the so-called undressing room was better ventilated than the alleged homicidal gas chamber! This is technically senseless.

The classic work of engineer Wilhelm Heepke on crematory planning establishes that for mortuary chambers it is necessary to provide for a minimum of five exchanges of air per hour, but in the case of intense usage, up to ten exchanges. This is entirely consistent with the revisionist position that the ventilation installations of *Leichenkeller* 1, with their 9.5 exchanges of air per hour, were planned and constructed for a mortuary chamber, and that the room in question was not transformed into a homicidal gas chamber. By comparison, for the (non-homicidal) disinfestation or delousing gas chamber with hydrocyanic acid, using the DEGESCH-*Kreislauf* (circulation) system, 72 air exchanges per hour were projected.

Pressac asserts that Crematories II and III were planned and constructed as normal hygienic-sanitary installations but were later transformed into instruments of extermination. Yet, after the alleged transformation, the oven rooms of the two crematories still had the same number of crematory ovens that had been projected to handle the prisoner death rate due to natural causes, and the ventilators of *Leichenkeller* 1 still had the same capacity that had been specified for normal mortuary rooms. Where, then, is the criminal transformation of the crematories?

Gasprüfer

On February 26, 1943, the Auschwitz main construction office (*Zentral-Bauleitung*) sent a telegram to the Topf company asking for ten gas analyzers or testers (*Gasprüfer*). [Pressac translates this as “gas detectors.”] In Moscow, Pressac discovered a letter of response from the Topf company, dated March 2, 1943, in which the *Gasprüfer* were referred to as *Anzeigergeräte für Blausäure-Reste*, or “apparatuses for indication of hydrocyanic acid traces.” [These two documents are published in facsimile in *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, pp. 117, 188.] Pressac contends that this document constitutes proof of the existence of a homicidal gas chamber in Crematory II at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

In reality, the document could, at the most, be an indication, but not definitive proof, of the existence of a gas chamber. However, the contention that this gas chamber was homicidal is arbitrary. Regarding this document, the following points should be made:

(a) In German technical terminology, *Gasprüfer* were simply analyzers or testers of combustion gas.

(b) The standard apparatus that was used to detect hydrocyanic acid residual traces was called *Gasrestnachweisgeräte für Zyklon* ("Gas trace detection apparatus for Zyklon"). This was a test kit for measuring the amount of residual Zyklon gas.

(c) This apparatus was routine required equipment at all (non-homicidal) disinfestation or hydrocyanic acid delousing installations, including those at Auschwitz.

(d) The request for ten combustive-gas testers sent to the Topf company, which manufactured crematory ovens, was perfectly understandable. However, what could have motivated the Auschwitz *Zentral-Bauleitung* office to request ten devices for detecting traces of hydrocyanic gas from Topf, a company specializing in the installation of combustion equipment, rather than ordering them directly from the company that manufactured Zyklon B — namely DEGESCH (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung* or "German company for combatting pests") — or from the firm that was one of the two distributors of Zyklon for the manufacturer — namely TESTA (Tesch und Stabenow)? The Auschwitz *Zentral-Bauleitung* office was in regular contact with TESTA, its supplier of Zyklon B. The conclusion is that the ten *Gasprüfer* requested in February 1943 were simple testers of combustion gas in the crematories. They were meant for the ten smoke ducts or conduits of Crematories II and III, or perhaps for the ten smoke flues of the crematory stacks at Birkenau. I therefore conclude that the document discovered by Pressac is a fake.

Conclusions

As already mentioned, Pressac wished to carry out a technical study of the question of the crematory ovens and of the alleged homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau. While he did not possess the requisite competence to undertake such a study, he nevertheless accepted the methodological principle put forth by revisionists, that is, in case of discrepancy between testimony and physical evidence, it is physical evidence that should prevail.

Pressac has applied this principle by reducing the number of persons alleged to have been homicidally gassed at Auschwitz. He did this precisely because of technical incompatibilities between the previously-claimed number of victims and the capacity of the crematories, even though he arbitrarily increased their capacity three- or four-fold.

In accepting the revisionist methodology, Pressac has punctured an irreparable hole in the traditionally dogmatic "exterminationist" historiography, because technical reality and physical evidence show the material impossibility of a mass extermination at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Pressac's colleagues, including those responsible for compiling *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, seem immediately to have understood the danger here, and have taken remedial action. In fact *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* seems to be directed against Pressac more than against revisionist scholars. In refutation of Pressac's three most important conclusions, this book states:

1. All the crematories at Auschwitz-Birkenau were designed and planned for criminal purposes of mass killing.

2. The number of Auschwitz victims amounted to 1,100,000 persons.

3. The Birkenau crematories were able to cremate 8,000 corpses per day.

With this, the theological dogmatism proclaimed by the French scholars in 1979 and imprudently violated by Pressac has been re-established. All Pressac can do now is make public amends; by collaborating on *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, he already seems to have begun doing so. For the revisionists, however, Pressac's own two books are further milestones in the dismantling of a legend.

IN COLD BLOOD . . .

GRUESOME HARVEST: The Allies' Postwar War Against the German People

by Ralph F. Keeling, tells the grim, suppressed story of how the victorious Allies—after the end of the Second World War—carried on a brutal campaign against defeated Germany's civilian population. Completely reset attractive new IHR edition of a moving classic, with a new publisher's introduction by Ted O'Keefe. Bristling with contemporary documentation, burning with humanitarian and patriotic outrage, this

informed, riveting classic dares to tell the shameful story of how American and other Allied policymakers undertook the political, economic and social destruction of the German people even as they presumed to instruct them in "justice" and "democracy." Softcover. 151 pp., \$9.00 + \$2 shipping.

GRUESOME HARVEST

The Allies' Postwar War Against The German People



Ralph Franklin Keeling

Doug Collins Under New Fire for Holocaust Views

Jewish Group Brings Criminal Charges for "Swindler's List" Column

Over the years, few Canadian writers have delighted and aggravated more readers than Doug Collins. Now semi-retired, the feisty, articulate British-born journalist regularly still turns out an often-provocative column for the widely-read *North Shore News* of North Vancouver, British Columbia.

No stranger to controversy, Collins has recently come under fire from Jewish groups for a March 9 column (reprinted in the May-June 1994 *Journal*) about Spielberg's much-hyped movie, "Schindler's List."

Calling it "Swindler's List," Collins wrote:

Fifty years after the war one tires of hate literature in the form of films. British Columbia school-children are being trooped in to see this effort... What happened to the Jews during the Second World War is not only the longest lasting but also the most effective propaganda exercise ever ...

In time of war, propaganda is justified. Fifty years on, it's a bit much. But it comes about because the Jewish influence is the most powerful in Hollywood. One is not supposed to say that, of course. It's the ultimate in political incorrectness ...

Opening the new campaign against Collins was a polemic masquerading as a news article in the British Columbia daily paper *The Province*, Oct. 5. Headlined "Holocaust just a story: Collins," it began with a doubly erroneous statement: "Right-wing columnist Doug Collins came out of the closet yesterday and denied the Holocaust occurred." As an irate Collins later pointed out, his views about the Holocaust story have not been a secret, and he is just about the last person in the world to hide his views, in a closet or elsewhere.

Compounding the misrepresentation, the *Province* article went on to complain that Collins' columns are being reprinted by the *Journal* of the Institute for Historical Review, which the paper called "a prominent anti-Semitic group in the US." It added that the IHR "is described by Nazi fighters as a cornerstone of the US neo-Nazi movement."

The Province made no effort to contact the IHR before printing this rubbish. (For some time now, selected Collins' columns have occasionally been reprinted, with his permission, in this *Journal*.)

This was not the first time that Jewish groups have expressed displeasure with Collins, an outspoken champion of freedom of speech who has publicly defended Ernst Zündel, and who addressed the 1990 IHR Conference. (Collins' presentation, "Reflections on the Second World War, Free Speech and Revisionism," was published in the Fall 1991 *Journal*.)

Not one readily to cave in under pressure, Collins has roared back against the new smear campaign, both in his regular column and during a spiritedly defiant October 21 appearance on the Charles Maclean radio talk show (station CKST). "The press has grossly misrepresented Collins and broadcasters are urging a boycott of the *North Shore News*," observes Maclean. "It's a sad day for freedom of speech."



Doug Collins

As part of its vindictive campaign against him, the Canadian Jewish Congress recently brought a criminal charge against Collins, charging that his "Swindler's List"

column violates the country's "hate law." Canada's "Human Rights Act" criminalizes any public expression that "exposes a person or group of persons to hatred or contempt." If found guilty, Collins could be fined up to \$100,000 (Canadian).

Along with Collins, the CJC has also brought a "hate law" charge against John Ball, a British Columbia geologist who rejects the Holocaust extermination story. (Ball spoke about his extensive study of wartime aerial reconnaissance photography at the recent Twelfth IHR Conference).

The CJC complaint "is too ludicrous to take seriously," says Collins. "The obvious intent is to terrify people into silence," he adds. "I may wind up losing \$100,000 and having to live with the homeless, but I'm enjoying myself." He slams the complaint as "a direct attack on freedom of speech and freedom of the press — and, as such, well in line with the traditions of the Canadian Jewish Congress."

Collins, a native of the United Kingdom, served with the British army during the Second World War. After being captured at Dunkirk he was interned, but later escaped from German and Hungarian prisoner of war camps. Recipient of two of Canada's most coveted awards for journalism, his career has included work, both a reporter and commentator, for several major Canadian daily papers, and on television and radio. (For more about Collins, see the *Journal* of Fall 1991, p. 382, Jan.-Feb. 1993, p. 42, and May-June 1993, p. 22.)

The Collins affair is beginning to receive country-wide attention. Diane Francis, editor of the nationally circulated *Financial Post* (Dec. 3), castigated Collins' "Swindler's List" column as "dreadful" and "obnoxious," but at the same time criticized the CJC legal action. Similarly, the leadership of the British Columbia Press Council, a media monitoring group, is "appalled" by the CJC move.

As happened in the Ernst Zündel case, it is likely that the CJC effort against Collins and Ball ultimately will prove counter-productive. For one thing, the "Collins affair" seems to be generating greater public awareness about the Holocaust issue, and public sentiment appears to be largely on Collins' side. For example, every one of the 30 or so persons who called in during Collins' October 21 radio talk show appearance expressed support or sympathy for him. Moreover, a call-in "Hotline" telephone poll conducted by *The Province* asked readers: "Do you agree with Doug Collins that the Nazi Holocaust is exaggerated?" Of the 295 calls received, 50 percent answered "yes." (*The Province*, Oct. 6, 1994.)

— M.W.

"Columnist Blasts News Story"

DOUG COLLINS

[From the *North Shore News*, Oct. 7, 1994]

There I was, barely off the plane from a holiday in England when a callow youth from the morning trash sheet called me to ask why a couple of my columns had appeared in a sinister magazine in the US called *The Journal of Historical Review*.

The pieces in question were my famous columns

on the propaganda movie "Schindler's List" and the Holocaust.

The next day [Oct. 5] there was a "zip" across the bottom of the [front page of] said rag that read "Holocaust? What Holocaust?", plus a picture of Doug the Villain and the words "North Van columnist Doug Collins denies it happened."

On page five the headline was "Holocaust just a story: Collins," plus a picture showing me with a curled lip. (All the best people curl their lips now and again, there being newspapers like *The Province* around.)

The lead paragraph contained the breathless news that "Right-wing columnist Doug Collins came out of the closet yesterday and denied the Holocaust occurred." Fact: I did not deny that "it" occurred. I said I did not believe in the six million story; but that there was no doubt that large numbers of Jews died in the concentration camps, as did large numbers of non-Jews.

Nor did I say that the Holocaust was "just a story." If the interview was taped, I challenge young Mr. Callow, aka Gordon Clark, to produce such words. They were never spoken.

As for coming out of the closet, someone must be mad, and it ain't me. I have been accused of many things, but hiding in closets isn't one of them. Mountain tops yes, closets no.

The columns reprinted in *The Journal of Historical Review* had of course already appeared in the *North Shore News* and caused endless discussion. So talk of closets is pure balderdash.

Clark also asked me whether I was anti-Semitic. This came out as "Collins doesn't consider himself to be anti-Semitic or neo-Nazi (thanks, Gordon) 'but I can't say that some of my best friends are Jews'." What I said on the question of anti-Semitism, was, "The usual answer to that is often the cliché, 'Some of my best friends are Jews.' I can't say that, but it would be idiotic to be opposed to Jews simply because they are Jews."

I also pointed out that I had fought against Hitler for six years during the war (and would do so again if I had the choice). For the record, I take people as I find them. There are vicious Jews, kind Jews, poor Jews, rich Jews. The same applies to any other group.

I did say that in my opinion the gas chamber story was false, and pointed out that for some years after the war it was being claimed that gas chambers existed in the concentration camps of Western Germany; also, that I had seen Bergen-Belsen in 1945 and that it had contained no gas chambers.

Today, as I told the reporter, if such he be, even "Nazi-hunter" Simon Wiesenthal admits there were no gas chambers in the West. As to their existing elsewhere, there is considerable doubt. Not that

such doubts would appear in our politically correct press, except to be ridiculed.

Also for the record, it isn't only "neo-Nazis" who are asking questions. Arno Mayer, a Jew and Professor of European History at Princeton University wrote a book on the Holocaust called *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?*. In it, he admitted that "sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable." Also that "there is no denying the many contradictions, ambiguities and errors in the existing sources."

David Cole, who is also Jewish, has the director of the Auschwitz Museum confessing on video tape that the "gas chamber" shown to tourists there was a reconstruction done after the war by the Soviets. And the Poles have stated that the story of "four million" deaths there is not true. All of which is food for thought, except that some people do not want thought. They want tunnel vision.

To repeat. The Nazis did horrible things. But the six million story is something else. And it's curious that while we get the Holocaust thrown at us daily, the crimes perpetrated by the Communists are dropped into the memory hole. I leave you to guess why.

So why did two or three of my columns appear in the revisionist *Journal*? Because they asked me for them and I said OK. It is reviled by Jewish pressure groups but is a scholarly publication. My arrangement with the *News* is that if anyone wants to run my column regularly, as Sterling News did before my critics got to work, it had to be cleared with my publisher, Mr. Peter Speck. But he told me years ago that the occasional column did not need clearance.

Is the Institute for Historical Review "neo-Nazi?" If so, there must be a lot of neo-Nazis in or from the universities because its magazine's masthead contains the names of 18 PhDs. And in the issue in which my two pieces appeared, so did some Solzhenitsyn stuff. So did an article by Joseph Sobran, whose column appears in 70 U.S. newspapers. If I don't watch it I'll get a big head.

"Confessions of a Modern Heretic"

DOUG COLLINS

[From the North Shore News, Oct. 16, 1994]

The subject is heresy and heretics, because it seems that I am one.

I am in good company. One of the greatest heretics was William Tyndale, who first put the Bible into English. The Roman Catholic Church objected because it thought it would be dangerous for the

"uneducated" to be able to read it.

Tyndale was burned at the stake.

Then there was Galileo. Having studied Copernicus he knew that the Earth revolved around the sun. And said so. The Church thought otherwise, and Galileo was told to recant. He refused. Then they showed him the torture chamber and he changed his mind. I would have done the same. You bet. But Galileo still knew that the Earth went round the sun. And now we do, too.

More recently there was the case of Malcolm Muggeridge, top British writer, journalist and wit, now deceased. In 1953 Muggeridge wrote a piece called "Royal Soap Opera" for an American magazine. It ridiculed the reverence in which the Royals were held, and all hell broke loose. (He was in advance of his time, as you may have noticed.) Muggeridge's name was mud. Cowards libelled him. No one would use him and he was forced to flee to Australia for a while.

But in the end he was rehabilitated. I am a non-entity but I do have a doctorate in political incorrectness. I am against immigration, affirmative action, radical feminism, abortion on demand, homosexuality, the prodnoses of the "human rights" racket and other goodies dispensed by the New Establishment. Still, it is with some timidity that I mention myself in the same breath as Muggeridge and the great heretics. They were captains. I am a rear-rank foot soldier.

My main heresy is "the holocaust." I do not believe the six million figure, although I used to. Nor do I believe in the gas chamber stuff.

How can I know about such things when the Popes of the New Establishment know otherwise? I don't "know" anything, but have read the revisionist literature and come to certain conclusions. My media critics, on the other hand, have not read any of it. They just go on repeating the Orthodox Version. And that's safe. Discussion is not on. Discussion is "denial" and therefore heresy. Don't they get the truth daily on TV?

The literature is impressive. It includes Professor Butz' *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the writings of Professor Robert Faurisson of France, those of former French Resistance leader and concentration camp inmate Paul Rassinier, and judge Wilhelm Stäglich's *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*. Plus the work of arch-heretic David Irving.

Although the smell of burning flesh does not attend today's heretics, jail can await them. If they have teaching jobs they will lose them. That's why no Canadian academic wants to blot his copybook. Academic freedom has its limits.

If a person is a top threat to orthodoxy, like Irving, Jewish pressure will get him barred from South

A Video that Revises History —And Could Change the Course of It

Out of all the footage I brought back, nothing is more significant, or of more vital importance, than the interview I conducted in Poland with Dr. Franciszek Piper of the Auschwitz State Museum. He felt comfortable enough to talk with me for an hour in his office at Auschwitz. The result should keep people talking for quite some time. —David Cole

Equipped with a Super VHS camera, a microphone, a list of questions, and a sense of humor, Revisionist David Cole traveled to Auschwitz in September 1992 and produced a video of that trip that is, to put it mildly, *devastating*. Cole not only documents on tape the falsehoods told Auschwitz visitors every day by unknowing tour guides, he shows that the very people who run the museum aren't at all sure about their main attraction—the “gas chamber”!

Here is dramatic confirmation of what Revisionists have been saying about the Holocaust for more than 20 years, graphically presented on video so you can see and hear for yourself the tour guides and the museum's director, and examine the layout of the camp with its buildings and their surroundings. For those who cannot afford the trip to Europe to see all this for themselves, this video brings Auschwitz, as well as *The Leuchter Report*, to life right in your living room.

Most devastating of all is Cole's interview with Dr. Piper, in which the director of the Auschwitz Museum casually admits to postwar alterations of the room that for decades has been shown to tourists as an unaltered, “original state” gas chamber.

Professionally produced in full color and crisp sound, the tape runs just under an hour. If you've been waiting for a concise, intelligent, and persuasive presentation on the Holocaust that you can comfortably show to friends and family, *that video is here!* For those with no access to a video player, the soundtrack is available on C-60 audio cassette.

DAVID COLE INTERVIEWS Dr. FRANCISZEK PIPER

VHS \$49 (PAL format \$59)

Price to *Journal* subscribers, \$39 (\$49 in PAL)

Audio cassette of the video soundtrack, \$9.95

Add \$2.50 for shipping • Cal. residents add 7.75% sales tax

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Correction:

The sampling of Revilo Oliver's writings in the Sept.–Oct. 1994 *Journal* was taken not only from pages 1–4, 79–83, 182–183 and 187–189 of his book, *America's Decline* (as noted on page 21 of that issue of the *Journal*), but also from the following additional pages of Oliver's book: 190–191 and 212–213.

Africa, Australia and Germany. It will also get him arrested while making a speech in Victoria and deported from liberty-loving Canada on the pretext of his having broken the immigration laws.

This even though immigrant rapists and murderers float freely around this country and an apologist for terrorism like Sinn Feiner Gerry Adams can make speeches here. The clamps on holocaust discussion are there “for the protection of the truth.” The same sort of thing applied in Tyndale's day. But as Oberon Waugh has asked, what sort of truth is it that needs protecting?

Meanwhile, even a minor heretic like me can watch out. If he starts writing for a newspaper chain the pressure groups will soon have him “de-syndicated.” And the biggest fool and flapmouth in local radio will call for the boycotting of the one newspaper that publishes him. The least he can expect is that a contemptible sheet like the *Province* will publish a crude cartoon on him reminiscent of the stuff in the Nazi newspaper *Der Stuermer*.

Such trash is not confined to “holocaust heretics.” For criticizing our crazy immigration policies the late, great J.V. Clyne was shown in the same fine newspaper getting encouragement from a man in a white hood. “Way to go, J.V.,” said the hood.

No, they're not yet burning people at the stake. But when they do they'll need a lot of wood because a *Province* phone poll showed that 50 percent of their hundreds of respondents agreed with me. Amazing. Look out for a veritable tsunami of abuse and propaganda.

PEARL HARBOR The Story of the Secret War

by George Morgenstern

Hailed by Revisionist giants Barnes, Beard, and Tansill when it appeared shortly after World War II, this classic remains unsurpassed as a one-volume treatment of America's Day of Infamy. Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* is the indispensable introduction to the question of who bears the blame for the



Pearl Harbor surprise, and, more important, for America's entry through the “back door” into World War II. Attractive new IHR softcover edition with introduction by James J. Martin. 425 pp., index, biblio., maps, \$14.95 + \$2.50 shipping.

“Taking Tabloid ‘Trash’ to Task”

[Reprinted from the North Shore News, Oct. 9, 1994]

To the Editor, *The Province*:

The article you ran by Gordon Clark on Oct. 5 (“Holocaust just a story: Collins”) was the grottiest piece of “journalism” I have seen in a long time. And that’s saying something.

I did not deny that the “Holocaust” occurred. I stated quite clearly that large numbers of Jews died in the camps, as did large numbers of non-Jews. Just ask the Poles. I did not say that “it” was “just a story.” If your reporter was taping our conversation I challenge him to produce those words. They were simply not spoken.

I did say that the six million story was not true. And I quoted several Jewish sources to that effect, including Professor Yehuda Bauer, the Israeli Holocaust scholar who in 1989 was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying: “The larger figures have been dismissed for years, except that it hasn’t reached the public yet.” [*New York Times*, Nov. 12, 1989]

When Clark said that historians stand by the six million story I replied that many do but some don’t (including Professor Arthur Butz, author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*). Also that Prof. Daniel Vining, another American, has stated [*Chronicles*, Sept. 1993] that to question the six million story is a good way for academics to lose their jobs. Jewish pressure groups don’t mess around.

Nor did I state, baldly, that “none of my best friend are Jews.” Asked whether I was anti-Semitic I stated that the usual cliché response to such a question was to state that “some of my best friends are Jews.” But I added that it would be idiotic to dislike Jews simply because they were Jews.

I did say that I do not believe in the gas chamber stuff and could have quoted Jewish academic Arno Mayer who stated in his book *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* that sources on the gas chambers are “at once rare and unreliable.” A particularly stupid statement by Clark was that “Columnist Doug Collins has come out of the closet and denied the Holocaust.”

Closets are not my style. My views, including those on this subject, have been up front for years, and as far as I am concerned anyone can have them, including the Institute for Historical Review.

Your newspaper is a tabloid trash bag. Next time you want to interview me, don’t bother. Just make it up out of whole cloth. The result would be the same.

Doug Collins

PAID ADVERTISEMENT

Revisionist Television!

Watch the “Voice of Freedom” from space
via satellite TV!

Sunday

21:30 Eastern Time

G-6/TR-2 C-Band

74° west longitude freq. 3740

Your host, *Ernst Zündel*, in English!

Revisionist Radio!

News, Views, and History

Freedom Radio

Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday

10:00 p.m. Central Time

KXEL 1540 AM

Waterloo, Iowa

Sunday

6:15 p.m. Eastern Time

WWVA 1170 AM

Wheeling West, Virginia

Revisionist Shortwave!

Listen to Ernst Zündel’s

Another Voice of Freedom

heard America-wide on

WRNO shortwave

Saturday

9:00 p.m. Eastern Time

7.355 mHz, 41-meter band

Sunday

5:00 p.m. Eastern Time

15.420 mHz, 19-meter band

Samisdat

206 Carlton Street, Toronto

Ontario M5A 2L1 Canada

Tel: (416) 922-9850

Fax: (416) 922-8614

Letters

Havel and "Ethnic Cleansing"

In his Independence Hall speech (published in the Sept.-Oct. 1994 *Journal*), Vaclav Havel said that "the Creator gave man the right to liberty."

Does Mr. Havel live by those words? As President of the Czech Republic, he has deplored the forced expulsion of 3.5 million ethnic Germans from Czechoslovakia, and the killing of 325,000 of them, in 1945-1946. But today he protects the killers from prosecution and upholds the Benes "ethnic cleansing" decrees of 1945 that ordered the expulsion. Also, Havel refuses to meet with the representatives of the expelled Sudeten Germans.

Why does Mr. Havel not reverse a great historic injustice and "give man the right to liberty." It seems that President Havel is a liberal: he says what people like to hear, but does what he wants. He is not a revisionist!

E. B.

Hallandale, Florida

Dr. App's Book Recommended

I am writing to recommend to readers *No Time for Silence* [published by the IHR], a 150-page collection of newspaper articles, essays and pamphlets by Dr. Austin App that originally appeared between 1946 and 1978 about the terrible fate that befell Germans in the aftermath of the Second World War.

As freedom-loving people, we must not forget the terrible treatment of the more than ten million German men, women and children who fled or were driven from their ancient homelands in East and West Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, the Oder-Niese region, and Sudetenland. Under often appalling conditions, they fled or were deported from their homes into what was left of bombed-out, dismantled, amputated Germany.

One million German, Austrian and Hungarian women — ages eight to eighty — were raped. In Berlin alone, more than 100,000 women were raped. Small boys who tried to protect their mothers and sisters were shot down on the spot. More than two million men, women, and children perished in this horror — history's single most terrible act of genocide.

To "complete" the devastation, American officials devised the genocidal Morgenthau Plan — which was backed by President Franklin Roosevelt. According to App, this horrific plan for the devastation of Germany was abandoned only after loud protests from American Christians. [*No Time for Silence* is available from the IHR for \$6.95, plus \$2 for shipping.]

T. G.

Fort Smith, Ark.

Appreciation from Egypt

The Holocaust story plays a very important role in Western public opinion, and certainly needs revision. The Zionist movement exploits the Holocaust story to justify the establishment of the Zionist state and its bloody crimes against the Arab Palestinian people.

We are convinced that some of the Western literature about Zionist history and the Palestinian cause is biased, if not entirely wrong. Of course, we do not accept the killing of even one innocent person, but deaths of Jews decades ago in Europe is no excuse to push the Palestinian people from their homeland.

I would like to express my appreciation of the efforts by you and others to reconsider and revise the historical record.

Recently I have been committed to attending several sessions of a drawn-out trial relating to what we have published in our

newspaper *Al Shaab* ["The People"] exposing corruption of high-level Egyptian officials.

Magdi Hussein
Editor, *Al Shaab*
Cairo, Egypt

Truth From America or Russia?

I very much appreciate the work that is being done by the IHR and the revisionists cooperating with all of you, especially as a German who sees that the political action taken by the Bundestag is leading us into the worse dictatorship we ever had.

The Kohl regime rules against the will of more than 80 percent of the German people in order to deprive us of our state, its constitution and its currency. In keeping with the proposals of T. N. Kaufman (*Germany Must Perish*) and Earnest A. Hooton, the Kohl administration is flooding Germany with millions of foreign people, drawn by high incomes paid for by German taxpayers.

There is no newspaper and no television station informing the public about this background. The truth about Auschwitz cannot be published in Germany. A Munich paper (*Münchner Anzeiger*) and David Irving tried. The editor of the paper survived an attempt on his life, and the paper is no longer published. Irving is now prohibited from entering Germany. It seems that the truth must come to us from America and/or from Russia.

Because I am a retired engineer my funds are not so grand anymore. So my contribution is only \$100.

D. L.

Neustadt, Germany

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space.


THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW

1993 Bound Volume

The Essays, Reviews and Commentary
from 1993's Six Bimonthly Issues, with Index

Each year we index and bind the year's Journals into handsome, durable, cloth-covered volumes with royal blue gilt-imprinted covers. Only 300 of these annual volumes are produced, making them rare and valuable, and an important addition to any library, public or private.

Now you can own (or donate to your favorite library) the 1993 annual bound volume of **The Journal of Historical Review**, which includes all the essays, reviews, news and commentary published in Volume 13, issues 1 through 6, with an index and master table of contents.



The Journal of Historical Review
1993 Bound Volume
Volume 13, Nos. 1-6 with Index
Cloth • 312 pages • \$35 + \$3 shipping

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659
See the IHR catalog for descriptions of all JHR bound volumes

—Essays—

- Life Under Fire*
by David Irving
- The Life and Death of My Father Rudolf Hess*
by Wolf R. Hess
- The Legacy of Rudolf Hess*
by Mark Weber
- The Holocaust Issue: Three Christian Views*
Thomas Jefferson's Place in History
by Martin A. Larson
- Seeking Justice for John Demjanjuk*
by Jerome Brentar
- Demjanjuk, Israel and the Holocaust*
by Joseph Sobran
- Abraham Lincoln and the Issue of Race*
by Robert Morgan
- "Liberators" Film & Book Fraud*
by Mark Weber and Greg Raven
- The Adventure of Revisionism*
by Robert Faurisson
- Reflections on the Zuendel and Irving Cases*
by Doug Collins
- The Holocaust and Middle East Policy*
by Alfred Lilienthal
- America Becomes an Imperial Power, 1898*
by John Ries and Mark Weber
- The US Holocaust Memorial Museum: A Challenge*
by Robert Faurisson
- Zionism and the Third Reich*
by Mark Weber
- A Critique of Pressac's Opus*
by Arthur R. Butz
- A Jewish Revisionist's Visit to Auschwitz*
by David Cole
- The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers*
by David Irving

—News & Comment—

- David Irving Barred from Australia*
Victory for Irving in Australia
Faking War Atrocity Stories
"Gas Chamber" Fraud at US Holocaust Museum
Legal Assault Against Revisionists in Europe
George Will and Holocaust Revisionism
- The Journal of Historical Review: A Look Back*
The Story Keeps Changing
Documentary Takes Aim at Holocaust Claims

—Reviews—

- Lipstadt's Denying the Holocaust and Other Anti-Revisionist Works* • *Arnold Forster's Square One*
• *Vidal-Naquet's Assassins of Memory* • *The Third Reich Almanac* • *Taylor's Anatomy of the Nuremberg Trials* • *British Historian J.F.C. Fuller* • *Stannard's American Holocaust* • *Taylor's Paved with Good Intentions* • *Nakhleh's Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*

A Story of Revenge That Needs Telling

“ . . . Extremely gripping and compelling account of the appalling events which accompanied the end of the war and the expulsion of the Germans from what was to become Western Poland in one go. . . . The topic of Jewish participation in these acts of oppression is controversial. . . but I am satisfied that the author is a serious researcher. . . . The book is in fact a major contribution to our understanding.”


—ANTONY POLONSKY,
Professor of East European Jewish History,
Brandeis University

An Eye for an Eye: The Untold Story of Jewish Revenge Against Germans in 1945 is a riveting account of terrible but little-known events that followed the end of World War II.

In 1945 the Soviet Union, which occupied Poland and parts of Germany — a region inhabited by ten million German civilians — established its Office of State Security and deliberately recruited Jews to carry out its own trademark brand of de-Nazification. The Office’s hirelings raided German homes, rounding up men, women, and children — 99 percent of them noncombatant, innocent civilians — and incarcerated them in cellars, prisons, and 1,255 concentration camps, where inmates subsisted on starvation rations, and where typhus ran rampant and torture was commonplace. In this brief period, between 60,000 and 80,000 Germans died while in the hands of the Office.

This book tells the story of how the Jewish victims of the Third Reich’s policies turned around and inflicted equally terrible suffering on innocent Germans. Author John Sack focuses on people like Lola, a young woman who became commandant of a prison, determined to avenge the death of her family, and Shlomo, a commandant who bragged that “What the Germans couldn’t do in five years at Auschwitz, I’ve done in five months at Schwientochlowitz.”

This is the first book to tell the story of Jewish atrocities against German civilians. To unearth it, the author, a veteran journalist and war correspondent, spent seven years conducting research and interviews in Poland, Germany, Israel, and the United States.



AN EYE FOR AN EYE

The Untold Story of Jewish Revenge Against the Germans in 1945

Hardbound • 252 pages • Notes • Sources • Index • \$25.95 postpaid
Institute for Historical Review • PO Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659