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On April 22, 1993, presidents and high-ranking officials of the United States, Israel and other countries gathered in Washington, DC to dedicate the new US Holocaust Memorial Museum. An army of journalists, cameramen and commentators was there to broadcast the media event to the world.

IHR was there, too — there to declare its unequivocal opposition to this monstrous $160 million monument to flawed priorities and illicit power. On April 21 IHR held a conference at a hotel in a suburb of Washington, DC where 200 friends came to hear Robert Faurisson from France, David Irving from England, JHR editor Mark Weber and Robert Countess speak out against the Holocaust lobby. The event was captured on video, including, Prof. Faurisson's challenge to Museum officials that read, in part:

Tomorrow the US Holocaust Memorial Museum will be dedicated in Washington. I challenge the Museum authorities to provide us a physical representation of the magical gas chamber. I have searched for 30 years for such a representation without finding it. . . . I warn the officials of the US Holocaust Museum . . . that tomorrow, April 22, 1993, they need not offer, as proof of the existence of Nazi gas chambers, a disinfection gas chamber, a shower room, a morgue, or an air-raid shelter . . . . I want a portrayal of an entire Nazi gas chamber, one that gives a precise idea of its technique and operation.

Watch Prof. Faurisson deliver the complete text of his devastating challenge. Watch the inimitable David Irving thrill his audience with details of the Holocaust lobby's stepped-up efforts to crush truth in history. Watch Mark Weber deliver his rousing "call to arms" in opposition to the museum, and hear Dr. Countess' elegant tribute to the IHR — all in an unforgettable 90-minute video that tells you what you need to know about this costly and dangerous mistake they call a "museum."

Barred From Australia

Last February the Australian government banned British historian David Irving on the pretext that he was "likely to become involved in activities disruptive to, or violence threatening harm to, the Australian community or a group within the Australian community."

Zionist organizations of course cheered the ban — Irving's views are "against the national interest," they bitched — but the Australian media, with candor unthinkable elsewhere in the West, zeroed right in on the ban's pivotal component — Jewish pressure — sharply condemning the campaign by Jewish groups to impose their fanatical views on the entire country. At the controversy raged, Irving appeared by satellite hook-up for 20 minutes on a major prime-time Australia television news program.

Irving and his views soon became house knowledge in Australia. Lamenting the publicity, I. L. President of the E Council of Australians, cautioned that Jewish interests would be better served if only Jewish groups would conceal their role in such cases.

Irving took offensive:

The battle for freedom of speech is just beginning . . . I don't intend to be beaten. I'm a fighter. Free speech is becoming a rarity around the world, and it is being restricted to those with politically correct views. I'm not politically correct. I express views based on information I've dug out of archives. . . . If I'm telling lies or half-truths, why don't they let me come to Australia and expose me?

By this restriction of the freedom of speech in Australia, and of the rights of Australians to hear me, my opponents will achieve precisely the result they wished to avoid — namely an increase in anti-Semitic feelings among ordinary Australian citizens.

Now, from IHR and Focal Point Productions, learn the whole story of the ban and the evil behind it, see the extraordinary headlines and copy it sparked in the Aussie media, and watch Irving deliver a rousing talk on the ban and his plans to fight it.

This exclusive 80-minute video, The Search for Truth in History (also available on audiotape) has already sold thousands of copies in Australia. It's history in the making. It's about the war for Freedom of Speech. And it's a case study of how the real bigots and hatemongers bend governments to their will. Order your copy of this high quality, full-color video production today. Your documentary library is not complete without it.

THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH IN HISTORY
VHS • $29 + $2 shipping (Audiotape $9.95 + $1 shipping)
from INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
The Journal of Historical Review
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Front cover photo: John Demjanjuk, holding his release papers, shakes hands with a prison guard in the Israel Supreme Court in Jerusalem on July 29, 1993, after he is acquitted of crimes as “Ivan the Terrible” of Treblinka. (Reuters/Bettman)
John Demjanjuk's vindication — culminating in his recent reunion with his family in the United States — has special meaning for Jerome Brentar. For more than a decade, this deeply religious man of Croatian ancestry and anti-Communist conviction has devoted countless hours of his own time and considerable money from his own pocket to help defend the Ukrainian-American auto worker.

This was not the first such case in which Brentar had played an important role. In the earlier case of Frank Walus, Brentar dug up evidence that proved to be of crucial importance in exonerating the Polish-born American.

It was only after a protracted and devastating legal ordeal that Walus, who has gratefully called Brentar "my savior," was able to establish that he was not a Gestapo murderer of Jews in wartime Poland, as Simon Wiesenthal, the United States government, eleven Jewish "eyewitnesses," and several newspapers had insisted, but instead had spent the war years as a quiet teenage farm laborer in Germany. (For more on this case, see the Summer 1992 Journal, pp. 186-187.)

Brentar's dismissal in early September 1988 as national co-chairman of a George Bush presidential campaign organization — after a Jewish weekly paper focused attention on his efforts on behalf of Demjanjuk — made headlines in newspapers around the country, and brought Brentar's face to national television news broadcasts.

Explained a Bush campaign aide: "We became aware of his [Brentar's] affiliation with the group that supports the defense of John Demjanjuk, and that position is at fundamental odds with the Vice President [Bush] and this campaign. And we took the action based on learning about that today.... We told him [Brentar] that his advocacy on this issue puts him at a fundamental disagreement with the campaign and the Vice President."

Commenting on his dismissal, Brentar said: "It's part of a dirty smear campaign that started because I said Demjanjuk is innocent. For that, I'm called a neo-Nazi and an anti-Semitic revisionist." Brentar also noted: "I could have been an atheist. I could have been a polygamist. I could have been anything else, and questions wouldn't have been asked. And now because I helped a poor victim, I'm everything under the sun." (New York Times, Sept. 9, 1988.)

A mark of the sorry moral level to which our country has fallen is not only the shameful role of the US federal government in the persecution of John Demjanjuk, but that an American vice president could see fit to order the removal of a man as decent and upright as Brentar from a campaign committee because of his selfless work on behalf of an American citizen he passionately believes to be innocent of monstrous crimes, in a country where people are supposedly presumed innocent until proven otherwise.

On September 14, 1988, not long after his dismissal from the Bush campaign, Brentar appeared on the CNN cable television program "Crossfire," along with New York Congressman Stephen Solarz and co-hosts Tom Braden and Pat Buchanan. On a nationally-televised broadcast, apparently for the first time ever, the great taboo of Holocaust revisionism was breached.

Although Brentar was reluctant to get into the Holocaust issue itself, the program's "liberal" fossil, Tom Braden, gave further evidence of his calcified mindset by vigorously claiming that he personally saw gas chamber victims at Buchenwald at the end of the war. Co-host Pat Buchanan, a savvy and courageous writer and probably the most prominent national defender of Demjanjuk, thereupon cut in and pointed out that no serious historian makes that claim anymore.

Braden responded with sheepish silence.

Stephen Solarz, a Congressman from Brooklyn who boasted in 1981 that he had become a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in order, as he put it, to "deliver for Israel," lost control of him-
He charged that Brentar’s greatest sin was not that he defended Demjanjuk, but that he had doubts about the Holocaust story.

Although Brentar explained that he preferred not to get into the issue, Solarz insisted on a statement. “Did Jews die in gas chambers at Auschwitz? Were six million Jews killed?,” he demanded. Finally, Brentar simply said that although he is not a scholar of the Holocaust, there are certainly absurdities and contradictions in the Holocaust story. Brentar specifically mentioned the once seriously made allegation that masses of Jews were put to death at Treblinka in huge steam chambers, and he mentioned the now discredited story of mass killing by electricity.

Brentar’s calm and factual remarks only further enraged Solarz. After another outburst from the ultra-Zionist politician, Buchanan shot back, “don’t be a complete phony,” a remark that so stunned the normally loquacious lawmaker that he was momentarily struck speechless.

Over the years, Jerry Brentar has endured a barrage of outrageous attacks against his character, including loud criticism for speaking at IHR conferences. But long after such mean-spirited carping is forgotten, this noble man will be remembered as the person whose intrepid and selfless help John Demjanjuk almost certainly would have been deported to the Soviet Union and executed for crimes he did not commit.

— M. W.
Demjanjuk, does not mention Treblinka at all, but instead places him at Sobibor and at an agricultural estate in Poland.

Along with this piece of evidence, the government produced five witnesses from Israel who testified that Demjanjuk was the notorious Ivan of Treblinka. As it happened, though, one of these witnesses, Elijahu Rosenberg, had told the Polish War Crimes Commission in 1945 that the man known as Ivan of Treblinka had been killed during an uprising at the camp in August 1943. Rosenberg repeated this claim in a statement given in December 1947 at the Jewish center in Vienna, declaring under oath that Ivan of Treblinka had been killed. Some years later, though, testifying against Demjanjuk in Cleveland in 1981, and again in Israel in 1987, Rosenberg changed his story. He admitted that, yes, he had stated that Ivan the Terrible was dead. At the trial in Israel, however, he said, pointing, “But he's there. He's alive. I'm seeing him there!” It was testimony like this that brought the sentence of death against this poor man.

A dramatic moment during the trial in Jerusalem of John Demjanjuk: Prosecution witness Elijahu Rosenberg angrily spurns the defendant's offered hand as Demjanjuk attorney Mark O'Connor looks on.

Streibel's Testimony

After seeing the ID card in the newspaper, I called Mr. Karl Streibel, who had been commandant of the Trawniki camp, where this document had supposedly been issued. Streibel told me:

Mr. Brentar, I told your people from Washington, who came to see me three years ago, that this is not an ID card from Trawniki. I told them that Trawniki was a training camp for those men who were chosen to work as guards for the Germans, and that this was a training camp not only for concentration camp guards. There were approximately five thousand men there, most of whom were then assigned to guard military installations, bridges, depots, motor pools, and so on. About three hundred of them were assigned to guard at camps such as Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor.

Mr. Streibel went on to tell me:

Mr. Brentar, the attorneys from the OSI were here, and I told them to bring me the original ID card. I wanted to see the original because I would absolutely never sign any document without putting the date and place of issue before my signature.

The OSI was very much concerned that Demjanjuk’s defense attorneys would try to meet and talk with Mr. Streibel. And indeed a meeting was arranged in Hamburg with Streibel and the defense attorneys, Mr. John Martin and Mr. Spiros Gonakis. But even though a date and a time in the late afternoon had been set for the meeting, as John Martin later told me, he received a phone call, allegedly from a friend of Mr. Streibel, informing him that he was not interested in meeting with the gentlemen from America after all. As it turned out, Streibel received a similar telephone call, allegedly from the defense attorneys, telling him that they were not interested in seeing him. This clearly seems to be another example of the dirty tricks engaged in by the OSI in its campaign to prosecute and persecute this man, and bring him to KGB-style justice.

Additional Testimony

As you can appreciate, I quickly became very suspicious of the charges against Demjanjuk. I then began a years-long search for evidence, tracing the route followed by the OSI in its search for evidence against this man. In Germany, I met with the wartime commandant of the Treblinka camp, Kurt Franz, who was then serving a sentence in a prison near Düsseldorf. During our meeting, Franz told me: “Mr. Brentar, several years ago six of your people were here, and I told them that this man [Demjanjuk] is not the Ivan of Treblinka. The Ivan of Treblinka was much older, had dark hair, and was taller. He had a stoop because he was so tall. So why do you come here again to ask me the same questions?” I replied: “Mr. Franz, I am not from Washington. I'm from Cleveland, Ohio, and I'm trying to help this man.”

I want to mention here that the Institute for Historical Review, and its friends and associates, have really helped me to establish contacts with people who proved instrumental in helping put together a thorough and truthful picture, of what happened — and still is happening — to John Demjanjuk.

Well, as I continued my investigation, I
arranged to meet with every one of the people whom the OSI had visited earlier. What I discovered is that the OSI’s case against John Demjanjuk was built on lies, exaggerations, distortions, fabrications, innuendos, and dirty tricks.

**Obstacles in Israel**

Visiting Israel, I arranged to go with a Jewish friend to meet with Menachem Russek, chief of the agency that is the Israeli counterpart of the OSI in the United States. “Mr. Russek, don’t be a fool,” I said to him. “You’re being misled by the OSI. This is an innocent man.” And even though I had brought along evidence to prove what I was saying, well, he couldn’t care less, because he was every bit as eager to prosecute and persecute John Demjanjuk as was Neal Sher and his OSI entourage.

I asked Mr. Russek if I could speak with the three main witnesses against Demjanjuk: Pinchas Epstein, Elijahu Rosenberg and Sonia Lewkowicz. I particularly wanted to meet with Rosenberg, to question him about the discrepancies in his sworn statements. “I’m here to give you everything I have — all the truth,” I told Russek. “Why don’t you let me meet with these people so I can question them?” Well, for obvious reasons, I was not permitted to meet with any of them.

**Fedorenko’s Fate**

John Demjanjuk was originally supposed to be deported to the Soviet Union where, as you know, the authorities make quick work of liquidating their “enemies.” That’s what happened to other “Nazi war criminals” from the United States, such as Karl Linnas and Fedor Fedorenko. While Fedorenko’s case was on appeal, OSI chief Neal Sher met with the Ukrainian-born Fedorenko and told him: “Look, why don’t you go back to your homeland. You’ve already been back several times.” (That was true: he had a wife and a family there, and had returned several times since the war.) “This appeal will cost you a lot of money. Why don’t you go back and spend the rest of your life with your family there?” That was a trick. No sooner had Fedorenko, the poor fellow, arrived there with thousands of dollars worth of Soviet rubles, which he had bought on the black market (getting a much better rate than he could have gotten in Russia), then he was arrested and, after a quick KGB trial, shot. I am convinced that Neal Sher had notified the Soviets of his arrival, to get rid of him and prevent him from testifying in the Demjanjuk case.

**Villagers’ Testimony**

In Poland I visited Treblinka and the nearby villages. In one such village I visited the house of Maria Dudek. When I showed her the photograph of John Demjanjuk, she said to me, in Polish: “I never saw this man before.” But when I asked her if she ever heard of “Ivan the Terrible,” she panicked and shut the door on me.

I found three other witnesses from that village, former inmates of Treblinka, who had seen “Ivan.” These three villagers were supposed to come to Cleveland to testify in court. But an OSI official named Michael Wolf telephoned the US Consulate in Warsaw and told officials there: “Don’t let the witnesses come. The hearing is over.” That was a lie; the hearing was still continuing. This was another of their many dirty tricks. They prevented these three witnesses from testifying on behalf of Demjanjuk.

Pinchas Epstein, a key prosecution witness in the Jerusalem trial of Demjanjuk, accuses the defendant of being the notorious Treblinka camp guard known as “Ivan the Terrible.” (Reuters/Bettmann photo)

Wolf also told the Polish authorities that I’m a neo-Nazi, an anti-Semite and a revisionist, and that I’m paying money to witnesses to lie to defend a Nazi murderer, John Demjanjuk. As a result, a long article appeared in the Polish newspaper Polityka that condemned me for trying to recruit witnesses who would lie in court for money as witnesses on behalf of Demjanjuk.

With regard to testimony of Maria Dudek, I’d like to mention an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer (Sept. 13, 1992), headlined “Demjanjuk wasn’t Treblinka’s ‘monster,’ ex-captives insist,” which reports that an additional witness named Nina Shiyenko likewise confirmed that “Ivan of Treblinka” is not John Demjanjuk.

Such incidents tell just part of the story of what has happened to this poor man, John Demjanjuk.
But there's an old saying that I think applies in this case: "Every evil carries within itself the seed of its own destruction." And that seed has begun to germinate.

**Exonerating Evidence**

As a result of all the exonerating evidence that I was able to provide to the defense, Demjanjuk was not deported to the Soviet Union, as was originally planned. Instead, OSI chief Sher panicked. He ran to Israel to tell the authorities there to work for Demjanjuk's extradition to that country, because of the danger that the case was being lost in Cleveland. There's too much evidence to show that Demjanjuk is innocent, he told them. As a result of his effort, Israel made an official request for his extradition.

According to the legal rules for extradition that were in effect at that time, it was not permissible to submit any further evidence on behalf of a defendant. So it was planned to present the additional evidence to the court in Jerusalem.

---

**A Journalist's Admission**

Back in Cleveland, in 1984, I visited the office of the *Plain Dealer*, the city's main newspaper, which was supposedly supporting Demjanjuk. Regrettably, though, they printed more negative than positive articles about him. A *Plain Dealer* reporter said to me: “Jerry, we're not interested in his innocence. We're only interested in his extradition.”

**The Bush Campaign**

I want to tell you a little more about how I was asked to resign from the Bush presidential campaign. Actually, I had never been active in Bush's campaign, the Republican party, or even in politics. So I was very much surprised when I learned that I had been chosen to become co-chairman of the Bush campaign's national ethnic coalition group. In Washington I was received by Mr. Bush, who congratulated me. When he asked me to support him, I told him that I would. My hope was that this might give me a further opportunity to help John Demjanjuk.

Unfortunately, in this God-blessed country of ours, it's no longer what you know, but who you know, that counts. About a month after I was named, I received a phone call from an official of the Bush campaign, who told me: “Mr. Brentar, the Vice President is very much upset because we've been getting all kinds of calls telling us that you're a neo-Nazi, that you're an anti-Semitic revisionist, and that you are helping a convicted Nazi war criminal. Mr. Bush wants you to leave the ethnic coalition, and I calling to ask you to resign.” I replied by telling him: “My dear man, I am with the campaign by invitation. If you want me to resign, please send me this request in writing, and I'll consider it.” Well, I never received it.

As a result of that, my name appeared in newspapers around the country, and I received phone calls from Argentina, Australia, and from people I had met and worked with years earlier in Germany, who asked me what was going on. “I don't know myself,” I told them. “I'm just trying, as a true American, to help an innocent man, and instead I'm being lambasted as an anti-Semitic neo-Nazi revisionist.”

**Pat Buchanan**

Some good did come out of all this publicity, though. One day I got a call from a Mr. Matt Balic of New Jersey. Like me, he is of Croatian background. He told me that he he'd like to introduce me to Pat Buchanan. Balic told me that I have an important story to tell, and asked if I'd like to appear [on the television program] "Crossfire." “Sure,” I replied. So that's how I came to appear on "Crossfire." I got to know Buchanan very well, and from that time on I sent him much information that he used in writing articles in defense of Demjanjuk.
Congressman Traficant

A short time after that, Matt Balic arranged for me to meet Congressman James Traficant. Well, after I finished telling him the whole story, much as I'm telling it to you here, but in even more detail, Traficant said to me: "Jerry, I can't believe this. Are you lying to me? Are you exaggerating?" And I said, "Why should I? I'm not paid. I'm doing this voluntarily because I am for truth and justice, and that's the only way we're going to have peace in this world, with justice." Well, after that meeting this man really went to bat for me, and for Demjanjuk, going far beyond the call of duty.

Another "Ivan"

It was during its investigation of Fedorenko that the OSI had obtained copies of court transcripts of the Treblinka trials in the USSR that referred to the Ivan of Treblinka. These papers, which were not made available to the defense in Demjanjuk's denaturalization hearings in Cleveland, include the testimony of 18 former Treblinka guards who confirmed that the "Ivan of Treblinka" was a man named Ivan Marchenko (or Marczenko). These documents had been in the hands of the OSI since 1978, so these US government officials knew very well that John Demjanjuk was not "Ivan the Terrible" of Treblinka.

In August 1991, Congressman Traficant was able - through the Freedom of Information Act - to obtain copies of these documents, which proved to be crucial in finally exonerating Demjanjuk. Traficant even arranged for John Demjanjuk's son-in-law, Ed Nishnic, along with John Demjanjuk, Jr., to go to Poland and the Soviet Union in December 1991, as his aides, to obtain additional exculpatory evidence. During this visit, the two men met with Marchenko's daughter.

"Political Suicide"

Until my meeting with Jim Traficant, we had had no luck at all with politicians. Earlier, John Demjanjuk, Jr., and I had visited Washington, DC, where we rapped on the doors of every Congressman and Senator to ask for help in the defense of an innocent man. The Representatives from the Cleveland area, Demjanjuk's home, whom one might have expected to be most willing to help, wanted nothing whatsoever to do with the case. A few Congressmen were somewhat sympathetic, but they did nothing.

One Congressman, Dana Rohrabacher, who represents a district in southern California, explained frankly to me why he would not help: "Jerry, do you want me to commit political suicide?" Is this really the kind of country we now live in? Pat Buchanan really hit the nail on the head, I think, when he referred to the US Congress as "a parliament of whores" on "Israeli-occupied" capitol hill. Because of comments like that, Buchanan is, of course, near the top of the ADL's enemies list.

I am not so far down on that list myself. I'm not trying to brag, but while I was in Israel attending the trial of Demjanjuk, the prosecutor took time to ask me to stand up and to identify myself as a defender of the convicted murderer. When I did, I was booed. My name also came up during the appeal hearing last year, when the charge was made that the defense case was suspect because it had to rely so much on help from a revisionist, an anti-Semite and a neo-Nazi - me, that is - in obtaining all this lying, crooked information and testimony.

Congressman James Traficant

"Big Business"

The people who work for the Office of Special Investigations claim to be motivated by concern for the memory of the dead. But I am sure that none of those people would lift a finger for anyone if the Holocaust was not so profitable and prestigious. There is truth to the saying, "There's no business like Shoah business."

This point was confirmed by Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits, who is Chief Rabbi of Britain, and Lord in the British parliament. A front-page article in the Israeli newspaper Jerusalem Post (Nov. 26, 1987, p. 1) reports:

Despite widespread acceptance of the Holocaust as a tragedy unique in Jewish history, leading
[Jewish] Torah scholars are “unanimous” in “denying the uniqueness of the Holocaust as an event any different . . . from any previous national catastrophe,” according to British Chief Rabbi Sir Immanuel Jakobovits.

The Holocaust, Jakobovits went on to say, has become “an entire industry, with handsome profits for writers, researchers, film-makers, monument builders, museum planners, and even politicians.” He added that some rabbis and theologians are “partners in this big business.”

Because it is considered the most important event in Jewish history, those who play up the Holocaust also find sensationalism necessary. Tales about Demjanjuk and “Ivan the Terrible” give the story spark. But as Jakobovits warned:

Would it not be a catastrophic perversion of the Jewish spirit if brooding over the Holocaust were to become a substantial element in the Jewish purpose, and if the anxiety to prevent another Holocaust were to be relied upon as an essential incentive for Jewish activity?

Ivan of Sobibor?

Now, as the story of Demjanjuk of Treblinka falls apart, efforts are being made to replace it with the story of Demjanjuk of Sobibor. Now it is claimed that “when Demjanjuk was an SS guard he took part in mass killings of Jewish citizens in Sobibor camp.” Well, that’s a lot of baloney because, as Karl Streibel explained to me: “Mr. Brentar, anybody who was [trained] in Trawniki had to have a Personalbogen.” This refers to a German personnel and identity record, which includes information about date and place of birth, a thumb print, and so forth.

Here, for example [holding up for everyone to see], is a facsimile copy of the Personalbogen identity record from Trawniki for Ivan Marchenko. If John Demjanjuk had actually been a guard at Sobibor, as some are now claiming, he would have received basic training at Trawniki, and his completed Personalbogen would therefore have been on file there as well. But there isn’t any.

False and Authentic Documents

As Mr. Streibel explained to me, the Soviets advanced so quickly on the Trawniki camp that those in charge there had no opportunity to destroy the camp’s files. The Soviets captured all those records, including the Personalbogen for Marchenko and others, as reproduced in facsimile here in this book [holding it up], which was written by a very good friend of mine, a German by the name of Dieter Lehner. I am sure that if a Personalbogen record for Demjanjuk had been on file at Trawniki, the Soviets would certainly have made it public.

In this book, which is entitled Du sollst nicht falsch Zeugnis geben (“Thou shalt not bear false witness”), Lehner proves the phoniness of the widely-reproduced ID card that was a key piece of prosecution evidence against Demjanjuk. Lehner points out some 30 different errors in the supposed Demjanjuk ID card, and shows just what a genuine Trawniki ID card looks like. Lehner also cites, and in a few cases, reproduces in facsimile, authentic Personalbogen documents issued to other men who had been trained at Trawniki. He shows that every guard of this type who was assigned to a camp was first sent to Trawniki, where he received an Erkennungs-marke metal “dog tag,” but not a Trawniki ID card.

[This holding it up] is the ID card of Heinrich Schäfer, a German official in the camp administration who served as paymaster in Trawniki. It has the signature of the officer in charge, and includes Schäfer’s rank and the date and place on which the card was issued. Schäfer testified that the supposed Demjanjuk ID card was not issued in Trawniki.

German Subservience

Dr. Louis-Ferdinand Werner, a department chief of the Federal Criminal Office (Bundeskriminalamt) in Wiesbaden has similarly declared — as the German magazine Stern reports — that the infamous Demjanjuk ID card is not authentic, in any way or form.

It took quite a long time for the Germans to make such a statement. Some years ago, when I had just begun my own investigation into the Demjanjuk case, I visited the office of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. I went with a friend who happens to be a priest in the parish in Ludwigshafen where Mr. Kohl is a parishioner. He had met with Mr. Kohl, who had said to him that if there was anything he could do for him, please feel free to call upon him. So that’s why the priest and I took the liberty to go right to Kohl’s office in Bonn to ask for help in proving that the supposed Demjanjuk ID card is not authentic. During a meeting there with an aide or adjutant to Chancellor Kohl, I said that this supposed ID card is an insult to the German tradition of Ordnung (order) and Pünktlichkeit (precision). During the war, the Germans were proud of the care they took with everything, including their dress and their documents. Even during the war’s final months, everything had to be tip-top, and there was no place for such a sloppy document.

After we explained what we wanted, Chancellor Kohl’s adjutant said to us: “My dear friends, if you want any help from us [for this], you have to ask the Israelis for permission.” Just imagine! Well, I could go on and on to tell you about more of the many difficulties we’ve had in our efforts on behalf of Demjanjuk.

“Better to light a candle than to curse the darkness,” wrote Thomas Merton, the poet and Trappist monk. Some years ago, I choose to light a candle, and now it seems that the whole world is seeing the light of a great fire.
Demjanjuk, Israel and The Holocaust

JOSEPH SOBRAN

The Israeli Supreme Court has finally acquitted John Demjanjuk of the charge of being “Ivan the Terrible,” the Treblinka guard who is said to have killed and tortured countless Jews. The acquittal is also a vindication of Pat Buchanan, who led the calls for the old Ukrainian’s release.

It has become increasingly obvious that Demjanjuk was framed. A US appeals court has ordered that he be readmitted to this country because of the underhanded way the sadistic Immigration and Naturalization Service arranged his deportation to Israel in 1986: Among other things, evidence that would have exonerated him was suppressed.

Meanwhile, the Israelis have decided to detain him for a few more days while they decide whether to try him on another charge, which contradicts the charge that he was “Ivan the Terrible”: namely, that he was a guard at Sobibor. If that one falls through too in a few years, they can probably produce witnesses to swear he was a guard at Belsen or Buchenwald.

The Zionist lust to convict this poor man is incredible. If he wasn’t Ivan of Treblinka or Sobibor or Buchenwald or Somewhere-or-Other, maybe the Israelis will finally just try him on the charge of having been named Ivan. With any luck, Demjanjuk, now 73, could be home in time for his 90th birthday.

Many Zionists fear that Demjanjuk’s acquittal could cast doubt on the whole story of the Holocaust and play into the hands of the Holocaust revisionists. No doubt that is true, but whose fault is it? And should the old man have been convicted, though innocent, just to prove a point?

Israel is one strange country, when you stop to think of it. The standards of jurisprudence by which it claimed the right to try Demjanjuk at all are alien to Western notions of justice and fair procedure. (As are some of the INS practices.) He was tried in one country for crimes committed in another country, at a time when the country trying him didn’t even exist. This is a big advance on traditional ex post facto laws. His fate was decided, nearly permanently, 40 years after the crimes were committed, by hysterical witnesses who had been coached or had changed their stories.

In short, it was a show trial. Its purpose was to drive home the Zionist version of “the lessons of the Holocaust,” and the Israeli government gave it maximum publicity toward that end. Now it has backfired, creating overdue skepticism about the official history — the victors’ account — of World War II. Someday it will be possible to ask soberly what really happened.

I suspect that the official version will turn out to have a great deal of truth, because a lot of it is undisputed or checks out, even when you discount American and Zionist propaganda: but that when the full truth is known, and exaggerations are trimmed away, what is now suppressed will make the whole picture look very different.

Chiefly in this: The whole war was an unprecedented war on the innocent — on both sides. I have seen an appalling statistic: whereas civilian deaths in World War I were about 17 percent of the total, the percentage in World War II was about 70. It was the policy of both sides to bomb cities, and both sides were trying to develop the atomic bomb, whose whole purpose was mass murder. If you think Hitler has a monopoly on race hatred, watch some videos of American propaganda about “the Japs” and “the Nips” with their “grinning yellow faces.” (At least two of the demonically brilliant Why We Fight series are easily available at low prices.)

But for the time being, there are intense pressures against any independent view of that war. The legitimacy not just of Israel but of the American political establishment depends on the standard version. Even many conservatives now accept the heroic mythology of Roosevelt and Truman.

These questions are not merely speculative. They nearly cost John Demjanjuk his life. And it’s daunting to reflect that if Pat Buchanan hadn’t had the courage to endure smears for defending him, Israel might have killed him. (Ironically, some of the most bitter abuse of Pat came from the “Anti”-Defamation League.)

No apologies were forthcoming from the Amen Corner, whose party-lining and concerted smearing would do Stalin’s old fellow-travelers proud; nor from the Amen Corner’s amen corner, those servile conservatives who hope the Zionists and liberals blacken Buchanan’s name. Luckily, Demjanjuk’s fate didn’t depend on their honesty or courage, or he’d have been a goner.

The Corner swung into action the same week as Israel bombed southern Lebanon, killing hundreds and driving 200,000 or so people from their homes, in retaliation for the killing of seven Israeli soldiers. The soldiers were killed not in Israel but in Lebanon — yet the Israelis called the acts “terrorism.” The word “terrorism” has legitimate uses, but it hardly describes the killing of invaders; it would be more apt as a description of what Israel did to the entire civilian population of southern Lebanon. Of course we don’t call it terrorism when it’s done from the air;
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the word is used by countries with air power to condemn the tactics of their enemies who don’t have bombers and have to commit their mayhem on the ground.

Even if Israel can be defended for avenging the soldiers’ deaths, its response was immoral and widely disproportionate. Its explicit purpose was to punish civilians, and the carnage inflicted was completely unjustifiable. So much for hopes that the labor government would be more “moderate” than the Likud. Of course there will be no war crimes trials for the Israeli atrocities.

Israel wants to have it both ways. It wants to be accepted as a model democracy, “an integral part of the West,” as Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu put it. It also claims exemption from the normal obligations of a state — to treat people justly and equally, for example.

Its real purpose, of course, is to provide a privileged existence for Jews. All Gentiles, including Christians, are second-class citizens at best. (A Jew who becomes a Christian can forfeit the privileges of a Jew.) This is played down by Zionists, but it is perfectly obvious to anyone who examines Israel even cursorily.

This is why the Holocaust is so important to Israel. It helps legitimate acts that would otherwise seem plainly barbaric. Any normal state would be roundly condemned for doing what Israel does to its minorities and neighbors, but Israel can always do it in the name of “survival” — an excuse that lets the consciences of its Western Christian servitors off the hook, as they ignore the plight of their fellow Christians under Israeli rule, occupation, and air assault. Armed with nuclear weapons, Israel can insist that it perpetually faces the threat of extermination.

A state that can always claim to be in a state of crisis can literally get away with murder. The duty of a normal state is to maintain peace and justice. But an abnormal state can do nearly anything, however violent and disproportionate, in the name of national security. It can define anything it pleases as a threat to its existence, and act accordingly. Everything becomes a matter of “defense.” Granting itself continuing emergency powers, the state can do away with all the limitations that protect personal liberty. The memory of the Holocaust — and the supposed prospect of another one — prevents Israel from being judged by ordinary standards applied to states.

World War II, in its received version, also helps legitimate the US government as we now know it, and is invoked to justify American military intervention everywhere. Without the war’s mythology, it would be very hard to claim that American “vital interests” are at stake around the globe and that every little despot is a new Hitler.

But eventually the habit of intervention becomes so strong that it sheds its rationale like a snakeskin. We have armed forces in Somalia now, and nobody thinks our own face is at risk there. It’s odd that we always talk of “preparedness” for war, but nobody imagine for a moment that the next war will be here.

The Story Keeps Changing

DOUG COLLINS

Museums are much in vogue these days. I reported recently on the Simon Wiesenthal “Museum of Tolerance” in Los Angeles. But an apparently even bigger bang for the propaganda buck is to be seen in the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C.

The major media again fell over themselves to deliver unquestioning coverage of the six million story, and we can expect more of the same when the Spielberg boy (he of the Jurassic Park nonsense) completes his film on Auschwitz.

But I do not believe the six million story that is thrown at us daily on TV and in the prints. Let me emphasize, though, that large numbers of Jews did die in the concentration camps — as did many others. There were also large-scale massacres on the Eastern Front, and David Irving is wrong when he says they were “My Lai-type massacres,” i.e., actions conducted in the heat of battle. They were much bigger than that. And I never heard of anyone being court-martialed for them.

Winston Churchill’s memoirs spanned the whole of the Second World War, and the last volume was published in 1954, nine years after the war and after the Nuremberg trials were long over. What did he have to say about the six million? Nothing. There is plenty about the persecution of the Jews in Hitler’s Germany, but nothing at all about war-time gas chambers, etc. And if it was true that 60,000 Jews a day were being disposed of, as is frequently claimed, he could hardly have ignored it.

Bear in mind too that London was cracking the German codes and that Churchill was loyal to the Zionist cause — even after his friend, Lord Moyne, was murdered by Jewish terrorists in Palestine. The closest he got to the subject was a footnote mention of the brutal deportation of the Hungarian Jews to Germany in 1944.

Its a fact, also, that the Polish government-in-exile was in constant touch with Poland. It had spies in Auschwitz as early as 1940 and published a newspaper in Britain called The Fortnightly Review. But there was no mention in it until May 1945, when the war was virtually over, of any mass extermination of the Jews.

There were a thousand other questions. Why would a David Irving bring calumny on his head by becoming a leading “holocaust denier?” He once accepted the six million story and was a top British
author. But after he changed his mind he became a media leper and his “revisionism” cost him a fortune.

Why, too, would the late Paul Rassinier write a book debunking the story? He was a French socialist, Resistance fighter and concentration camp inmate himself.

Why would Professor Robert Faurisson of France have his academic career ruined? Europe’s leading “revisionist,” he has been dragged through the courts for years by a government anxious to please French Jews. And four years ago he was nearly killed by Jewish thugs.

It used to be a given that four million people perished in Auschwitz. In my book P.O.W. I described it as “the place where millions died.” Well, it’s time to confess. I was parroting what “everyone” knew. The Polish government has now reduced the figure to 1.5 million, and the plaque containing the other total has been taken down. Further, the senior curator at Auschwitz has admitted that the “gas chamber” shown to tourists at the camp was a reconstruction done by the Soviets after the war.

In 1989, Israeli holocaust scholar Professor Yehuda Bauer declared: “The larger figures have been dismissed for years, except that it hasn’t reached the public yet.” He could have added that it never will, given our conformist media. America’s “leading expert on the Holocaust” is Raul Hilberg, who says the proper figure is 5.1 million. But he was chewed to bits at the first Zündel trial and didn’t come back for more in the second.

_The Leuchter Report_, of which you have never heard, showed that the “mass gassings” were a technical impossibility.

So what difference does it make whether the figure was six million, one million, or 300,000, as was stated by the Red Cross after the war? Well, as a often-repeated witticism puts it, “There’s no business like Shoah (holocaust) business.”

My change of mind began when I went to the first Zündel trial as a witness for freedom of speech, and when I read Professor Arthur Butz’s _The Hoax of the Twentieth Century_. It is on Canada’s “banned” list, of course, but for $11.95 (U.S.) you can get it from the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, California 92659.
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Censorship Update from Down Under
Victory For Irving In Australia Free Speech Struggle

Greg Raven

In an important victory for free speech and open debate on the Holocaust issue, Australia’s Federal Court on September 16 unanimously overturned an earlier decision by immigration authorities to reject the visa application of David Irving. Any decision about a visa application by Irving, the high court ruled, must now be reconsidered “by law.” There now appears to be no legal bar to visits by the bestselling British revisionist historian, who immediately announced plans for a six-week lecture tour.

The high court also ordered the Australian government to foot the total bill of more than $100,000 in legal costs in the case, including Irving’s own legal expenses of $22,000.

In an editorial commenting on the Federal Court decision, the Melbourne Herald Sun (Sept. 18) offered some advice:

The Jewish community vocally opposed his [Irving’s] visit. This was a tactical error. It elevated Mr. Irving to martyr status, and ensured a level of publicity he did not merit. The sensible course for Australian Jews now is to ignore him.

Irving thus once again finds himself at the forefront in the free speech struggle against the international campaign to suppress dissident views on the Holocaust issue. “The fight is colossal,” says Irving, a Journal contributor. (For more on this, see the Jan.-Feb. 1993 Journal, pp. 12-19.)

“I think my opponents have underestimated the tenacity of the English,” says Irving. “We have a tendency in England when we hear gunfire not to move away from it but, out of a sheer sense of bloody-minded curiosity, to go and find out what the gunfire’s about . . .” (Herald Sun, May 20)

Following Australia’s example, New Zealand has recently repealed its own ban on Irving’s entry. Officials there still won’t let him speak in public, though. “We shall see!” says Irving.

Background

The “fight” began late last year when Irving, planning to combine a six-week lecture tour with attending the wedding of his daughter to an Australian, contacted ten (mostly Jewish) heads of university history departments in an attempt to arrange debates on matters historical. Although not one of those contacted responded to the offer, news of his plans triggered a campaign to bar him from the country. Citing earlier alleged exclusions of him from Austria, Canada, Italy, and South Africa, some legal setbacks in Germany, and the sometimes violent controversy over his works in Britain, Jewish groups argued that this was not an issue of free speech, but rather one of public safety.

Bowing to pressure, Immigration Minister Gerry Hand decided in February to deny Irving’s visa application on the grounds that he was “likely to become involved in activities disruptive to, or violence threatening harm to, the Australian community or a group within the Australian community.” (For more on this, see the May-June 1993 Journal, pp. 13-16.) As matters turned out, Hand was not entirely incorrect, although the disruption and violence came not from Irving (or his supporters), but from his enemies.

As Australia’s leading daily newspapers have plainly acknowledged, efforts to bar Irving from the country have come almost entirely from the Jewish community. Irving has served libel writs against five major Jewish personalities and periodicals.

A Dangerous Man?

By denying Irving a visa, Australian immigration authorities had implied that the internationally renowned researcher, author, and lecturer is as dangerous as four Serbian terrorists — the only others to be refused entry into Australia in a similar manner out of 1.68 million visa applicants in 1991-92. (Martin Daly, The Age, Feb. 16.)

An editorial in the Newcastle Herald (May 21) made a related point:

A worrying aspect of the ban on Mr. Irving is that it is selective. In 1987, the Foreign Affairs Department brought the then leader-in-exile of the African National Congress, Mr. Oliver Tambo, to Australia for a tour. This was despite the fact that Mr. Tambo’s much-publicised visit was expected to polarise opinion, and did. However, there was no violence on that occasion and there would probably have been none if Mr. Irving’s opponents and the Federal Government alike had been prepared to let him make his tour without surrounding it with controversy.

Electronic Democracy

Although forced to postpone his tour by one year, Irving’s message has been getting through nevertheless. The historian has appeared, via satellite, three times on Australian television during
prime time, and has given countless live and recorded radio interviews. Dozens of articles, editorials, and letters to the editor have appeared in newspapers across the country, and letters by Irving clarifying his position have appeared in at least two major newspapers. (The Australian, May 24; Sydney Morning Herald, May 26.)

Generating the most attention, though, has been a specially-made 80-minute videotape cassette, "The Search for Truth in History," in which Irving effectively presents his views on the Holocaust issue and on the international fight for free speech. According to Veritas, Irving's Australian publisher, hundreds of the video were sold within hours of its release in May. "They started buying it late yesterday [Wednesday] afternoon and haven't stopped," reported Veritas manager Jan Pope. (Herald Sun, May 21) Altogether some 10,000 copies have been produced. (The Search for Truth in History" is available from the IHR for $29, plus $2 for shipping. See the inside front cover of this issue.)

All proceeds from sales of the video are earmarked for the David Irving Legal Fighting Fund, which was set up to overturn restrictions on the historian's movements worldwide. (P.O. Box 1707, Key West, FL 33041, USA)

"G" Rated

When Irving's opponents learned of the video, they immediately contacted the Film and Literature Censorship Board (FCB). Any video imported for commercial purposes must have a FCB rating; without a rating it would be illegal to sell or screen the video for profit. Technically, the FCB can legitimately censor a video only if the contents are violent or sexually depraved. Just hours before the first screening was scheduled to start, the FCB issued the video a "G" rating, claiming it is "suitable for viewing by persons of all ages and contains no material that would distress or harm children." Five members of the ten-member Board voted to award the "G" rating, four voted for a "PG" rating, and one voted to ban the video entirely as being "not in the national interest."

The move was applauded by International PEN, a writers' group that earlier supported Irving's right to visit Canada. Likewise supportive was an the Sydney Morning Herald (May 21), which editorialized:

This robust trust by the [Film Censorship] board in the good sense of the public is in the best interests of a workable and useful system of censorship. The point about censorship is
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that there should be as little of it as is necessary for the well-being of the community. There has been too much censorship by Australian authorities of Mr. Irving's strange views, though. It's becoming increasingly obvious that the Federal Government made a mistake when it decided, just before the last election, to ban Mr. Irving from Australia.

**Israeli Snooping?**

Interest in the outcome of the FCB vote was not limited to citizens of Australia. Israel's secret intelligence agency Mossad apparently bugged the room in which the FCB had met to discuss the Irving video. In an article headlined "Israeli secret agents linked with bugging," the *Sunday Times* of Perth (May 30) reported that "allegations of a covert bugging operation organized in Sydney by the Israeli intelligence organization Mossad are being pursued" by the leader of Australia's opposition National Party. "An espionage operation using a highly-sophisticated listening device is alleged to have been discovered" in the building where the FCB met. "There is speculation that the alleged operation is linked to the canceled visit and lecture tour by controversial historian David Irving, who claims Jewish suffering in the Holocaust has been overstated," the paper went on.

**Pressure and Threat**

Having failed to halt distribution of the new Irving video, Jewish groups next threatened and otherwise pressured the managers of hotels, halls, and theaters where it was scheduled to be shown. As a result, a number of screenings were canceled. In a letter to the *Herald Sun* (May 25), one reader expressed his disgust at this turn of events:

> What a bunch of spineless yellow-bellies have so many Australians become! The slightest threat of protest and virtually the entire management of the proposed venues for the G-rated video presentation, cave in.

At sites where the video was scheduled to show, groups of Jews gathered to protest. David Berinson, 23-year-old spokesman for one such protest, was quoted as saying, "It's clear that this sort of video, though I haven't seen it, and David Irving's statements have formed the basis of a lot of neo-Nazi action in movements in Europe." (*West Australian*, Perth, May 20) Jewish community leader Mark Leibler commented: "Australia is no place for the peddling of Irving's sick, racist hate propaganda." (*Herald Sun*, May 25)

Mick Coventry, owner of one establishment where the video was shown, defended his decision to allow the screening: "I don't care what is on the video, as long as it's not illegal." (*Riverine Herald*, May 26.)

**Media Coverage**

Australian media coverage of the entire affair has been intense, as noted in the May-June 1993 *Journal*. Front page headlines in the *Shepparton News* of May 21 and 23, for example, proclaimed in two-inch-high letters, "'Nazi' video on show," and "Irving ban foiled."

A hostile review of the Irving video in *The Australian* (Sydney, May 21) by Sam Lipski — a "media commentator" and publisher of the *Australian Jewish News* — carefully avoided any substantive arguments and instead relied on character assassination and misrepresentation to discount Irving's message.

In contrast to media coverage in other Western democracies of similar disputes, most Australian papers have fairly and accurately presented the views of Irving and his supporters. For the most part, the country's press reported that Irving regards the Holocaust story as "exaggerated," "overstated," and "open to debate." Assertions that Irving "denies the Holocaust" come almost exclusively from Jewish sources, which have routinely misrepresented other aspects of the issue.

**The Free Speech Debate**

Defenders of the orthodox Holocaust extermination story predictably deny that repression of dissident views on this question involves any issue of free speech. Most Australian newspapers sharply disagree, even though none seems to think very highly of Irving.

An editorial in the Perth *West Australian* (May 20) reflected what might be called a consensus view:

> It is one of the measures of a truly democratic system that even those whose views and values are anathema to a majority of people are entitled to a fair hearing.

> Indeed, the ultimate strength of a democracy rests on its ability to accommodate a free flow of ideas — even ones which may be repugnant and which may be seen in some quarters as posing a danger to cohesion in the community. . . .

> The Federal Government's decision early this year to refuse a visa for an Australian visit by controversial British writer David Irving was an affront to principles of free speech. . . . [This] action has diminished the rights of all Australians.

> Perversely, by banning Mr. Irving, the Government and those who support the decision have given him an international platform from which to campaign. Canberra's heavy hand has ensured that Mr. Irving's warped material has been disseminated more widely and attracted more publicity than would ever have happened if he had been allowed into Australia this time — as he has in the past.
An editorial in the Canberra Times (May 20) opined:

The Commonwealth film censor has shown considerably better judgment in classifying British historian David Irving's video so that it can be shown publicly, than the Government showed in February by banning the man from Australia.

... Instead of attracting a small amount of critical press attention for his views, the ban has generated a public debate about his right to free speech. He has attracted respectable defenders (of his right of free speech, not of his history) who otherwise never would have allowed their names to be associated with his.

As is so often the case, if the Government had simply let events take their course his views would have been more than adequately exposed by the light of public debate.

The Melbourne Herald Sun (editorial, May 21) expressed a similar view, but upset a few readers with a reference to "that article of faith for post-war Jews, the Holocaust":

... Mr. Irving has visited this country on two other occasions and there is no record of violence being perpetrated against the Jewish community as a result of these tours.

... To ban a person on the basis of what might occur as a result of what he might say establishes a dangerous precedent. Such a ruling could be used effectively against any international visitor wishing to enter this country who has opinions that conflict with the views of any religion, ethnic, political or special-interest group.

... The ultimate irony is that if David Irving is banned from our shores he can justifiably claim (as he already has) that free speech is threatened in Australia.

As Irving has pointed out, and as the recent events in Australia underscore, each new attempt to censor or ban revisionists has ultimately proven to be another boost for the revisionist cause. Clearly, it is becoming ever more difficult for those who seek to monopolize history to rely on help from venal and repressive government officials. With active support from the growing worldwide revisionist community, each attempt at censorship provides yet another opportunity to broadcast the revisionist viewpoint to additional thousands who otherwise would never hear of it.

Errata:

In the July-August 1993 issue, in the review of The Third Reich Almanac, the beginning portion of the sentence at the start of page 45 is missing. This sentence should begin with the words:

"Just about everyone who was active in the anti-Hitler opposition merits a separate entry, although . . ."

In the September-October 1993 issue, a sentence in the caption to the photograph on page 11 is not accurate. It is not true that "More than 23,000 men lost their lives in this single clash." Actually, this figure refers to casualties (both dead and wounded).

In the September-October 1993 issue, the issue date at the bottom of page 3, as well as at the bottom of the odd-numbered pages 37 through 47, is incorrectly given as July-August.
“The Problem of ‘Auschwitz’”

Ever since the charge was made that the SS attempted to physically annihilate the Jews of Europe, under orders from Hitler and as directed by Himmler and the Reich Security Main Office, the problem of “Auschwitz” had been completely blacked out. Since the capitulation in 1945, “Auschwitz” has also served as the main vehicle in a campaign to reduce the German people to complete moral degradation.

... Countless works have been published and claims made since 1945 that cannot be proven and which cynically add to the infamy. The most horrible events of modern times have been exploited through the use of distortions, deceptions and exaggerations for the purpose of totally disqualifying a people.

Thus, the victorious Allies claimed the existence of “extermination camps” of which there was not a single one in Germany. For years visitors to the Dachau concentration camp were shown “gas chambers” where as many as 25,000 Jews were allegedly killed daily by the SS. Actually, the rooms displayed were dummy chambers that the US military had forced imprisoned SS men to build after the capitulation. A similar case involved the notorious Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, where 50,000 inmates were supposedly murdered. Actually, about 7,000 inmates died during the period when the camp existed, from 1943 to 1945. Most of them died in the last months of the war as a result of disease and malnutrition — consequences of the bombings that had completely disrupted normal deliveries of medical supplies and food. The British commander who took control of the camp after the capitulation testified that crimes on a large scale had not taken place at Bergen-Belsen.

The deportation of the Jews took place as part of a general forced-labor program for the war industry. After the
beginning of the war against Russia, the German war economy grew from month to month and reached a high point in mid-1944. All those who could work at all were inducted, including the Jews. In accordance with their special status, they were subject to especially inhumane treatment. The enormous program for their deportation by railway from all the occupied territories for use in Eastern munitions factories and work camps was justified by the military importance of their tasks and received top priority, even ahead of army transport.

Auschwitz, an old industrial town in the upper Silesian plateau, developed into a major wartime production center. The chemical industry quickly became far more important than the older zinc rolling mills and grinding works. The most significant aspect was the production of artificial rubber and petroleum from coal. On February 16, 1942, all concentration camps were incorporated into the war economy and munitions industry and accordingly came under the organizational authority of the SS Main Office for Economic Administration and its chief, General Otto Pohl.

The various camps were classified according to their importance to the war economy. Birkenau, a part of the Auschwitz complex, served as the camp for those inmates who were declared unsuited for work. Consequently, the camp had the highest death rate. On July 26, 1942, a devastating typhus epidemic broke out in Birkenau. As many as 20,000 died within three months.

That is why an especially large number of crematoria for burning the bodies were built in Birkenau. Reports of the high death rate there moved Himmler to issue an order on December 28, 1942, "to reduce the number of deaths in the concentration camps at all costs."

During the war Jewish emigration was no longer possible, and the expression "total solution" or "final solution" was coined to refer to the policy whereby all Jews were to be segregated from the German population, removed from central Europe, evacuated to the East, and relocated in new ghettos. This plan was outlined by Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the Reich Security Main Office, on June 24, 1940. The central questions about what actually happened in the subsequent years still remain unclear despite all of the literature. "Auschwitz" is the German stigma of this century.


WHO REALLY KILLED THE ROMANOVS... AND WHY?

Today, 75 Years After the Brutal Murders, A Long-Suppressed Classic Gives the Shocking Answers

When the news of the cold-blooded massacre of Tsar Nicholas II, his wife Alexandra, and their five children reached the outside world, decent people were horrified. But the true, complete story of the murders was suppressed from the outset—not only by the Red regime, but by powerful forces operating at the nerve centers of the Western nations. Nevertheless, one intrepid journalist, Robert Wilton, longtime Russia correspondent of the London Times, dared to brave the blackout. An on-the-scene participant in the White Russian investigation of the crime, Wilton brought the first documentary evidence of the real killers, and their actual motives, to the West.

A SKELETON KEY TO THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOVIET SLAUGHTERHOUSE

Wilton's book, The Last Days of the Romanovs, based on the evidence gathered by Russian investigative magistrate Nikolai Sokolov, was published in France, England, and America at the beginning of the 1920's—but it soon vanished from the bookstores and almost all library shelves, and was ignored in later "approved" histories. The most explosive secret of Wilton's book—the role that racial revenge played in the slaughter of the Romanovs—had to be concealed. And it continued to be concealed for decades—as the same motive claimed the lives of millions of Christian Russians, Ukrainians, Balts, and other helpless victims of the Red cabal.

AVAILABLE AT LAST FROM IHR!

Now, an authoritative, updated edition of The Last Days of the Romanovs, published by the Institute for Historical Review, puts in your hands the hidden facts behind the Soviet holocaust!
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My Lunch With George
How an Influential Journalist Twists the Truth

MARK WEBER

With a syndicated column that appears in several hundred daily papers, regular appearances on ABC television’s “This Week With David Brinkley,” several successful books, and well-paid appearances on the lecture circuit, George F. Will has a deserved reputation as one of America’s most influential commentators on social-political affairs.

So when his secretary phoned to ask me to meet with him for lunch, I was both hopeful and wary: Hopeful about the good that could possibly come from such a meeting; Wary because, given his well-known biases, he might distort whatever I say or do as part of a smear.

Still, I was optimistic, in part because his secretary had assured me that Will merely wanted to meet and talk. She indicated that this would not be an interview.

From the outset of our August 19 luncheon meeting, Will made clear that he was interested in revisionist motives (or what he believes them to be), not revisionist arguments. Indeed, at one point he said that it is not the truth or validity of what a revisionist says that determines whether it is evil, but rather his motive.

In response to a question early on, Will told me that he had read the issues of this Journal and other IHR material I had sent him prior to our meeting. It was quickly, even embarrassingly obvious, though, that he was either lying, or was not able to understand what he had read.

When I asked Will if he considered himself to be well informed about the Holocaust, he replied that he did — citing visits to the sites of some of the wartime German camps, and his reading of a good bit of secondary literature.

I was struck by what Will did not know about this subject. He was completely unfamiliar with the Einsatzgruppen — the special German security police units that operated in the occupied Soviet territories. He did not know (or remember) that Anne Frank — along with others in her family — had “survived” internment in Auschwitz. (She died later in Bergen-Belsen camp, a victim of typhus.)

He confirmed that he accepts as accurate and reliable the often-cited “testimony” of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss. Will acknowledged that he did not know that this important piece of Holocaust evidence was obtained by torture, and that, on a number of key points, it is not even consistent with the current version of the Auschwitz extermination story.

He said that he also accepts as authentic the frequently quoted but now thoroughly discredited “testimony” of Hermann Rauschning. Will made clear that he was not aware of the many German wartime documents that plainly show that the “Final Solution” policy was not one of extermination.

It soon became obvious during the course of our conversation that Will is unable or unwilling to view Holocaust claims with the same refined skepticism with which he critically dissects so many other official and historical claims.

I reminded Will of something he had written about Auschwitz a decade earlier. In his Washington Post syndicated column of March 10, 1983, he told readers:

You could tell from the smoke the sort of persons consumed in the crematoria. Newcomers to Auschwitz, who still had some fat on their bones, made black smoke. Persons who had been there for awhile made white smoke. There: that is an emblematic fact of 20th century politics.

What Will calls an “emblematic fact” is, rather, an instructive fable, and the way he cites it not only points up the reverential, even awestruck way he regards the Holocaust story, but shows his careless disregard for facts.

When I told him that this statement is simply not true — that in fact crematory chimneys give off no flame and almost no smoke — he asked me how I know this. I explained that I had studied the matter, and had spoken with crematory managers — adding that anyone who takes a little time to look into this question can determine the truth for himself.

Will responded by somewhat snidely asking if the Auschwitz crematories were like those at Forest Lawn. In reply, I explained that the crematories at Auschwitz were of the standard design used throughout Germany during the war years. Will responded with silence.

I then asked Will for his source for this anecdote, adding that in all the reading I have done on this subject, I had never come across any other mention of this particular story. Will replied that he couldn’t remember, but that it was something an Auschwitz inmate (perhaps Elie Wiesel, he mentioned) had said or written.
Will's rigid bias with regard to the Holocaust story and Israel is no secret. Even William Buckley, himself a staunch friend of Israel and Zionist interests, has taken note of what he calls Will's "perverse" partisanship with regard to these matters. (The Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1987.) With regard to the Holocaust issue, wrote the founder of National Review magazine, "Will is losing sight of rather a lot of things." Buckley took exception to a reference by Will to the "Vatican's contemptible behavior toward the Holocaust."

George Will begins any discussion on the Middle East, Buckley wrote, "by siding with Israel on every single point." He went on: "The problem with devising peaceful solutions in the Mideast, where George Will is concerned, is that there he sees only a single position: Israel's — at all times, in all places. George sometimes sounds a little like Rabbi Kahane" (founder of the terrorist Jewish Defense League).

As part of a discussion with Will about the double standard that prevails in America with regard to the Holocaust story, I mentioned the ban against Austrian President Kurt Waldheim. He was barred from this country, I pointed out, even though no evidence of his personal involvement in any atrocity or war crime has ever come to light. At the same time, I went on, American presidents have rolled out the red carpet for Israeli leaders Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir — each of whom has a well-documented record as a terrorist.

Will had no comment, but when I asked him if he agrees that Waldheim should be barred from the United States, he said yes. When I asked on what basis he deserves to be banned, Will replied: because Waldheim is a "suspected war criminal."

Will said at one point that he has been particularly impressed with the presentation in Claude Lanzmann's film "Shoah" of the "testimony" of Treblinka camp barber Abraham Bomba. Contrary to the impression given in the film, I responded, this "testimony" is actually a staged recitation, the absurdity of which should be obvious to any really critical person.

Will himself seems to understand this, at least implicitly. Writing in a November 1985 column, he apparently concluded that Bomba's claim to have cut hair of doomed Jews inside the Treblinka "gas chamber" is not credible, deciding instead to shift the action to "the threshold of the gas chamber." (Lanzmann's nine-and-a-half hour film "Shoah," wrote Will in that 1985 column, is "the noblest use to which cinema — the technology, the techniques — has been put, ever.")

At one point, and suddenly changing the subject, Will asked me why I think that anti-Semitism exists. I said that this is a complex issue, and that a better way to put it might be to ask why hostility towards Jews has persisted over so many centuries, and in so many different cultures.

I went on to say that I largely agreed with what Theodor Herzl, the founder of the modern Zionist movement, had written (in The Jewish State) on this issue. I mentioned that Herzl, along with many others, often referred to the relationship between Jews and non-Jews in society as "the Jewish question." (Grossly misrepresenting this aspect of our conversation in his column, Will also pretentiously cited the German term, Judenfrage, as if this version is somehow more sinister.)

When I put this same question to Will, he expressed the view that the phenomenon of anti-Semitism is probably rooted in Christianity, but said that he is completely unable to explain why it has persisted through the centuries. "Why is there is no 'Baptist question?," he rhetorically asked, an exclamation that is either disingenuous or manifests intellectual poverty.

Near the conclusion of our meeting, Will spoke — in a tone almost of exasperation — of having once stood in a Birkenau barracks with a former inmate who pointed out the exact place where she had once slept. He cited this anecdote as particularly compelling reason for his belief in the Holocaust story.

While I didn't expect the column that Will said he would write about our meeting would be flattering, I was surprised at just how mean-spirited and inaccurate it turned out to be. He was unwilling even to concede my sincerity. (The column appeared in The Washington Post on August 29, and in dozens of other daily papers on or about the same day.)

As unfair as it was, on balance it was probably more helpful than harmful. It at least made many more people (most of them relatively well-educated) aware of the growing skepticism about the orthodox Holocaust story. And he paid for my lunch.

Letters of response from the IHR were published in perhaps half a dozen of the papers in which Will's column had appeared. It was also gratifying.
to note that letters from other revisionists taking issue with Will on this matter appeared in at least several daily papers.

George Will's attitude about the Holocaust issue is, unfortunately, all too typical of millions of relatively well-educated Americans today. His smug sense of moral and intellectual certainty about this subject is characteristic of the close-minded who know just enough about this trendy subject to pronounce on it with arrogance. The self-righteous and almost reverential way he writes about "the Holocaust" is not merely fashionable these days, it is all but obligatory — particularly for a successful commentator on current affairs.

Will's column concludes with the "good news that this year two million people" will visit the US government's new "Holocaust Memorial Museum" in Washington, DC. In the end, though, it will be neither such state-sponsored temples nor the motives of revisionists that matter, but rather the historical reality — which cannot be suppressed forever.

A Letter to George Will
George F. Will
1208 Thirtieth St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

Dear Mr. Will,

While I did not expect a friendly report by you of our conversation over lunch, I was surprised at just how mean-spirited, unfair and intellectually dishonest your column turned out to be.

You attribute words to me that are either invented or are gross distortions of remarks ripped from their context. You attribute the following sentence to me: "Anti-semitic and anti-Hitler correspondence over lunch, I was surprised at just how..." Your presentation of what I said to you about Hitler gives an utterly false impression of my view of the man. (You may recall my remark to you that your own statements to me about Hitler could, if taken out of context, be taken as praise for the man.)

Your assertion that "the deniers 'arguments' always return to what Weber, like the Nazis, calls 'the Jewish question'" is likewise inaccurate and dishonest. As you will recall, it was you who first raised the issue of relations between Jews and non-Jews.

Your portrayal of the arguments of Holocaust "deniers" is grotesquely inaccurate. No serious revisionist has ever claimed that "Zyclon-B [sic] gas was too weak to kill." Your contention that revisionists claim that gas from Zyclon was "too powerful to use for mass murder" or that "the gas chambers were really showers" is likewise a gross misrepresentation. You have obviously not taken the time to familiarize yourself — even superficially — with the findings and arguments of revisionist scholars. Apparently you have simply relied on Lipstadt's grossly distorted portrayal of revisionist arguments [in her book, Denying the Holocaust].

What you wrote about an IHR Journal advertisement for Ingrid Weckert's book about the "Crystal Night" is similarly dishonest. Contrary to what you suggest, neither the advertisement, nor Weckert's book, contend that "the Jews" benefited from that outburst of violence on November 9th (not 6th), 1938. While you chide a young reporter for his/her failure to read Lipstadt's book, it is obvious that you have not read the book by Weckert you inaccurately describe.

Finally, your assertion that I "torture the past in the hope of making the future safe for torturers" is simply contemptible. You should be ashamed of yourself for writing such a column.

Sincerely,
Mark Weber

Letters from individual revisionists, and from IHR Journal editor Weber, responding to George Will's polemic were published in several of the papers in which the syndicated column had appeared. The entire text of the IHR's response was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer and in the St. Petersburg (Florida) Times. In most cases, though, only a portion of the full text appeared.

Will's column, and Weber's response, touched off an exchange of views in the "readers' letters" section of the San Francisco Chronicle, including a commentary by an ADL official and this follow-up letter by Weber (published September 15) that included the IHR address. It resulted in about 60 letters and postcards to the IHR from readers seeking further information. Typical was this comment: "Thanks for your letter to the editor. You are the biggest secret around. Please send me your literature."

Sincerely,
Mark Weber

Holocaust Revisionism

Editor — Contrary to what Richard Hirschhaut of the Anti-Defamation League asserts, I am not a "neo-Nazi" or a "peddler of hate" (Letters, September 10).

Such name-calling is ultimately irrelevant anyway. A growing number of people — including scholars and, yes, Jews — have come to accept the revisionist view of the Holocaust story because they have been persuaded by the evidence — not because of their politics, or because they hate Jews. One young Jewish revisionist, David Cole, has recently come under intense fire for his video debunking myths about Auschwitz.

Name calling as a substitute for solid arguments does no credit to anyone. Unfortunately, such polemics seem to be a stock in trade for the ADL, which has yet to respond forthrightly to specific charges of criminal wrongdoing in the ADL/Bullock spy case, or to revisionist arguments.

To learn more about what Holocaust revisionists actually say, we offer literature at no cost (P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659).

MARK WEBER, editor
Institute for Historical Review
Newport Beach
FROM: David Cole and Bradley Smith

TO: Journal of Historical Review Subscribers,
Institute for Historical Review Supporters,
and Revisionists everywhere —

THANK YOU

It was one year ago exactly that we released David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper, the video which contained the dramatic admission from the senior curator at the Auschwitz State Museum that the “gas chamber,” shown to millions of tourists as being in its original state is, in fact, a post-war Soviet creation.

Since that time, the “Piper” video has had an incredible impact on the Holocaust debate. It has been the subject of numerous articles in both the revisionist press and the establishment media. It has been discussed on TV talk shows, on the radio, and even in college classrooms! The world over, from North America to Europe . . . from Australia to (believe it or not) Israel, vast numbers of new people have been introduced to the hard revisionist truths contained in the Piper video. So difficult has the Piper tape been to ignore, that in the August 7th edition of the Jerusalem Post, internationally renowned Holocaust scholar Dr. Yehuda Bauer, head of Hebrew University’s Institute of Contemporary Jewry, had to admit the impact of this ground breaking video. He called the Piper tape “a powerful video,” and urged the production of exterminationist videos to counter it.

How could all this come about? How did this one video, denied any advertising in the mainstream press and viciously attacked by the Anti-Defamation League, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and influential individuals like Holocaust scholar Professor Deborah Lipstadt and University of Texas (Austin) President Dr. Robert Berdahl, still make such an impact?

It was because of you, the revisionist community. This victory in the battle for historical truth is yours to celebrate. All the censorship, all the suppression, all the lies employed by the other side couldn’t stop you from getting the information contained in the Piper tape to the general public. And how was this done? With the Piper tape as your tool, you have put an incredible amount of energy and creativity into educating the public about the Auschwitz fraud. Throughout the past year, we have marveled at the ingenuity you’ve displayed. Neighborhood get-togethers and home video parties have been organized where the Piper video is shown to revisionist newcomers. In cities all across North America, private showings of the Piper tape have turned skeptics into revisionist supporters!

You have taken the lead in getting the Piper tape shown on local community access cable channels. On cable stations from Oregon to Florida, from Texas to New York (in Manhattan no less!), you have helped educate tens of thousands of people who might never have been exposed to revisionist ideas. You have taken the time, completely on your own, to translate the Piper tape into other languages, post the transcript onto national computer bulletin boards, and even prod local TV talk shows into doing episodes about the Piper tape!

It’s gotten to the point where so many people have seen the Piper tape that the other side can no longer ignore the Auschwitz “gas chamber” issue. We have put the exterminationists on the defensive, and now they must worry about “damage control.” All this because of you. Your dedication. Your ingenuity.

And now, a challenge: CAN WE DO IT AGAIN? Within the next month, we will be releasing David Cole’s next video from his 1992 fact-finding tour of the camp sites in Europe. Titled The Gas Chambers: A Look at the Physical Evidence, this video will go the Piper tape one better. Whereas the Piper video dealt only with the Auschwitz main-camp “gas chamber,” this new video, consisting of never before seen footage, will tackle the other supposed gas chamber sites at Birkenau, Majdanek, Mauthausen and Dachau.

It is our belief that this new video will be a final nail in the coffin of the gas chamber story, because the evidence presented in this tape will prove conclusively the physical impossibility of homicidal gassings at those sites. It will be absolutely impossible for anyone to dismiss this video. It will demonstrate that the evidence most damaging to the gas chamber story comes not from conjecture, but from the physical state of the rooms where the gassings are said to have occurred. The hard evidence presented in this video, much of it never mentioned before in any other revisionist work, will stun even the most seasoned revisionist.

So, our challenge is this: Can we repeat, or even top, the success we’ve had in disseminating the information contained in the Piper tape? Can we build on our successes from 1993 and, with this new video, make 1994 the year the tide turns in this debate?

Our answer is yes! We believe we can do it — together.
Smith Steps Up
CODOH Ad Campaign
Bradley Smith, intrepid chairman of the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH), attracted nationwide notoriety in late 1991 and early 1992 as a result of his success in placing advertisements calling for open debate on the Holocaust issue in student newspapers at several major universities. After something of a lapse, Smith has recently put new life his CODOH ad campaign. Some highlights:

- A syndicated College Press Service (CPS) article about Smith's campus ad campaign appeared September 16 in The Setonian, the student paper of Seton Hall University (South Orange, New Jersey). This short article is based in part on an interview with Smith.
- Smith's CODOH ad was published in the September 27 issue of the Christian News, a traditionalist Lutheran weekly paper published in Missouri.
- The text of Smith's ad appeared September 28 as a guest editorial in the Record, student paper of State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo.
- In Ann Arbor, the text of Smith's ad appeared October 6 as a “viewpoint” guest opinion essay in the Michigan Daily, student paper of the University of Michigan. In the same issue, an editorial sharply denounced Smith's piece as irrational and “absurd.” A few days later, activists of the “National Women's Rights Organization” held a campus rally to denounce the paper, which they called “a tool of fascists,” for publishing Smith's essay.
- A rather lengthy College Press Service article appeared October 1 in the Northwestern Chronicle of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois). The article is based in part on interviews with Bradley Smith and anti-revisionist author Deborah Lipstadt.
- Smith’s CODOH ad appeared in the October 14 issue of the Georgetown Voice of Georgetown University (Washington, DC). Michael Berenbaum, project director of the US Holocaust Memorial Council (which operates the new federal Holocaust Museum), responded to Smith's ad with a guest opinion essay in the paper.
- Smith's CODOH ad appeared in the October 15 issue of The State News of Michigan State University (East Lansing).
- Smith's CODOH ad was published October 21 in the Rough Rider, student paper of Roosevelt High School in Portland, Oregon. This is the first publication of the ad in a high school paper. In response to protests from some parents, the school principal confiscated the remaining copies of the issue.
- Also in Portland, Smith's CODOH ad appeared October 24 in The Oregonian, the state's most influential and largest circulation newspaper. This is the first publication of the CODOH ad in a major metropolitan daily.
- Smith's CODOH ad was published, in slightly abbreviated form, in the October 26 issue of The Stanford Daily of Stanford University. Accompanying it was an error-ridden and prominently displayed editorial commentary that was highly critical of the ad.
- Smith's CODOH ad ran in the student newspaper of Ohio University (Athens, Ohio), October 28.
- Smith's CODOH ad appeared November 2 in The Miami Student of Miami University (Oxford, Ohio).

Fred Leuchter
Arrested in Germany
IHR Protests Politically-Motivated Act of Censorship
Fred A. Leuchter, Jr., the American execution hardware specialist who insists that claims of wartime mass gassings at Auschwitz are not true, was arrested in Cologne, Germany, on October 28, half an hour before his scheduled appearance on a television show.

Leuchter was arrested without an arrest warrant or formal charges. He was then taken to Mannheim, leaving his wife, Carolyn, behind in Cologne. Neither speaks German.

Only the next day was Leuchter formally charged. Cited in the criminal charge were statements he had made during a speech at a meeting in Germany in November 1991, in which he spoke about his 1988 on-site forensic examination of the alleged execution gas chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek. These facilities were not used, and could not have been used, to kill people as alleged, said Leuchter, a recognized specialist of gas chambers used to execute convicted criminals in the United States.

Leuchter had been scheduled to appear on the show “Schreinemakers Live” of the private television network SAT-1. He was invited to appear as an execution expert, the show's host, Margarethe Schreinemakers, confirmed. His travel costs and hotel expenses had been paid in advance by the station.

Schreinemakers said she had no idea that Leuchter was wanted by the police, and was flabber-
The Institute for Historical Review has written confirming the political motive of the arrest, a police official declared that “it was decided on the political level that a television appearance by Leuchter would harm Germany’s image in foreign countries.” (Kölnerische Rundschau, Oct. 30.)

Leuchter was formally charged by the Mannheim prosecuting attorney’s office with “incitement to hatred,” and “defamation of the memory of the [Jewish] dead.” If convicted, Leuchter could face a sentence of up to five years imprisonment.

In recent years a number of individuals who publicly reject claims about wartime mass killings of Jews have been arrested and convicted in Germany on these charges. Best-selling British historian David Irving, for example, was convicted in 1992 on a charge of “defaming the memory of the dead,” for public statements rejecting stories of mass extermination of Jews in gas chambers at Auschwitz as a myth. (For more on this case, see the July-August 1992 IHR Newsletter, p. 3.)

Bail has been denied Leuchter, and eight days after his arrest he was still being held under “investigative custody” in a Mannheim jail cell.

The Institute for Historical Review has written to the US ambassador in Germany “to express our profound concern over this situation, and to strongly urge you to take every legally permissible action on behalf of this American citizen.” The letter concludes:

This case is particularly important because, according to newspaper reports, Mr. Leuchter has been arrested for actions that are not criminal in the United States. He was arrested for expressing views that, in our country, are protected by the Constitution. This can therefore be regarded as a free speech case, and Mr. Leuchter consequently has something of the status of a political prisoner.

The decision to arrest Leuchter is an apparent expression of panic on the part of the German authorities, and will likely prove to be a major mistake. A formal court hearing is now all but inevitable, which will force a public airing of the Holocaust issue, and of the iconoclastic findings of Leuchter and other specialists.

Reports about the arrest — many of them unfortunately biased, sensationalized and inaccurate — have appeared in dozens of German daily papers.

Leuchter, a resident of Malden, Massachusetts, addressed the IHR conferences of 1989, 1990, and 1992. The Holocaust lobby has responded to Leuchter’s findings, which have been widely circulated as The Leuchter Report, with a campaign of slander, pressure and intimidation. As a result of this campaign, Leuchter’s career as an execution hardware specialist has been destroyed. (For more about Leuchter, his career, and the campaign against him, see the Winter 1992-93 Journal.)

IHR Activist Puts Cole Video on Local Television

In northern California, veteran IHR supporter Harvey Taylor recently arranged for the broadcast of David Cole’s compelling video about Auschwitz on local cable access television, Continental Cablevision of Yuba City. To inform the public of the showing, Taylor also published an announcement (reproduced here) in the local daily Marysville Appeal-Democrat. Beginning October 5, it appeared in the paper for seven consecutive days. As a result of the broadcast, anonymous persons made telephone death threats against Fred Kirchubel, video production supervisor of Continental Cablevision (Sierra region), as well as other members of the station staff.

“An invasion of armies can be resisted, but not an idea whose time has come.”

—Victor Hugo
"Where are the gas chambers?" asks an American soldier at the "Liberation of Buchenwald." This cartoon by a prominent female artist who uses the pen name "Chard," is from the French paper Rivarol, July 2, 1993.

Not long after it appeared, French authorities summoned the artist to question her about this drawing. Even though no serious historian now contends that anyone was killed in gas chambers at Buchenwald, it appears that her cartoon may have violated France's Fabius/Gayssot law of July 1990, which makes it a crime to contest the "crimes against humanity" as specified by the Nuremberg Tribunal.

On September 6, a French court ordered Robert Faurisson and Rivarol to each pay a fine of 19,750 francs (about $3,950) because the paper had published a mildly revisionist article by Faurisson.

**Holocaust Lies: Bergen-Belsen Gassings**

Fraudulent Holocaust claims about magical gas chambers and miraculous survival in wartime German camps are all too familiar. Occasionally, though, we come across a claim so breathtaking in its mendacious effrontery that it deserves special notice.

In an article (reproduced here) in The Gazette of Montreal (Canada), August 5, 1993, and in a memoir, Moshe Peer recounts his wartime ordeal as an eleven-year-old in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. Peer claims that he was sent to the Bergen-Belsen camp gas chamber at least six times. The Gazette account goes on to relate: "Each time he survived, watching with horror as many of the women and children gassed with him collapsed and died. To this day, Peer doesn't know how he was able to survive."

In an effort to explain the miracle, Peer muses: "Maybe children resist better, I don't know." (These days, not a single reputable historian claims that anyone was ever "gassed" in the Bergen-Belsen camp.)

**How was such horror possible?** In Peer's view, the "rest of the world stood by and let the Holocaust happen." The evil Germans, he says, "had the permission of the world" to kill Jews. Although Peer claims that "Bergen-Belsen was worse than Auschwitz," he acknowledges that he and his younger brother and sister, who were deported to the camp in 1944, all somehow survived internment there.

---

**Surviving the horror**

Author recounts experiences in Nazi concentration camp

**FRANCOIS IGAYSSOT, THE GAZETTE.**

These days, not a single reputable historian claims that anyone was ever "gassed" in the Bergen-Belsen camp.

How was such horror possible? In Peer's view, the "rest of the world stood by and let the Holocaust happen." The evil Germans, he says, "had the permission of the world" to kill Jews. Although Peer claims that "Bergen-Belsen was worse than Auschwitz," he acknowledges that he and his younger brother and sister, who were deported to the camp in 1944, all somehow survived internment there.

---

**Sarajevo Worse Than Auschwitz, Says Former Inmate**

According to at least one former inmate of Auschwitz-Birkenau, conditions today in Sarajevo, the capital of wartorn Bosnia, are worse than in the notorious German camp during the Second World War.
Danica Bagaric, an ethnic Croat, was a 17-year-old partisan fighter with Tito's Communist forces when she was captured by the Germans in April 1943. During the next two years, she was interned in four German camps, including (she says) 14 months in Auschwitz-Birkenau, perhaps the most notorious German wartime internment center. Bagaric's statements are reported in a Reuters news agency feature article dated July 27, 1993. This item has appeared in a number of daily newspapers, including Australia's Sydney Morning Herald of July 30 (reproduced here).

"Danger" of Holocaust Revisionism Spreading, Says Israeli Scholar

Israeli Holocaust scholar Yehuda Bauer is worried. In an article in the Israeli English-language daily Jerusalem Post, August 7, 1993, he warns that "America is the center of a world-wide Holocaust denial movement."

According to the article, headlined "US is center of Holocaust revisionism," Bauer also "named France as the second major center, followed by Sweden. He said the danger is spreading from South America and from France to the rest of the European continent, to the Third World, India and Japan."

"Only a small percentage of people in different countries believe what is being spread by the revisionists," Bauer went on. "In some countries it is eight percent, in others it is ten or twelve percent."

Yehuda Bauer is head of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at Israel's Hebrew University. As one of the world's most prominent Holocaust experts, it has been his unenviable task to announce awkward but unavoidable concessions to truth — and thus to revisionist critics of the Holocaust story. In April 1990, he publicly acknowledged that the long-standing allegation that the Germans had manufactured bars of soap from the bodies of murdered Jews is a myth. A few months later, he had the equally unhappy task of acknowledging that the long-standing allegation that the Germans killed four million people at Auschwitz — a claim that was supposedly proven at the Nuremberg Tribunal — is likewise not true.

In the Jerusalem Post article, Bauer specifically mentions David Cole's videotape about Auschwitz, calling it "a powerful video." ("David Cole interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper" is available on VHS from the IHR for $49.00, plus $2.50 for shipping.)

"Producer of the video is the Institute for Historical Review," Bauer inaccurately goes on to say. (In fact, the IHR had nothing to do with the video's production.) Israel, Bauer said, "lags behind the rest of the Western world" in producing video material to counter Holocaust revisionism.

Cole on Morton Downey Show

David Cole appeared on the nationally-broadcast Morton Downey television show, on the episode aired October 13 (or 14), 1993. Downey was at his typically raving and vicious worst, loudly denouncing Cole as "crap," and saying that the young Jewish Holocaust revisionist should be given "a damn good spanking."

Willis Carto and the IHR

Willis Carto is perhaps best known as the founder and director of Liberty Lobby, an organization based in Washington, DC that publishes a weekly tabloid paper, The Spotlight. Carto has also been affiliated with the Institute for Historical Review since its founding in 1978. As those who have attended recent IHR conferences know, the IHR staff acknowledges the many hours of volunteer help that he and his wife Elisabeth have contributed over the years. Neither, however, contributed financially to the IHR. Neither was involved in the IHR's day to day operations, nor was either ever a paid employee. Willis Carto did, however, occasionally act as an "agent" for the Institute and its non-profit corporate parent, the "Legion for the Survival of Freedom, Inc."

During the past several months, facts have come to light to persuade the IHR senior staff that Carto's relationship with the IHR had become a liability. After much careful deliberation, and on advice of legal counsel, the Institute resolved to terminate this relationship. Accordingly, the corporate Board of Directors, meeting on September 25, voted unanimously to end its relationship with the Cartos. This decision has the full support of the IHR staff, including Director Tom Marcellus and editors Mark Weber, Theodore O'Keefe and Greg Raven.

Three Revisionist Books from Germany

The Rudolf Report: Germany's "Leuchter Report"

A German chemist's meticulous new technical-forensic examination of the alleged execution "gas chambers" of Auschwitz has been attracting a good bit of attention in Europe.

Printed on glossy paper in a large, magazine-size format, this 110-page report contains numerous photographs (several in color), charts, diagrams, and more than 200 reference notes. It is entitled Gutachten über die Bildung und Nachweisbarkeit von Cyanidverbindingen in den "Gaskammern" von Auschwitz ("Technical Report on the formation and detection of cyanide compounds in the 'gas chambers' of Auschwitz"). Germar Rudolf, the author, is a certified chemist and doctoral candidate who has
been working at the renowned Max Planck Institut research center in Stuttgart. The samples taken by Rudolf from the alleged execution "gas chambers" in Auschwitz were analyzed by the prestigious Institut Fresenius.

Rudolf's study provides further authoritative confirmation of the conclusions reached by American gas chamber specialist Fred Leuchter in his widely-distributed 1988 report, as well as of the similar findings of American chemist William B. Lindsey, Austrian engineer Walter Lüftl, the Institute of Forensic Research in Krakow (Poland), and German engineer Wolfgang Schuster. (For more on this, see the Winter 1992-93 Journal.)

Germar Rudolf at Auschwitz-Birkenau, taking samples from the ruins of the mortuary room (the supposed "gas chamber") of crematory (Krema) II.

"For chemical-physical reasons," concludes Rudolf, "the claimed mass gassings with hydrocyanic acid in the alleged 'gas chambers' in Auschwitz did not take place." Eyewitness claims of gassings in Auschwitz are not consistent with the laws of natural science, he affirms. "The supposed facilities for mass killing in Auschwitz and Birkenau were not suitable for this purpose... The supposed gas chambers in Auschwitz and Birkenau did not come into contact with Zyklon B. In legal language: the weapon was not loaded."

Rudolf also dismissively notes that "the reports and position papers that have appeared so far in response [to the revisionists] — written, astonishingly, for the most part by non-specialists — are, above all, shameful." Hundreds of copies of the Rudolf report have already been distributed to leading figures of German academic, political, business and media academic life.

The Rudolf Gutachten is available for DM 46 (about $28) from: Cromwell Press, 27 Old Gloucester St., London WC1N 3XX, England, U.K.

Valuable "Lectures"

Despite its rather innocuous-sounding title, a new 350-page book is one of the most impressive works of its kind to appear in German on the Holocaust issue. Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte: Strittige Fragen im Kreuzverhör ("Lectures on Contemporary History: Controversial Questions in the Cross Fire") by Ernst Gauss was published earlier this year by Grabert Verlag of Tübingen.

Presented in the form of six lectures, including probing questions and commentary, this mine of valuable information provides an excellent overview of the entire subject of Holocaust revisionism. It is well-organized and detailed, with a rather strong emphasis on technical aspects of this issue. Numerous charts, diagrams, photos (some in color), and a good bibliography help to round out this important work.

Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte can be ordered for DM 40, or about $25 (softcover, not including shipping), from: Grabert Verlag, Postfach 1629, 72076 Tübingen, Germany.

Deported Jews Resettled in Occupied Soviet Lands, Says Revisionist Author

One of the most important works of Holocaust revisionism to appear in Germany in recent years is Die zweite babylonische Gefangenschaft: Zum Schicksal der Juden im Osten seit 1941 ("The Second Babylonian Captivity: On the Fate of the Jews in the East Since 1941") by Steffen Werner. Privately published in early 1991, it has been distributed by Grabert Verlag of Tübingen.

This detailed, carefully written 200-page softcover book deals with the fate of the hundreds of thousands of Jews who were deported to the East and allegedly gassed in "death camps," especially Treblinka, Sobibor and Belzec. Werner assembles an impressive amount of documentation — including citations from numerous secret wartime documents and quotations from high-ranking German officials, and 483 reference notes — to support his thesis that the hundreds of thousands of "evacuated" Jews were deported to the occupied Soviet territories, and particularly to the province of Belarus (White Russia). The work also contains maps (including two in color), diagrams and charts.

Denounced as "exoneration literature of the worst kind," the newspaper of Germany's central Jewish organization cited Werner's book to demand that the authorities shut down the Grabert publishing company "to protect society against socially dangerous aggression and incitement." (Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung, March 21, 1991.) In contrast, Journal contributor and editorial advisor Dr. R. Clarence Lang praises Werner's book as "compelling."
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Challenging facts of Holocaust is responsibility of historians

The Holocaust. Like any other historical event, should be studied in depth to separate the propaganda from the facts. To seriously argue that no individual or organization has any right to challenge the established version of a historical event goes squarely against what this country stands for.

In fact, it seems odd that we live in a society that values the freedom to question the existence of God, but stops short of extending that freedom to the Holocaust.

Tom Terpen, in his July 23 column, argues that the evidence presented by the Holocaust deniers is "false" and motivated by anti-Semitism. He goes on to state that Steiner's recently opened "naive and revisionist..."

Well, I personally can't think of a more reliable source with unquestionable motives than the former Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union, only 40 years, is the country that presented the evidence that the Holocaust was a "false" and revisionist scheme.

As for the Soviet Union, only 40 years, is the country that presented the evidence that the Holocaust was a "false" and revisionist scheme.

And asking an individual or group's motives won't make you an anti-Semite just because you are questioning the facts. Any claim that cannot be substantiated by facts cannot be taken as the truth.

Here are a few facts that are generally not known about the Holocaust:

- In 1990, the official figure of 4 million deaths at Auschwitz was officially and quietly reduced to 1.1 million. Strange as it may seem, the figure of 6 million has not been adjusted accordingly by the media.
- Porecky's Point, the head curator and director of the Auschwitz State Museum, for the last 25 years, has admitted that the "gas chamber" shown to tourists was "reconstructed" after the war.
- Not a single autopsy conducted on any of the bodies recovered from the concentration camps has ever indicated the cause of death or gassing.
- None of the facial photographs of the Auschwitz camps taken during the war shows any of the usual signs of mass killings — no beheading, no hanging, no water lines of people, etc.
- None of the camps on German territory — including Dachau — is recognized by historians as ever having had gas chambers.
- Israel has lost more than $3 billion since the end of World War II from the United States and the funds are still flowing. The Holocaust is big money.

Ingrid Weckert’s FLASHPOINT

The Book that Dares to Ask: Cui bono (Who Benefitted?) from Reichskristallnacht

Kristallnacht—the attacks on Jewish property throughout Germany in response to the assassination of a German diplomat by a young Jew in Paris — signified an ominous turning point in relations between the Third Reich and international Jewry.

But what was the real story of the shooting in Paris? Was Herschel Grynszpan a "lone gunman"? Or was he commanded by shadowy backers? And what was the role of Vladimir Jabotinsky, mentor to Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir?

Who bears the responsibility for the riots? Was it Hitler? Goebbels? The German people? Or a shadowy cabal of provocateurs?

Historian Ingrid Weckert asks and answers these bold questions in Flashpoint, her gripping investigation of the instigators, victims, and beneficiaries of Kristallnacht.

Meticulously researched, Flashpoint places the momentous events of early November, 1938 firmly within the much-neglected context of German-Jewish relations (above all the surprising collaboration between Hitler's Germany and the Zionists). Yet it reads like an international thriller!

No one with an interest in the Third Reich, Zionism and the Jews can afford to ignore Flashpoint.
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New Books Seek to Discredit "Growing Threat" of "Holocaust Denial"


Reviewed by Theodore J. O'Keefe

The earlier method of opposing Holocaust Revisionism was to ignore it entirely as a scholarly, historiographical phenomenon (except for a few dismissive phrases about "flat earthers") in favor of attacking it as a political threat, branding it as "neo-Nazi," "anti-Semitic," etc. With the exception of Bradley Smith's radio talk show appearances and college newspaper advertisements, Revisionism's opponents have been able to impose an effective blackout on Revisionist challenges to the Holocaust. The result? In the United States, some 16 years after the title of Profesor Arthur Butz's Hoax of the Twentieth Century was mistakenly reported by The New York Times in its first notice of Holocaust Revisionism, there are scores of millions who know that there is a determined movement that challenges the factuality of the alleged World-War-II genocide of the Jews, and tens of millions of Americans who, according to the latest polls, question it themselves.

Whether the growth of this opposition occurred so much in spite of the blackout of what the Holocaust Revisionists say and have written, or rather because of an increasing aversion to the spread of what one Jewish writer has called "Holocaustomania" is unclear, but obviously the blackout hasn't worked to its proponents' satisfaction. Thus, the powerful lobby which propagates (obligatory) reverence for the "Holocaust" has decided to mount an elaborate propaganda campaign against the Revisionists. This time, as the Holocausters march into the fray, some of them are proclaiming a new theme: confronting and defeating Revisionist scholarship.

Generous Help

Two of the three books here under review advertise themselves as setting off on this new demarche; the third, ADL's Hitler's Apologists, sticks unabashedly to the tried and true tactics of what might be called "McCarthyism."

Chief among these three intellectually slight works is Deborah Lipstadt's Denying the Holocaust, a labored exposé that has been years in the gestation (the New York Times devoted a major fanfare to Lipstadt's lucubrations on the Revisionists as far back as June 20, 1988), yet manages to give off telltale signs of desperate, last-minute suturing and low-voltage jolts of stylistic electricity, by a crew of editorial Igors in New York City.

The book that shambles forth from the Free Press (a division of Macmillan in Manhattan) is, as author Lipstadt herself acknowledges, heavily dependent on the assistance of professional character assassins from Jewish so-called "defense organizations": operatives of the Anti-Defamation League, the Canadian Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the World Jewish Congress' Institute for Jewish Affairs in London, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center all receive thanks in the preface.

Theodore J. O'Keefe is an IHR editor. Educated at Harvard, he is the author of numerous published articles and reviews on historical and political subjects.
breathless intimations that she's the first researcher who has dared to look Holocaust Revisionism in the face, and despite the hosannas which have poured forth from the book review sections of the New York Times, Washington Post, and other newspapers. Although the author, proudly enthroned on something called the "Dorot Chair in Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies" at Emory University, makes much of the need to analyze the Revisionist case against the Holocaust, in sum her promised "exposure" of the Revisionists has little to do with confronting Revisionist scholarship.

**Ineptitude and Deceit**

While Professor Lipstadt is less than honest elsewhere in her book, she is disarmingly frank about her dogmas and purposes at the outset: "The existence of the Holocaust [is] not a matter of debate" (p. 1); Revisionists are "extremist antisemites" who "camouflage their hateful ideology" under the guise of scholarship..." (p. 3).

But how to expose them, other than by proclaiming that the Holocaust is beyond question (which comes perilously close to delegating it to the realm of religion) and calling the Revisionists names, particularly when she has haughtily announced her refusal to be "sucked into a debate that is no debate and an argument that is no argument"?

In fact, her promised "analysis" and "exposure" is in large measure derived from the tried-and-true methods of the ADL and its junior partners at the Wiesenthal Center and elsewhere. Lipstadt parades the same labeling and smear techniques as the slick dossiers churned out by the "watchdog groups": antisemite/neo-Nazi/fascist/anti-Hamitist/anti-Semitic/British/Hitlerian/Holocaust-denier. As you flip through the pages of Denying the Holocaust, the epithets all seem to run together into a single quavering wail.

Where Professor Lipstadt can't believably pin one of her slanderous labels on her subjects, or has perhaps temporarily tired of impugning their supposed motives, she is forced to attempt, as best she can, historical analysis and scholarly argument. However, she gives scant evidence of any grasp of historical knowledge or method, and more than a little indication of scholarly indolence and a timidity about confronting the masters of Holocaust Revisionism in their areas of expertise. Her analytic efforts are further vitiated by errors, big and small; omissions, deliberate or in ignorance; and distortions and misstatements, that, coming from any real scholar, can only be called deceitful. Lipstadt's ineptitude, after years of ballyhooed toil amid Revisionist writings, is only underscored by her pitiful efforts to take refuge in her own academic credentials (by the way, all the evidence indicates that she is unable to read Revisionist works in the original French or German) and those of the numerous professional historian-hacks whose authority she invokes. These she brandishes, like Medusa shaking her snaky locks, at the Revisionists in hopes of petrifying these alleged amateurs. But this tactic will impress only other amateurs.

To catalogue the slanders and mistakes of Denying the Holocaust, let alone refute them, would require almost a book itself, and despite all the media trumpet blasts, this book isn't worth the effort. Still, a look at some of the more important techniques that serve Lipstadt, as well as the rest of the now sweating wardens of Holocaust orthodoxy, is perhaps of some merit.

**Word Wizards**

Chief among these is one surprisingly simple: a reliance on the emotive and minatory power of the Word. For Lipstadt and her fellows, words such as "antisemite" (her spelling), "neo-Nazi," "denier," "Holocaust," "memory" and the like aren't so much (if they are at all) labels for independent realities as they are weapons, first for controlling discourse, then for anathematizing opponents, and finally for striking directly at the central nervous systems of the population at large. Thanks to the Holocaust lobby's ready access to the international media, efforts by Revisionists to reverse the process by labeling the other side "Exterminationists" and the like tend to strike even sympathizers as odd, labored, and reeking of reactive, *tu quoque* ("you too").

Nevertheless, it is indispensable for Revisionists untiringly to confront and mercilessly to dissect the shibboleths of the word wizards: as in this book, deceptive labels are 90 percent of their case. "What is the Holocaust?" Revisionists must ask, and why does "denying" it sound so direr and more unreasonable than merely questioning whether the Germans had a policy to exterminate the Jews, resulting in the deaths of around six million of them, largely in gas chambers?

What is an "antisemite"? If the word denotes merely someone who opposes the Jews, what's wrong with using a term that says so? (And why don't we hear more of "anti-Hamitism" and "anti-Japhetism"?)

Was Robert Faurisson correct when he suggested, in a 1989 article, that the Jewish "memory" that professional Holocausters so often invoke might more accurately be defined as the "beliefs"

1. This reviewer recalls reading a "scholarly" article — author, title and source long forgotten — on the elaborate punctilio that governs the orthography of this term so dear to anti-defamatory bigdomes. "Anti-Semite was eschewed as seeming to indicate a (possibly rational) opposition to "Semitism" and "Semites," whereas the unhyphenated, uncapitalized form points to the unconscious mismas of unreasonable bigotry that lead "antisemites" to oppose US handouts to Israel, a Holocaust museum on every block, etc. There remain simpler Jewish souls, however, who favor the term "Jew-hater" for such creatures.
and “legends” of the Jews?

**Historical Revisionism**

For those who doubt that Lipsstadt’s long tussle with Holocaust revisionism is based largely on her manipulation of a handful of empty words, a more specific analysis of her use of the terms “Holocaust” and “Holocaust denial” is in order.

After decreeing that the “Holocaust” is not subject to debate, it is the author’s ploy to equate the word with the facts supposed to underlie it. She approvingly quotes (p. 198) the following pontification emanating from the Duke University history department shortly after the appearance of Bradley Smith’s full-page advertisement challenging several well-known tales of the Holocaust:

> That historians are constantly engaged in historical revision is certainly correct; however, what historians do is very different from this advertisement. Historical revision of major events is not concerned with the actuality of these events; rather it concerns their historical interpretation — their causes and consequences generally.

Sorry, profs, but that sophomoric stance wouldn’t fool many college freshmen — at least not in the days when a demonstrated ability to think critically was a prerequisite for college admission, let alone this or that professorship. In this reviewer’s freshman days, students learned quickly that many alleged “major events” — such as “the fall of the Roman Empire,” “the Middle Ages,” and “the Renaissance” — are in large measure names and interpretations coined by historians based on their evaluation of a large, but still painfully limited, amount of evidence. Although perhaps various proponents of this or that historical interpretation might have welcomed anathemas aimed at their opponents, this reviewer doesn’t recall any of them attempting to turn logic on its head by invoking the “reality” of the “Dorian invasion” or the “Ottonian renaissance” to validate each component of the theory, as Lipsstadt and her colleagues have tried to do to save the lampshades, shrunk heads, Jewish soap bars, and spectral gas chambers attacked by Smith in his campus ads. Nor, outside of the flacks from the Holocaust lobby, has he ever encountered the cheap trick of representing a historian who doubted the applicability of the name “Dark Ages” for a period in European history as arguing that the centuries in question “never happened.”

**Exercise in Evasion**

Having conjured the “Holocaust” into existence without worrying about such inconsequential matters as the documents ordering, planning, and budgeting it, or the forensic tests establishing the murder weapons, or the autopsies showing deaths by gassing, Lipsstadt performs her next sleight-of-hand trick. This is to impose her own name for Revisionism, “denial” — with all its shopworn Freudian implications — on her targets. Focusing on “denial” and “deniers” as on some pathological syndrome allows her to “analyze” them without reference to the full body of Revisionist scholarship, of which she seems woefully uninformed, even after more than half a decade’s study.

In fact, most of her book is an exercise in evasion of precisely that body of Revisionist findings that would seem to have made her work necessary. Conversely, an inordinate amount of *Denying the Holocaust* is devoted to tracing the antecedents of contemporary Holocaust Revisionist scholarship.

Her book is front-loaded with Revisionists and Revisionist arguments which have been long since been incorporated, superseded, and in some cases corrected by later Revisionists. Indeed, Lipsstadt devotes five chapters, spanning 91 pages, to the predecessors of Arthur Butz, whereas Butz and his contemporaries and successors, including Robert Faurisson, Fred Leuchter, and the Institute for Historical Review, get a measly three chapters and an appendix comprising a comparatively modest 64 pages. (It should be noted that much of this text, particularly that concerning the IHR, is rife with the sort of irrelevancies that fill the pages of ADL’s “exposés”: the life and times of Willis Carto and David McCalden, headlines from *The Spotlight*, and the like.) Other chapters virtually devoid of analysis of Revisionist argument include her Chapter One, largely devoted to lamenting an alleged tolerance for Holocaust Revisionism in the mass media (that is, agonizing that a good number of radio and television talk shows have not blacklisted revisionists), and a speedy, superficial tour of “denial” abroad. In Chapters Ten she marshals such arguments as she can to support the banning of Revisionist advertisements and articles from college newspapers in the wake of Bradley Smith’s remarkably successful campaign of two years ago. Chapter Eleven, called “Watchers on the Rhine,” is her attempt to chart “the future course of Holocaust denial,” and to prescribe what must be done to thwart the Revisionism and an evidently looming rise of the Fourth Reich.

**Paul Rassinier**

Characteristic of her technique is the way she handles the work of two courageous pioneers of Revisionism, Paul Rassinier and Austin App. Each of these is accorded considerable space in *Denying the Holocaust*, largely to focus on flaws and errors, many of them minor, in their work.

Most readers won’t know that where both men genuinely erred, Revisionists have long since corrected them. Rassinier’s mistakes on Jewish population statistics, avidly cited by the author (pp. 58-62) were set right by *Journal* editor Mark Weber in testimony at
the second (1988) trial of Ernst Zündel, a trial with which Lipstadt should be familiar since she dwells on it at some length and has had access to the transcript. If that weren’t enough, however, Weber summarized his corrective testimony in the Journal (“My Role in the Zündel Trial,” Winter 1989-90, pp. 391, 415-416), and included three pages of specific corrections in an “afterword” to the IHR’s most recent edition of Rassinier’s key Revisionist writings, The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses (pp. 414-416).

Although Lipstadt states rather murkily that what she calls Rassinier’s “use of the numbers game . . . established a pattern followed by all deniers who try to prove that the death tolls are not valid” (p. 58), the knowledgeable reader searches in vain for evidence of this: she has omitted any and all mention of Walter Sanning’s key book The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry; the posthumous article “How Many Jews Were Eliminated by the Nazis?” in the Spring 1983 Journal (pp. 61-81) by Professor Frank Hankins, a longtime demographer and former president of the American Sociological Society; and Swedish demographer Carl Nordling’s two Journal studies, “The Jewish Establishment under Nazi Threat and Domination” Summer 1990 (pp. 195-209) and “How Many Jews Died in the German Concentration Camps,” Fall 1991 (pp. 335-344).

Austin App

Similarly, Lipstadt has chosen to give Austin App an entire chapter, eighteen pages long, subtitled “The World of Immoral Equivalency,” by which she means to say that App dared to compare such genuine, but comparatively unpublicized and certainly unpunished Allied atrocities as the mass expulsion of millions of Germans from their ancestral homelands, or the mass rapes carried out especially by conquering Soviet troops, to those alleged German atrocities of which we never cease to hear and for which the United States and other governments still dog innocent men, such as John Demjanjuk, to the present day.

While Dr. App, a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of this Journal from its founding until his death in 1984, deserves the highest praise for his indomitable courage, his unflagging loyalty to his German roots, and his dedication to propagating the case for the German nation and people during and after the Second World War, only a writer less than familiar with the progress of revisionist research could claim that App “played a central role in the development of Holocaust denial” (p. 85), or that “his major contribution was to formulate eight axioms that have come to serve as the founding principles of the California-based Institute for Historical Review and as the basic postulates of Holocaust denial” (p. 86). In fact, a survey of the more than 50 issues of The Journal of Historical Review published to date reveals only a single article by Dr. App (“The Holocaust Put in Perspective,” Vol. 1, no. 1 [Spring 1980]), an obituary tribute to him (Winter 1984, pp. 446-450), and a handful of mentions of his incisive but not always meticulous pamphlets.

It should not be necessary, by the way, to point out that Dr. App, a life-long Catholic who never wrote a word against the republican form of government its founding fathers bequeathed his native America, was by no stretch of the imagination a “fascist,” as Lipstadt terms him (p. 87).

Arthur Butz

Bad as is her work on Rassinier, App, and other precursors of contemporary Holocaust Revisionism such as David Hoggan or “Richard Harwood” (Richard Verral), Lipstadt’s real inadequacies as a scholar begin to shine when at length she attempts to analyze and expose the work of Dr. Arthur R. Butz and the Revisionist scholars who have followed him.

Her tack on Professor Butz and his epoch-making Hoax of the Twentieth-Century is to represent Butz as a master of trompe-l’oeil, assuming “a veneer of scholarship and the impression of seriousness and objectivity” (p. 123) to fool the unwary. To that end, she claims, he provided The Hoax with what Lipstadt calls “the hallmarks of scholarly works,” that is, “the requisite myriad notes and large bibliography” (p. 124), and criticized the work of earlier Revisionists as well as “German wartime behavior” — a ploy “that was clearly designed to disarm innocent readers and enhance Butz’s aura of scholarly objectivity” (p. 124).

Lipstadt’s efforts to unmask Butz’s pseudo-scholarly trumpey and hidden “agenda” are vitiated by both her ineptitude and her dishonesty. She bypasses both the central issues of The Hoax and Butz’s often complex argumentation to reduce its theses to caricatures. Thus, her chapter makes no reference either to Butz’s key (and as yet unanswered) question as to how the mass gassings at the huge, comparatively open, and closely monitored Auschwitz complex could go unnoticed and unreported for more than two years, or to the dual interpretations of German public-health measures at Auschwitz (brilliantly summarized on page 131 of The Hoax). Instead, Lipstadt would rather dog Butz for his appearance at a meeting sponsored by Minister Louis Farrakhan, or for the fact that “his books [sic] are promoted and distributed by the Ku Klux Klan and other [sic] neo-Nazi organizations” (p. 126).

Where Lipstadt does lay hands on what Butz actually writes, she almost invariably misrepresents, misstates, or otherwise garbles his positions. Butz does not argue that “the key to perpetrating the hoax was the forging of massive numbers of documents” (p. 127). As the discerning reader will discover by checking the citation from The Hoax that Lipstadt cites.
here, Butz in fact wrote of “a fabrication constructed of perjury, forgery, distortion of fact and misrepresentation of documents” (Hoax, p. 173).

Lipstadt similarly badly misconstrues (or misstates) Butz’s thesis on why so many postwar German defendants refused to challenge the extermination allegations. The vast majority of them did not “plead guilty” to the Holocaust, as she clearly implies (p. 130). Rather than argue (to their extreme peril in the context of the show-trial hysteria) that it hadn’t taken place, the defendants usually argued that they had had nothing to do with it.

Lipstadt is either unable or unwilling to follow Butz when he argues closely. For example, she badly misrepresents his argument regarding Oswald Pohl’s testimony at Nuremberg. Butz’s point is that it is absurd to imagine that Pohl, the head of the SS agency (the WVHA) that supervised the construction and operation of all the concentration camps, including Auschwitz, would only have learned of the alleged exterminations through a speech of Heinrich Himmler at Posen in October 1943, as Pohl claimed (Hoax, p. 195). Lipstadt is silent regarding this claim, stating only that Pohl testified “that he had heard Himmler deliver his famous 1943 speech to the SS leaders at Posen” (p. 131). Elsewhere she cites the word “ludicrous,” with which Butz characterizes Pohl’s claim about his first knowledge of the supposed genocide, as evidence of Butz’s dismissal of “anything that disagreed with [his] foregone conclusion and the thesis of his book” (p. 124).

This reviewer defies anyone to compare Lipstadt’s criticisms of The Hoax of the Twentieth Century with what its author actually writes, both in those passages Lipstadt cites as well as the far more numerous aspects of Butz’s book she has chosen to ignore, and come away convinced that the would-be confounder of the deniers has made so much as a dent in his thesis, even where it is perhaps most vulnerable.

Mistakes and Irrelevancies

Aside from the intellectual dishonesty that members of the professional Holocaust orthodoxy share (which can only grow as Revisionist researchers gain access to more evidence), Lipstadt seems to suffer from an intellectual incapacity crippling in a scholar bent upon penetrating veneers and veils of supposedly false scholarship through rigorous criticism. She excels at mistaking a point or fixing on an irrelevancy, then dwelling on it for half a page or more, as when, for example, she takes Richard Verrall (“Harwood”), author of Did Six Million Really Die?, for quoting Hitler biographer Colin Cross to the effect that “murdering [the Jews] in a time of desperate war emergency was useless from any rational point of view” (pp. 113-114). She reproaches Verrall for the better part of a page for having tried to represent Cross as challenging the “Holocaust.” Checking the passage in question (Did Six Million Really Die?, p. 20), reveals no such intent to co-opt Cross.

Then again, the fact that Revisionists have paid close attention to Exterminationist writers, and cited such authors as Raul Hilberg, Gerald Reitlinger, and J.-C. Pressac to bolster their case either by referencing otherwise unobtainable evidence or by employing the valid controversial tactic of admission against interest, brings forth an anguished yelp from our author: “They [the “deniers”] rely on books that directly contradict their arguments, quoting in a manner that completely distorts the authors’ objectives (p. 111).” Well, what’s sauce for the Gentile goose... but we understand perfectly, Debbie, that you and your colleagues would much prefer that we ignore your works — and we understand why.

Omissions

Another tactic (or failing) of Denying the Holocaust, is in the matter, already adverted to, of omission — omission of all sorts of pertinent facts, arguments, writings, personages, and attainments of Revisionist scholars. Lipstadt seems only half aware of the compass of revisionist research and publication. Her book contains no mention of such key Revisionist authors as Wilhelm Stäglich, Fritz Berg, Carlo Mattogno and Enrique Aynat. And, despite the fact that she makes use of the English translation of Pierre Vidal-Naquet’s Assassins of Memory, she omits all reference to world-class Jewish historian Arno Mayer’s Why Did the Heavens Not Darken, with its two crushing observations: “Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable” and “There is no denying the many contradictions, ambiguities, and errors in the existing sources.”

Lipstadt’s understating of the achievements and credentials of Revisionists, despite their availability from the sources she cites, is too frequent to be anything but willful. James Martin gets mention in a single footnote, which fails to mention his doctorate in history from the University of Michigan, his 25-year academic career, and his authorship of five well-received books and numerous articles: Lipstadt does credit him (p. 44) for being listed as “a contributor to the 1970 Encyclopaedia Britannica.” Mark Weber, who studied history at four different universities, including Munich and Indiana University, obtaining a master’s degree from the latter, is said (p. 186) only to have been “educated in a Jesuit high school in Portland, Oregon.”

When Lipstadt refers (p. 67) to Stephen Pinter’s famous letter published in the Catholic newspaper Our Sunday Visitor (June 14, 1959), which challenged the gas chamber and extermination claims, she leaves out all refer-
ence to the fact that Pinter served as an attorney for the U.S. War Department during the postwar Dachau trials, and that he based his knowledge of the wartime treatment of the Jews on having “interviewed thousands of Jews, former inmates of concentration camps in Germany and Austria.”

Fred Leuchter

Lipstadt’s noisiest evocation of the “credentials” issue comes in her assault on the findings of Fred Leuchter regarding the purported gas chambers at Auschwitz. She takes considerable pains to show that: 1) Leuchter has only a B.A. in history; 2) he is not a certified engineer; 3) a Canadian judge deemed him unqualified to “serve as an expert witness on the construction and functioning of the gas chambers” (p. 164); and he is not America’s leading authority on execution gas chambers.

Lipstadt presents a melange of truth and fiction to make her case that Leuchter’s analysis of the feasibility of execution gassings at Auschwitz, Majdanek and elsewhere may mislead the uninformed or the unmindful, but the essential facts and elementary common sense refute her.

Leuchter’s formal educational credentials easily exceed those of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Edison, or the Wright brothers; he holds numerous patents for inventions ranging from the first electronic sextant to a color stereo helicopter mapping system to various types of execution hardware (Lipstadt omits all mention of these). Even worse, she flagrantly misstates the truth by writing that Leuchter was not allowed to testify during the Second trial of Ernst Zündel as an expert on execution gas chambers; he certainly was, as the transcript makes perfectly clear.

As to Leuchter’s pre-eminence as the American expert on gas chamber design, operation and maintenance, a recent book by journalist Stephen Trombley, The Execution Protocol, makes abundantly clear that Leuchter was all that in abundance, before his career was wrecked thanks to his steadfastness in standing by the conclusions he reached in his widely-circulated 1988 Report. Lipstadt is aware of The Execution Protocol, since she reproaches it for having “resurrected” Leuchter’s reputation, but she has no specific criticisms to make of its massive confirmation, coming from an author unsympathetic to capital punishment, of Leuchter’s expertise and authority. (Trombley’s book also throws light on how Leuchter’s ambiguous position as an inventor and technician dedicated to humane execution methods, and an ambitious businessman, made him vulnerable to unfair charges from state officials that his testimony against defective and inhumane equipment and procedures was prompted merely by venality.)

In any case, Lipstadt is unable to shake the most important aspect of the Leuchter affair: that, thanks to the enterprise of Ernst Zündel and the dedication of Robert Faurisson, the first-ever expert forensic examination of whether mass homicidal gassing was feasible in the Auschwitz crematoria, and the first quantitative investigation of the physico-chemical evidence of such gassings, was conducted by a leading, professional, court-certified expert in homicidal gas chambers. Needless to say, she fails to report the existence of three subsequent reports on the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz — carried out by a Polish forensic institute, a German chemist, and an Austrian engineer — each of which corroborates Leuchter’s 1988 report.

Jean-Claude Pressac

Aside from attempting to impugn Leuchter’s credentials, Lipstadt makes a feeble effort to uphold the gas chamber myth by invoking the supposed findings and authority of Jean-Claude Pressac, the French pharmacist whose book Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers was published in 1989 by Beate and Serge Klarsfeld.

Despite its labored attempts to substantiate the “gas chambers” of Auschwitz by revealing and discussing an unprecedented wealth of documents from Auschwitz, Pressac’s book has to date received scant public notice from orthodox Holocaust scholars. It has, rather, been the Revisionists, above all in this Journal, who have analyzed this and other of Pressac’s writings — to the embarrassment of the Exterminationists and to the great profit of historical truth.

Suffice it to say that Lipstadt (pp. 226-228) has merely listed (not always accurately) a few of the 39 allegedly criminal traces which Pressac claims to have discovered from documents relating to the Auschwitz crematoria: a gas-tight door here, a request for gas detectors there, an inventory listing shower heads, and so forth. Readers interested in ascertaining the perfectly banal usages of all these items are advised to turn to the Journal articles by Robert Faurisson (Spring 1991), Paul Grubach (Winter 1992-93), and Arthur Butz (May/June 1993). As for Lipstadt’s own gross ignorance of the Auschwitz gas-chamber question, this reviewer is content to cite this sentence from Denying the Holocaust: “The delousing chambers were constructed in the same fashion as the homicidal gas chambers,” and refer the reader to The Leuchter Report, Pressac, or any other source for blueprints and photographs he or she may choose.

Dread Portent?

Dr. Lipstadt seems to have begun unraveling in the course of her work on this book. In her preface (pp. vii-viii) she makes less than cryptic references to the growing stress she felt as she strove to confront and expose the increasingly powerful arguments of the Revisionists:

I had constantly to avoid being sucked into a debate
that is no debate and an argument that is no argument. It has been a disconcerting and, at times, painful task that would have been impossible without the aid and support of a variety of people. Without them I would never have emerged from this morass.

In her final chapter, entitled “Watching on the Rhine: The Future Course of Holocaust Denial,” Debbie becomes completely unglued. After sniffing suspiciously at the work of such orthodox, modern German historians as Ernst Nolte, who has recently called for open debate on the gas chambers, and Michael Stürmer, who seems to think that the interpretation of his country’s recent past should serve purposes other than a source for Hollywood horror scripts and fundraising gimmicks for the United Jewish Appeal, Lipstadt conjures up the looming horror of a Fourth, Revisionist Reich.

The “deniers,” she tells her readers, are really no different from the Ku Klux Klan, the skinheads, the Neo-Nazis: “They hate the same things — Jews, racial minorities, and democracy — and have the same objectives, the destruction of truth and memory.” And the deniers are cleverer: they don’t run around in sheets or Nazi paraphernalia, but “...attempt to project the appearance of being committed to the very values that they in truth adamantly oppose: reason, critical, rules of evidence, and historical distinction. It is this that makes Holocaust denial such a threat.”

And just what does this dire threat portend? What final horror threatens Jews, racial minorities, and democracy? Here’s how Lipstadt evokes (p. 218) the coming tribulation:

A strategic change will also mark the activities of the racist, neo-Nazi, ultranationalist groups. So easily identifiable by their outer trappings, they will adopt the deniers’ tactics, cast off the external attributes that mark them as extremists, and eschew whatever pigeonholes them as neo-fascists. They will cloak themselves and their arguments in a veneer of reason and in arguments [sic] that sound rational to the American people. The physical terror they perpetrate may cease, but the number of people beguiled by their arguments will grow.

As a portent of the dangers to come, and as a tactic analogous to those of the deniers, Professor Lipstadt cites an attempt by one of the many Klan groupuscules to erect a cross on city property in Cincinnati during Christmas. Horrors!

She’s not done yet, however. After considering (p. 219) “the most efficacious strategies for countering these attacks” (she lukewarmly opposes legal censorship because it may turn revisionists into martyrs, and advocates that the population at large be stuffed, like so many Strasbourg geese, with more Holocaust education, museums, etc.), Lipstadt ends (pp. 221-222) with a final, quavering, self-pitying wail (a wail that begs for annotation):

Though we cannot directly engage them [in debate — as to why not, the reader may decide], there is something we can do. Those who care not just about Jewish history or the history of the Holocaust but about truth in all its forms [comment supererogatory], must function as canaries in the mine [not cuckoos in the clock or bats in the belfry?], to guard against the spread of noxious fumes. (“Gas masks for sale! O-o-o-ld gas masks!”) We must vigilantly stand watch against an increasingly nimble enemy. [Tough work for increasingly sclerotic Holocaustaniaes!] But unlike the canary, we must not sit silently by waiting to expire so that others will be warned of the danger. (“Good, heavens, Martha, it’s raining canaries! What can it mean?”) When we witness assaults on the truth, our response must be strong, though neither polemical or emotional [like your book?] We must educate the broader public and academe about this threat and its historical and ideological roots [Oh, boy! More lavishly funded Chairs of Holocaust Studies!]. We must expose these people for what they are. [Is the ADL about to fold up?]

The effort will not be pleasant. [You can count on that one, Debbie!] Those who take on this task will sometimes feel — as I often did in the course of writing [Does she mean typing?] this work — as if they are being forced to prove what they know to be a fact. [What an awful imposition!] Those of us who make scholarship our vocation and avocation dream of spending our time charting new paths, opening new vistas, and offering new perspectives on some aspect of the truth. [Us Revisionists have things so easy! But you’re not getting tired of the Holocaust, are you, Debbie? What are you — some kind of anti-Semite?] We seek to discover, not to defend. [Aww...] We did not train in our respective fields in order to stand like watchmen and watchwomen on the Rhine [100-1 she got this image only second-hand from prune-faced, lying old Stalinist Lillian Hellman, not from hearing the patriotic German song]. Yet this is what we must do. [What dedication!] We do so in order to expose falsehood and hate. [“But we don’t l-i-i-ke mirrors!”] We will remain ever vigilant so that the most pre-
cious tools of our trade and our society — truth and reason — can prevail. The still, small voices of millions cry out to us from the ground demanding that we do no less. [Ugh!]

And with that last emetic cry, the Wicked Witch of the West (or is it the East?) dissolves into an oozing putrescence. Unwilling to confront the Revisionists, unable of answering their arguments, at best a second-rate mistress of the dossier and the exposé, she can only bequeath her formulas and her broom to the smear mongers at the defense agency.

As for Denying the Holocaust, to recall the German philologist Wilamowitz-Möllendorff’s famous broom to the smear mongers only bequeath her formulas and the Wicked Witch of the West (or of answering their arguments, at least confront the Revisionists, unable to recall the German philologist best a second-rate mistress of the defense agency.
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merit not a review, but an epi-
taph: “Here lies Deborah

Stern's Effort

Kenneth Stern, author of the American Jewish Committee's Holocaust Denial, is described therein as “Program Specialist, Anti-Semitism and Extremism” for that organization. Despite these ominous credentials, and endorsements from Deborah Lipstadt, Shelly Z. Shapiro (who tried to frame Fred Leuchter on orders from Beate Klarsfeld), and the irrepressible Mel Mermelstein, Stern's book is fairer than might be expected.

Why so? After all, his book contains many of the standard slurs and slanders: the IHR is “Carto's lie-tank” (p. 8), “Holocaust denial” is an “enterprise of professional anti-Semites” (p. 9) and “a dogma that provides ideological incentives to feel good about Jew-hatred” (p. 84). Stern relies heavily on slanted information provided by Gerry Gable, editor of the pro-Communist periodical Searchlight, Leonard Zeskind, research director of the Center for Democratic Renewal, and other Marxist flacks, and opines that “even if we do not agree with the complete agenda of the current Europe [sic] organizations that have a mission to fight fascism — such as some of the mainstream left-wing ‘antifascist’ groups — we should be more active in helping them.” (p. 97)

Nevertheless, Stern takes Holocaust Revisionism seriously enough to provide nearly fifty pages of appendices with evidence — from their own mouths and pens — of Revisionist scholarly and polemical activity, including the full text of Brad Smith's first campus advertisement, “The Holocaust Controversy: The Case for Open Debate”; a complete transcript of Montel Williams’s April 30, 1992, television show devoted to Holocaust Revision- ism, during which Journal editor Weber and Revisionist filmmaker David Cole easily basted a gaggle of Holocausters, including a couple of survivors; and an 18-page listing of “Holocaust-denying” books, booklets, and pamphlets, and of articles from The Journal of Historical Review that should make even the harshest true believer shiver at the evident industry and sophistication of the Revisionists.

Like Lipstadt (in her first chapter), Stern offers a world tour of Holocaust Revisionism. His Baedeker is rather more informative than hers, for all his errors, and even this reviewer, inundated as all IHR's editors are by Revisionist news from around the globe, read it with some profit.

Stern takes a stab at refuting selected Revisionist arguments, not very successfully, since he has either dodged major questions in favor of trivial ones (“[Revisionist] Claim: That neither Churchill nor Eisenhower, in their memoirs, mention either gas chambers or a genocide program” (p. 71)), or relied on empty pronouncements from Exterminationist authority figures, such as Professor Yehuda Bauer, who confutes the laws of physics by informing us that “the incinerators at Auschwitz were built to cremate nine corpses per hour” (p. 65), or put his faith, like Lipstadt, in J.-C. Pressac.

In all, Revisionists will likely experience a warm feeling of satisfaction when they put down Holocaust Denial: we are on the march, and Stern makes clear that he and his fellow professional anti-anti-Semites don't know how to stop us.

ADL Hatchet Job

The second offering from the Jewish “defense agencies” under review is a rather less attractive effort. Hitler's Apologists lumbers along after Lipstadt’s and Stern's books, its knuckles grazing already well-worn grooves of innuendo, smear, and what used to be called “guilt by association.” Compiled by a cast of professional snoops, this 86-page booklet was edited by Alan Schwartz, who was dropped from the plaintiff’s list of expert witnesses after he was mercilessly grilled by Mark Lane in deposition during the second Mermelstein case.

Although the booklet's subtitle, “The Anti-Semitic Propa-ganda of Holocaust ‘Revision- ism’,” would seem to indicate a programmatic confrontation with the Revisionist case, the way Hitler's Apologists is organized belies that. Most sections are titled with the names of individual Revisionists, who are pilloried for all manner of associations and linkages, motives and agendas, positions and statements, some of them dating back decades, while their formal arguments are passed over or dismissed with ritualistic slurs.

For example, Mark Weber is falsely described as “a long-time neo-Nazi” (p. 10). (Question: How long does one have to be a “neo-Nazi” before he qualifies as a “paleo-Nazi”?) Bradley Smith, who has been earlier accused of falsifying credentials — credentials he never claimed! — by Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz, is taxed for being the co-director of a "pseudo-academic enterprise, the Committee for
Open Debate of the Holocaust" (p. 12), although Smith has never represented CODOH as being in any way academic.

Once the ADL's smear apparatus has been turned on and has sputtered to life, it takes on a demonic existence of its own, like some odd carnival amusement, ultimately repellent whatever its attraction. Amid stomach-turning odors, to the manic burbling of a cranky calliope, the centrifugal pump that is Hitler's Apologists whirls faster and faster, spewing filth and falsehood about Revisionists, great and small, into the faces of the American public. Fred Leuchter! David McCalden! Jack Wikoff! Hans Schmidt! Ernst Zündel! Pat Buchanan! Arno Mayer! Keegstra! Faurisson! Roques! Le Pen! The Germans! Faster and faster! Eastern Europe! Lithuania! The Muslims! Saddam Hussein! The Intifada!

And on and on it spins and stinks, this latest ADL hatchet job, shooting half-truths and lies, irrelevancies and mistakes, to the point where it becomes idle to track down and refute them one by one. A production like this is of a piece — either one great truth or one great lie. The big lie of Hitler's apologists — that all revisionists are simply Nazis — is wearing ever thinner. Thus the insane energy of the liars and sneaks who basted it together.

Repression and Monopoly

Each of the books under examination here calls for or tolerates continued censorship of Revisionists — if not through judicial or police measures, then by systematically refusing Revisionists the right of the effective public forum — media, academia, advertising, and commercial distribution. Only grudgingly conceded is the right to assail the Holocaust hoax from a soapbox in a public park.

This intolerance of debate, this relish for repression, is the reverse of the counterfeit coin whose obverse is the gas chamber lie and the six million myth. Whatever the responsibilities of the wartime propagandists and the postwar survivors, the minters of the false currency of Holocaust history cannot be excused for temporary opportunity, hot-blooded vengeance, or passing confusion. Through their jealously guarded monopoly of historical discussion of the "Holocaust," the Second World War, and ultimately the entire modern era of the West, they mean to silence all dissent, from the rantings of the most repulsive race-baiter to the researches of the most meticulous scholar. And they aim, through their hypostatized Holocaust, to raise their own filthy calumnies — of the Nazis, the Germans, the Axis, Europe, and ultimately America and the entire West throughout its history — to an obligatory state cult.

That is why the work of Holocaust Revisionism — including its sometimes peckish-seeming preoccupation with the innards of what Professor James J. Martin has called "Polish potato cellars," with the efficacy of insecticides, and the meaning of half-century-old invoices for light bulbs or showerheads — must continue. To use a military analogy, it is not enough that our scouts and our reconnaissance troops have won some skirmishes, not enough that General Rassinier's airborne troops have seized a bridgehead, not enough that Field Marshal Butz's panzer army has knifed deep into enemy territory. These victories must be confirmed and consolidated through further research and new findings, while the smallest and meanest of the Holocaust lies must be rooted out of the isolated intellectual bunkers in which they lurk, then destroyed.

Today, no matter how badly beleaguered by state censorship, by physical attacks, by economic pressure, Holocaust Revisionists are on the intellectual offensive. If the books reviewed above can't be much bettered by the Holocaust Lobby, both the lie and the lobby are in danger of definitive refutation and exposure before the decade is out.

Anti-Revisionist Work Takes Aim at Faurisson

Crossing Swords in France on the Holocaust Issue


Reviewed by Mark Weber

In no country has Holocaust revisionism gained greater ground than in France. Most of the blame or credit for this belongs to one man: Dr. Robert Faurisson. A victim of numerous costly legal battles, ten physical attacks (one of them nearly fatal), and an unrelenting media smear campaign, this specialist of French literature and text and document analysis has had a profound impact solely because of the solidity and persuasiveness of his arguments — arguments bolstered by an astonishing mountain of documents and compiled in years of meticulous research in archives in at least four countries.

In the years since he first presented his arguments in two articles published in the influential Paris daily Le Monde (December 29, 1978, and January 16, 1979), few efforts have been made to confront the substance of his arguments. This book by French Jewish scholar Vidal-Naquet is the most serious try at it.

This is not a new work. It is a collection of four essays that
appeared first in France in 1980, 1981, 1985, 1987, and as a newspaper article in Le Monde in April 1981. The fact that this largely outdated work has been pressed into urgent service in 1992 — with considerable applause from America's intellectual establishment — suggests a feeling of urgency on the part of the powers that be in dealing with the revisionists.

Pierre Vidal-Naquet

Assassins of Memory has been given the most prestigious and flattering treatment that a book can receive in this country: a laudatory front page review (along with Lipstadt's Denying the Holocaust) in the nationally-distributed New York Times Book Review (July 11, 1993). And yet, the appearance of this book is no cause for rejoicing, as psychiatrist Walter Reich complains in his Times review. "The Holocaust deniers," he writes, "have grown ever more successful in having their arguments presented — and heard with receptivity and respect — in high school classrooms, on college campuses and on television talk shows.

This unhappy mood verging on despair is further manifest in what is probably the most remarkable and interesting portion of this book: the 1992 foreword by Jeffrey Mehlman, a professor of French literature at Boston University. In five pages of Mehlman's foreword, one can find these words about either his friend, Vidal-Naquet, or about his friend's work:

A tone between rage and pessimism... disenchanted... bizarrely pessimistic... aberrant... most intriguing [meant pejoratively]... forced... camp of the dogmatists... dispirited... oddly dispirited pseudo-conclusion... dispirited... depressing... refusal of open debate... having written a book about (and against) arguments which he claims to regard as beneath consideration... stridency and insult... a venting of outrage... his declaration in Le Monde [Feb. 23, 1972] seems both like a closing of establishment ranks and an a priori refusal of discussion...

For years now, Vidal-Naquet has been the Nemesis of Faurisson, even testifying against him in court. While he has repeatedly claimed that he does not believe that Faurisson should be brought to trial because of his views, he has belied this by his actions. In an English-language interview broadcast on American radio in mid-December 1992, Vidal-Naquet said that he opposes laws that criminalize revisionism, but also stated: "I hate Faurisson. If I could, I would kill him personally."

French officials have bestowed numerous honors on Pierre Vidal-Naquet. His appointment to the Légion d'honneur was announced in the July 14 (Bastille day) 1990 issue of France's official gazette of laws (Journal officiel de la République française). In the same issue of the Journal officiel also appeared the text of a remarkable law specifically designed to criminalize "denial" of the Holocaust, a statute that can rightly be called the "Lex Faurissona."

The core of this book is the first essay; its title, "A Paper Eichmann," refers to Professor Faurisson. Unless the reader pays close attention to footnotes, he might not realize that Faurisson had already replied in scrupulous detail to Vidal-Naquet's points in a lengthy essay published in France in 1982. This reply is mentioned here in just four footnotes, and no mention whatsoever is made of the 52-page English-language version, "Response to a Paper Historian" (a reference to Vidal-Naquet), which appeared in the Spring 1986 issue of this Journal.

In his "Response," Faurisson has done a magnificent job of answering every one of Vidal-Naquet's pertinent points and arguments. In his 56-point reply, Faurisson sought to leave no stone unturned. Reading this devastating counter-attack, it is not difficult to understand Vidal-Naquet's reluctance to let people know of its existence. (It would, of course, be redundant and impossible to duplicate here what Faurisson has already written: the reader interested in a scrupulous revisionist response to the specific points and charges made in this book is referred to the Spring 1986 Journal, pp. 21-72.)

For years the "party line" on dealing with revisionists was simply to ignore them. Confronted with the continued progress of revisionism, this tactic has given way to a campaign of misrepresentation, vilification, censorship, fines and violence. So clever and deceitful are the Holocaust revisionists (so the argument goes), that the public is unable to see through their specious arguments. Therefore, they must be attacked ad hominem and never permitted an opportunity to respond.

In his preface, Vidal-Naquet accordingly insists that: "One can and should enter into a discussion concerning the 'revisionists'. . . but one should not enter into debate with the 'revisionists'." Faurisson, in his essay, "My Life as a Revisionist" (published in the Spring 1989 issue of this Journal), provides a tart reply to this comment. After taking note of some of Vidal-Naquet's reluctant
but significant concessions to
truth (pp. 53-55), Faurisson
wrote:

To draw an analogy from
sports, Vidal-Naquet thinks
he is better than Faurisson
at tennis; not only that, he
claims that Faurisson cheats
at tennis. Should the latter
suggest a match, before a re-
ference and in public, Vidal-
Naquet would respond that
he would certainly like to
play, but only on the condi-
tion that there be no oppo-
nent. He would ask the judge
to declare him the winner in
advance; the public’s job
would simply be to confirm
the decision.

In the opening sentence of his
chapter “Theses on Revisionism,”
Vidal-Naquet writes: “I shall call
‘revisionism’ the doctrine accord-
ing to which the genocide prac-
ticed by Nazi Germany against
Jews and Gypsies did not exist
...” This definition is dangerously
ambiguous because he provides
no definition of genocide. Every
serious revisionist — including
Faurisson — readily acknowl-
edges that European Jews were
victims of a cruel and harsh policy
— one that could well be described
as genocidal, but one not essen-
tially different than the treatment
many other peoples have endured
through the ages.

A mistake that strikes closer
to home is Vidal-Naquet’s asser-
tion that “In the United States,
revisionism is above all the speci-

ality of a Californian group, W. A.
Carto’s Liberty Lobby.” (p. 90).
Similarly untrue is Vidal-
Naquet’s assertion (p. 184) that
“Carto finances the Journal of
Historical Review.”

This book’s silly title is typical
of the Holocaust literature of our
day, even this supposedly serious
work. It suggests that revisionists
are intellectual criminals who are
murdering the sacred “memory”
of Holocaust survivors. Implicit
here is the notion that it is a sin, a
sacrilege, to question the “mem-
ory” of (Jewish) “martyrs.”

Well, does this include the
now-discredited “memory” of the
five witnesses in the Demjanjuk
trial who, under oath, identified
John Demjanjuk as a mass mur-
derer at Treblinka? Who are the
“assassins” of those “memories”?
And who “assassinated” the
“memories” of those who talk
about soap bars made from Jew-
ish corpses?

Or what about the “memory”
of the prominent former Auschwitz
inmate Rudolf Vrba? In sworn tes-
timony in the 1985 trial in Tor-
onto of Ernst Zündel, Vrba
claimed that Auschwitz-
Birkenau during a 25-month
period (April 1942 to April 1944),
the Germans had “gassed”
1,765,000 Jews, including 150,000
from France. Later, under rigor-
ous questioning, this impostor
admitted to having resorted to
“poetic license” in making these
claims. (See Faurisson’s essay,
“The Zündel Trial,” Winter 1988-
91 Journal, pp. 420-421.)

Similarly, who is guilty of
“assassinating” the “memory” of
those who once claimed to have
witnessed mass killings by elec-
trocation at Belzec and
Auschwitz? And who “assassini-
ated” the “memory” of those who
once recounted executions at Tre-
blinka in “steam chambers”?

Although Vidal-Naquet vows,
in his preface, that “I have noth-
ing to reply to them [revisionists]
and will not do so,” a good portion
of this book is devoted precisely to
that purpose. He also makes a few
grudging concessions to revision-
list arguments. He writes (p. 97)
that

there was no gas chamber
functioning at Dachau; that
The Diary of Anne Frank, as
it has been published in var-
ious languages, raises prob-
lems of coherence if not of
authenticity, and that] . . .
Krema I, that of the
Auschwitz [main] camp, was
reconstructed after the war
by the Poles.

In recent years, every serious
anti-revisionist has been obliged
to make concession after conces-
sion to the revisionists in order to
salvage what he believes is the
core of the Holocaust story.

In the two Le Monde articles
mentioned earlier, Faurisson
insisted on the physical and
chemical impossibilities of the
“Nazi gas chambers.” An alarmed
French intellectual establishment
responded to these articles with a
statement — co-authored by
Vidal-Naquet and signed by 34
scholars — that will certainly be
long remembered as one of most
shameful in that country’s intel-
llectual history. The declaration
(published in Le Monde, Feb. 21,
1979, and cited by Mehlman in his
foreword to this book), concludes
with the words:

The question of how techni-
cally such a mass murder
was possible should not be
raised. It was technically
possible because it occurred.
This is the necessary start-
ing point for all historical
investigation on the subject.
It has fallen to us to recall
that point with due simplic-
ity: there is not nor can there
be a debate over the exist-
ence of the gas chambers.

It has proven necessary for the
defenders of the Holocaust story
to ignore even this injunction.
Anti-revisionist researchers such
as Jean-Claude Pressac have
devoted considerable time and
energy to an effort to show pre-
cisely “how technically such a
mass murder was possible.”

Another early retort to Fauris-
son was an article in Le Monde,
fittingly headlined “An Abun-
dance of Evidence,” that claimed
that proofs of execution gas cham-
bers are plentiful. As Mehlman
notes, even leading Holocaust his-
torians must now admit that
there is no such “abundance” —
merely tortured interpretations of
documentary evidence. Even once
widely quoted “testimonies” of
“survivors” and famed postwar
“confessions” of German officials
are being abandoned. As Mehl-
man goes on to inform the reader, even Princeton University professor Arno Mayer (himself Jewish) in his book 1989 book, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The "Final Solution" in History*, acknowledged that “Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable,” and that more Jews perished at Auschwitz as victims of disease than were put to death — a view at odds with the “official” Auschwitz extermination story.

This book concludes with words of doubt: “Will truth have to be sure of it...” With sadness, Mehlman aptly comments on a striking contrast of moods:

Whereas Vidal-Naquet is left dispirited at the end of this volume as to the future prospects of truth, Zola’s great slogan has fallen — diabolically — into the adversary camp. “Historical truth is on the march,” writes Faurisson, and “one is hard put to see who might stop it.”

---

**Memoir by Veteran ADL Official Provides Revelations**


**Reviewed by John Cobden**

By any objective standard, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith is one of the most influential organizations in America today. Its ability to cajole, intimidate and pressure politicians, newspapers and broadcasters is legendary. In recent years, it has devoted considerable effort to countering the growing impact of Holocaust Revisionism.

During the last several months, the ADL’s nationwide “intelligence gathering” operations have come under critical scrutiny. Although the Gerard/Bullock “ADL spy scandal” is still unfolding, police officials have already charged the ADL with criminal conduct, and some of the ADL’s many victims have filed a class action suit against the powerful Zionist organization.

For more than forty years Arnold Forster, the author of this memoir, served as General Counsel and Associate National Director of this misnamed organization. I say misnamed because any unbiased reader of this boastful work cannot help but conclude that defamation has been a hallmark of Forster’s career.

He has written a dozen books, most of them polemical attacks against alleged anti-Semites, particularly in the conservative movement. In his work for the ADL, Forster (who changed his name from Fastenberg) has been quick to pin the anti-Semite label on just about anyone suspected of harboring less than total support for Israel and the Jewish people. While his accusations have undoubtedly often been correct, in many cases his charge of anti-Semitism — just about the most harmful thing any public figure can be called — has had little or no basis in reality, except in the tortured logic of a professional anti-anti-Semitism.

**Praise from Wiesel**

In his fulsome foreword to *Square One*, Elie Wiesel makes clear that he, along with Forster, regards any critic of Israel as an enemy of the Jews and, by extension, of humanity. (pp. 17, 18). In praising Forster, Wiesel writes:

> What is the anti-Zionist campaign, the anti-Israeli propaganda, if not the same archaic hatred [against Jews] in modern dress?... Here is a fearless man who refuses all compromise when it comes to defending the Jewish people, and through it, all of humanity. He loves Israel, as I do, with all his heart.

This arrogant Jewish-humanity equation doesn’t work in reverse, though. Wiesel would never praise anyone as “a fearless man who refuses all compromise when it comes to defending the Palestinian (or German, or Spanish or ...) people, and through it, all of humanity.”

In an effort to justify a belief in Jewish moral superiority, Forster writes: “No other religion, it was pointed out, so celebrated the principle of freedom.” (p. 138)

Whatever the merits of this view, if the actions of Arnold Forster
 Suppressing Free Speech

Forster tells us that the ADL “was chartered to defend against defamation,” and that it has “a reputation for reliability and accuracy.” (p. 151) He suggests that his accusations are always based on solid evidence. As he acknowledges here, though, Forster has spent much of life working to suppress the free speech rights of those whose views he does not like. This book establishes that the only evidence Forster needs to accuse someone of anti-Semitism is his own say-so.

Mystical Insight

In his foreword, Wiesel warns us that we will break into tears when we read Forster’s account of how he responded to an attack against his son, Stubs. Forster’s account (pp. 179, 180) may not bring tears, but it does provide an enlightening insight into the workings of the mind of a professional anti-anti-Semite. (For no apparent reason, we are parenthetically told that Stubs is blond, and that he now also has a son who is blond.)

Arnold Forster describes an evening in December 1965 when he learned by telephone that Stubs had been found beaten and unconscious on a roadside, apparently the victim of an attack. The narration continues as he describes the drive to the hospital with his wife and daughter, Jayne:

Leaning forward, straining to see the road, I remember I kept muttering, “the sons of bitches, the sons of bitches.”

After a long silence, Jayne spoke up. “Dad, why’d they beat up Stubs? Did he do something wrong?”

“They went after him Jayne, because he’s my son, your brother.”

“Why, what’d you do?”

“I defend the Jews.”

Thus, without any evidence whatsoever, Arnold Forster claimed to know that his son was attacked because he “defend[s] the Jews.” (To this day, no one has ever been charged in the incident.) Forster’s instant accusation of anti-Semitic motivation was a reflex assumption based, apparently, on what might be called a mystical revelation.

Violence Against Nazis

The casual reader might easily assume that Forster is opposed to violence as a means of silencing political opponents. That would be an error. Early on, Forster recounts an incident in which he and a group of friends encountered some youths who, he says, were marching through the street chanting “Up with Hitler, down with the Jew.” (p. 40) Forster tells how he and his buddies responded:

When they got to where we were standing, without a word passing among the five of us we stepped off the sidewalk into their path. Fists, as they say, flew. Five young attorneys, we should probably have known better. But also healthy and outraged, ours was a spontaneous combustion. The sudden brawl turned out to be a short-lived free-for-all.

While Forster is outraged because of violence allegedly directed at his son because of his views, he is himself ready to engage in violence against those whose politics he finds offensive. As this memoir makes abundantly clear, this is hardly the only example of Forsters’ abiding hypocrisy.

He tells us (p. 43) of his “anti-Nazi street-corner speeches.” These presentations were free-wheeling, not limited strictly to anti-Semitism; they ranged across the spectrum of what we thought was the broader problem. Any danger signal was worth mentioning, and danger signs were all around. For example, the Smith Act was adopted, making it a crime to advocate or teach the need to overthrow the government, or belong to a group dedicated to such a purpose. Entirely opposed to Communism, we nevertheless had deep misgivings about the outlawing of mere advocacy. Democracy, we argued, was being eroded by methods intended to protect it.

As touching as these words might be, they are not sincere. In Forster’s view, the First Amendment protects Communists but not real or imagined Nazis, anti-Semites or other “hatemongers.” While proudly defending, in the name of “democracy,” his own right, and that of Communists, to speak freely, he doesn’t refrain from dubious legal actions and even fist-fights to squelch the free speech of those he hates.

Forster tells how he made use of the police in fighting his ideological battles. Any “Nazi” who dared speak in public was put under surveillance by Forster and his friends. In each case, at least two of them “were assigned to attend meetings along with one of our attorneys. If a speech or the situation warranted it, one was to make a complaint to a nearby policeman and request the immediate arrest of the speaker. The other layman would be a witness.” (p. 42) The only crime committed by these individuals was to make a speech of which Forster did not approve. “We got convictions . . .” he brags.

Shylockian Legal Pretexts

To this his one-sided interpretation of the Constitutional right of freedom of speech, Forster provides an unusual legal theory. After describing a stern lecture by a judge who chastised him for his opportunistic construction of the First Amendment (p. 45), Forster

40
The magistrate may have been well grounded in his interpretation of the First Amendment guarantee of free speech and assembly. But my research has persuaded me that the Constitution does not protect "fighting words" that incite immediate violence, even if the violence is immediately prevented by the attending police.

"Fighting words," in Forster's arrogant view, are only words that provoke violence by him and his ideological friends. As Forster interprets the Constitution, an individual's First Amendment rights depend on the subjective, emotional reactions of his opponents. (As we have repeatedly seen, professional anti-anti-Semites need little to provoke them to violence. For example, the mere presence of Ernst Zündel as he walked into a Toronto courtroom in 1985 to stand trial was enough to rouse a mob to fury enough to begin beating him.)

Forster's view of the First Amendment is dangerous because much language that is quite acceptable to most people can incite violence in a few. If his view were ever to become the prevailing legal norm, there would be no First Amendment left.

Forster tells of another special First Amendment legal theory, this one dealing with broadcasters. Some decades ago, a member of the Ku Klux Klan named Lucius Spinks ran for governor of Mississippi. A campaign speech by Spinks delivered over a Mississippi radio station so enraged Forster and his ADL colleagues (p. 84) that they responded with open legal action along with press releases and refusal to sit still in the face of a klansman advocating his own election by defaming Jews. But the legal action was not directed at Spinks. It proceeded against the radio station that was involved, interpreting existing laws to mean that because broadcasters were licensed by federal authorities they were not in the same category as newspapers, which were entitled to First Amendment protection.

In Forster's view, government licensing removes First Amendment rights for radio (and presumably television) stations. So pleased was he with his unique interpretation of the Constitution (p. 84) that he brought similar suits against other radio stations:

Additional complaints were filed with the FCC about other stations that permitted the Spinks style of inflammatory comment. We won a number of cases, lost more. In some situations station owners backed away from giving their microphones to professional bigots after we complained to the FCC. At other times they fought us even while learning that allowing hatemongers the use of their facilities was to risk their licenses.

What Forster calls a victory here was, in reality, a dangerous defeat for the First Amendment rights of all Americans.

Unfortunately, such shenanigans are not just unsavory episodes from the distant past. Just a few years ago the Anti-Defamation League, with Forster's active participation, successfully intimidated numerous radio stations into canceling their broadcasts of allegedly anti-Israel commentaries of Liberty Lobby — the populist organization based in Washington, DC. In addition to the tactics that had proven their worth in the Mississippi case, the ADL pressured businesses into withdrawing advertising from the offending stations.

Other Measures

One such station, WVOX of New Rochelle, New York, pointed out that while Liberty Lobby paid for its air time, Forster's own radio program, "Dateline Israel," was carried free of charge. Station president William O'Shaughnessy told The New York Times that he and his station took pride in presenting a diverse range of opinions. Forster responded by insisting that the Liberty Lobby broadcast "is outside the spectrum of legitimate discussion and cannot be balanced by an equal number of programs on the 'pro' side." The only side of this issue that deserves First Amendment protection, Forster implicitly asserts, is the one that supports Israel. In Forster's view, the only legitimate "debate" about US support for Israel should be over how much aid American taxpayers should be giving. (For a fascinating narration of the ADL campaign to ban Liberty Lobby from the airwaves, read Conspiracy Against Freedom. This book includes many of the actual letters and internal documents used by the ADL in this campaign.)

Forster approvingly recounts other attacks against First Amendment rights. During the war, the Roosevelt administration charged 28 right-wing and isolationist leaders with "conspiracy to promote revolution in the US armed forces." (p. 81) After eight months the trial was suspended, and two years later the indictment was dismissed and the case closed. But Forster expresses no disapproval of this blatant attempt to suppress political opposition. To the contrary, "If the litigation did nothing else," he writes, "it as least interrupted some of the most divisive activities this nation has ever known." (pp. 81-82)

Another pernicious action that Forster finds entirely laudable was Franklin Roosevelt's shutting down of Social Justice, the magazine of the popular "radio priest," Father Charles Coughlin. (p. 82) As Forster notes:

Federal authorities revoked the paper's second-class mailing privilege, barred it from the U.S. mails and charged it with being in violation of the 1917 Espionage Act for "aiding the enemy" by...
disseminating Nazi propaganda. President Roosevelt's making clear his attitude to cabinet members undoubtedly was the reason for the Post Office Department's action.

**Anti-Anti-Communism**

Further pointing up his own shameless hypocrisy, just a few years later Forster was hard at work defending Communists and other left-wingers from investigation by the US Congress. In the case of such “innocent people,” he stridently argues, a person's political opinions must not be a factor in employment.

Forster claims (p. 170) the existence of a secret right-wing conspiracy of unnamed individuals who allegedly used a “blacklist” to keep Communists from getting jobs:

“I said the blacklist, to my knowledge, was the creation of a cabal of extremist self-styled anti-communists using their cause to deny their victims the right to earn a living for having allegedly radical political views.

Forster reluctantly admits that some of those he defended did, in fact, work with Communist front groups. He concedes, for example, that John Garfield (originally Julius Garfinkel), a boyhood friend who was a popular movie actor during the 1940s, “had without question time and again, joined paths with some undoubted Communists.” (p. 151)

In his defense, Forster writes that Garfield “was an extraordinarily gullible liberal or at worst, a political fool” who “unwittingly allowed his name to be used by politically sophisticated, camouflaged Communist sharpshooters.” (p. 154)

Forster devotes an entire chapter of this book to defending the “tragic” Garfield case. The ADL official has a special motive here because Garfield was a key speaker at the May 1948 ADL Annual Dinner. (p. 109)

Forster approvingly notes an attack in the ADL bulletin against anti-Communist Senator Joseph McCarthy that expressed alarm at “the disturbing tendency sweeping across our country toward blind and indiscriminate hatred for those with whom one disagreed.” (p. 160) This trend toward conformity, the ADL bulletin went on, was “stultifying” and could be “murderous.” So upset was Forster that Communists were being investigated that he wrote an entire book to vent his outrage. Published in 1956, *Cross-Currents* is an attack against McCarthy.

A good clue to understanding Forster’s mindset is his astonishing statement that “The civilized world was more revolted by McCarthyism than by Communism.” (p. 171) In Forster’s view, the millions of victims of Communism cannot compare to the trauma caused by asking a few dozen people if they had ever supported the Communist Party. What rational person, one must wonder, could really believe that the “civilized world” found the McCarthy hearings to be worse than several decades of mass murder! What can explain such a mentality?

**Blacklisting**

Whatever the reality of Forster's complaint of blacklisting by an unspecified group of un-named anti-Communists, it's worth noting that others have been victims of this practice.

Lillian Gish, one of America's most acclaimed actresses, reported that she was blacklisted for a time from both screen and stage because of her support for the anti-interventionist America First Committee. She also related that she was promised a $65,000 film contract if she would resign from the Committee (without, of course, revealing that she was being bribed to do so).

Ayn Rand, the libertarian novelist who had also worked in Hollywood as a script writer, pointed out that during the Congressional investigations of Communists in the motion picture industry:

Everyone who has testified for the [Congressional] Committee — not the big stars, but the lesser-known actors and writers who were considered dispensable, and those who were free-lancing and were not under contract to a major studio — lost their jobs. Morrie Ryskind had more work than he could handle; he never again worked in Hollywood. Adolph Menjou, who was also free-lancing, got fewer and fewer jobs; after about a year, he could find no work at all. I was not victimized, because of The Fountainhead, and because I had a contract with Hal Wallis.

Interestingly, Rand (who was Jewish) used some of her time before the House Committee to lecture the lawmakers about why America should have avoided getting involved in war on the side of the Soviet Union, the regime she had fled. Forster, of course, is utterly unconcerned about the blacklisting of people like Gish, Ryskind or Menjou, apparently because they held views different than his own.

**Hatred of Peace Activists**

Forster reserves his most venomous words for the Americans who opposed US involvement in the Second World War. His portrayal of this mass movement is vicious and inaccurate. However much one might disagree with their view on this issue, the millions of Americans who opposed US intervention in the European war were unquestionably sincere in their conviction that this policy served the best interests of both the United States and humanity. Non-interventionists upheld a tradition that has a long and venerable place in American history.

By far the largest and most prominent anti-war group was the America First Committee.
During its 15 months of life in 1940 and 1941, it enrolled more than 800,000 members, attracted thousands to mass rallies, and distributed millions of pamphlets and leaflets. Its broad-based membership included conservatives, liberals like Chester Bowles, and socialists of the stature of Norman Thomas.

the central propaganda weapon for isolationists, pro-Nazis and anti-Semites." (pp. 75, 76).

Forster’s characterization is a lie. The America First Committee included many who were pro-British and pro-Jewish, but who simply opposed direct United States involvement in war. The America First leadership scrupulously strove to keep out anyone who obviously pro-Nazi or anti-Jewish. Members had to sign a pledge that they did not belong to a pro-Nazi or a Communist group. There is no evidence that the Committee, which counted Jews as members, was anti-Semitic. So scrupulous was the Committee that it refused a $250,000 donation from Henry Ford because of his previous association with anti-Jewish publications, even though Ford had publicly repudiated those works.

After writing that “bigots often were found in high places” (p. 56), Forster mentions as examples prominent anti-interventionists, including Montana Senator Burton K. Wheeler, North Dakota Senator Gerald P. Nye, and New York Congressman Hamilton Fish.

Charles Lindbergh

In his hateful attack against the anti-war movement, Forster takes special aim at Charles Lindbergh, the aviator who was the America First Committee’s most popular speaker and prominent spokesperson. (pp. 75-76). Writes Forster:

Lindbergh blamed the Jews for most of America’s foreign problems and described Franklin D. Roosevelt, the British and the Jews as enemy confederates in an international conspiracy. By his attack in a September 1941 Des Moines speech on Roosevelt, Jews, the British and internationalists for allegedly bringing on World War II, Lindbergh revealed the platform of the America First Committee.

If there were a contest for distorting as many facts as possible in a single paragraph, this one would be a top contender. Lindbergh never blamed “the Jews” for “most of America’s foreign problems,” nor did he claim that Roosevelt, the British and the Jews were “enemy confederates in an international conspiracy.” To show how Forster distorts historical truth for his own polemical purposes, it is worth recalling Lindbergh’s precise words in that speech of September 11, 1941:

The three most important groups who have been pressing this country toward war are the British, the Jewish, and the Roosevelt Administration. Behind these groups, but of lesser importance, are a number of capitalists, anglophiles, and intellectuals, who believe...
that their future, and the future of mankind, depend upon the domination of the British Empire. Add to these the Communistic groups who were opposed to intervention until a few weeks ago, and I believe I have named the major war agitators in this country.

Not a single word of the statement is untrue, and not a word is anti-Jewish. While it is true that Jews did, as a whole, strongly support American involvement in the European conflict, Lindbergh made no mention of any "conspiracy." He never claimed that Roosevelt, the British or the Jews had started the war. Indeed, he made no mention of any "anti-Semitic" propaganda. While it is true that they are inadvisable from their viewpoint as they are inadvisable from ours, for reasons which are understandable from the viewpoint as they are understandable from our large ownership lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our government.

I am not attacking either the Jewish or the British people. Both races, I admire. But I am saying that the leaders of both the British and Jewish races, for reasons which are understandable from their viewpoint as they are understandable from ours, for reasons which are not American, wish to involve us in the war. We cannot blame them for looking out for what they believe to be their own interests, but we also must look out for ours. We cannot allow the natural passions and prejudices of other peoples to lead our country to destruction.

Although these are hardly the words of a Jew-hating Nazi, the propagandists of the pro-war movement immediately seized upon a small (and factual) portion of this speech, twisting what Lindbergh actually said, and distorting the truth so badly that much of the public was misled. Using techniques that Forster and his colleagues at the ADL have mastered, numerous newspapers and politicians lashed out at Lindbergh, largely succeeding in blackening his reputation.

Lindbergh actually anticipated the smear campaign that would come as a result of his words in this speech. He had prepared a paragraph concerning the attacks, but decided to delete it from the final speech:

I realize that tomorrow morning's headlines will say "Lindbergh attacks Jews." The ugly cry of anti-Semitism will be eagerly joyfully pounded upon and waved about my name. It is so much simpler to brand someone with a bad label than to take the trouble to read what he says. I call you people before me tonight to witness that I am not anti-Semitic nor have I attacked the Jews.

Lindbergh’s remark about those who find it “so much simpler to brand someone with a bad label than to take the trouble to read what he says” might well refer to Forster and the ADL crowd.

The Eichmann Case

More than ten percent of this book is devoted to a chapter on the Eichmann case. Forster takes pains to defend Israel’s handling of the case, and to stoking the Holocaust flames.

During the Second World War, Adolf Eichmann had served as the SS officer responsible for coordinating the deportation of European Jews. He avoided capture at the end of the war, and escaped to Argentina. He lived quietly there until May 1960, when Israeli agents kidnapped him and took him to Israel where, after a highly-publicized trial, he was executed in 1962.

Even though Israel had an extradition treaty with Argentina, it made no effort to have Eichmann legally apprehended. Instead, Israeli secret agents seized him on the street, drugged him, and dispatched him to Israel in a waiting airplane. Eichmann had not committed any crimes in Israel, a country that did not exist when the acts for which he was tried took place. Consequently it had no legal jurisdiction in the case. But Israel claimed (and still claims) jurisdiction in such matters because it appropriates for itself the right to speak and act in the name of "the Jewish people," wherever they live.

In most civilized countries, a person is put on trial to determine his guilt or innocence. Not in this case. Forster explains (pp. 200, 211) the reason for this highly-publicized trial:

The purpose of the trial?

Israel stated the trial’s pur-
pose was to alert the world's conscience to the fearful consequences of totalitarianism. The most terrible, Israel said, is genocide. Its chief victims in modern history — although not the only ones — have been Jews. ... The hope is that the trial will serve as an effective educational weapon to assure that it never happens again.

One of the main reasons for this trial, which inevitably is tearing open so many deep wounds for so many people in Israel, is the government's wish to teach its own young and the youth of the world the evil of Nazism and to remind the rest of us what an incredible price has to be paid by humanity to rid the earth of Hitlerism...

Arnold Forster, right, with Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin in Jerusalem, June 1979.

Serving as judges in the trial (which is similar in some ways to the trial, many years later, of John Demjanjuk) were three Israelis "of German-Jewish background." As Forster admits, these men were "not, in the deepest recesses of their hearts, neutral. Impossible. Who can be neutral about the bestial murder of six million innocents?" (pp. 208, 209)

Forster responds (p. 203) to the accusation that Eichmann was tried and executed on ex post facto charges:

Wasn't Israel trying Eichmann under an ex post facto law? An ex post facto statute is a law that makes an act criminal after the act itself was committed. True, it is outlawed in American jurisprudence. But the ex post facto concept is American, based on the idea that it is unfair to compel a man to stand trial for a deed which he could not have known was a violation of law when he committed it. Obviously, this concept cannot apply to murder; no one needs formal notice it is morally, legally and ethnically wrong to kill another person without just-

...Israelis, “four [were] based upon crimes against the Jewish people, seven for crimes against humanity, one for a war crime, and three for belonging to Nazi organizations.” (p. 205) Does Forster seriously ask us to believe that being tried in Israel in 1961 for belonging to an organization in Europe during the 1940s is not an ex post facto case?

In a murder charge the defendant is normally accused of killing a specific person or persons, who are usually named (unless the victim cannot be identified). Evidence is then presented to directly link the defendant to the murder of the specified person. In the Eichmann case, this was not done.

Mossad "Source"

One of Forster’s most startling revelations is his acknowledgment (p. 187), that in the Eichmann case he served as a “source” for Israel’s foreign espionage agency:

Among other Israeli intelligence operations, the Mossad — an acronym for the Hebrew name of the undercover service assigned to operate abroad — constantly sought leads from reliable governments and from other contracts and sources. I was a source.

Unfortunately, that’s all Forster tells us about this. He doesn’t reveal the extent or the duration of his service to the Mossad, or if (or how much) he was paid. Still, the bit he does acknowledge here may already be enough to confirm that he acted in violation of US federal law.

Illegal Activities

Forster acknowledges with some pride that the ADL, with his approval, has used illegal and unethical methods to gain information about political enemies. One ADL target of such activities, Forster relates, was Joseph Kamp (who died in June 1993, at the age of 93). A well-to-do man with important “connections,” Kamp’s
work as head of the "Constitutional Education League" and as editor of The Awakener newsletter greatly annoyed Forster and the ADL. Kamp's great sin, Forster charges, was to endlessly repeat that America was threatened by Communists and foreigners, "especially those with Jewish names." He also sinned by calling the ADL a "low racket which promotes hate and breeds intolerance." (pp. 62, 63)

As a result, the ADL was eager to know as much as possible about his work. Our investigator was adept enough to make himself a good "friend" of Kamp. He had worked for both British and French intelligence and at the outset of the World War Two had served as an instructor in an American intelligence school.

One day, while Kamp was away, the ADL agent illegally entered Kamp's Connecticut home, and made photographic copies of his files, particularly "material that divulged the identity of his financial contributors, network operations, and domestic and foreign connections utilized in his propaganda work." (p. 63).

Although the agent was almost caught when Kamp returned home briefly to retrieve a few items, this mission in what Forster calls "the business of espionage" (p. 64) was a success. "... The Kamp caper was repeated by still another [ADL] field investigator under only slightly different circumstances," Forster reports.

Forster tells about another ADL agent named Marjorie Lane (p. 64), who had lied to obtain a job working for a right-wing women's organization. One night she and another ADL operative spent several hours in the office busy photographing all the documents they could lay hands on from the private files.

As revelations from the still-unfolding Gerard/Bullock case suggest, criminal "capers" are a long-standing tradition with the ADL. One is justified in assuming that the cases that have come to light are only the tip of the iceberg.

Valuable Exposé

This memoir concludes with a solemn observation that, in spite of prodigious efforts, anti-Semitism can still be found everywhere. (This is hardly surprising, because Forster "finds" anti-Semitism even where it does not exist.) But there is a silver lining in the cloud. "We may be back to Square One. Except for one player — Israel." (p. 412). Arguably, though, a major generator of anti-Jewish sentiment during the last four decades has been Israel itself — or rather the Zionist state's often outrageous activities.

Contrary to what the author intended, this revealing book by a high-ranking ADL official serves as valuable exposé of the moral character of a man who sanctions violence against political opponents, who spits on the First Amendment, and uses illegal methods to obtain information about adversaries, and who served as an agent for a foreign spy agency.

Over the years, I have read several tracts and articles designed to discredit the Anti-Defamation League. None was able to persuade me of the illicit nature of this organization; it took the memoir of Arnold Forster to do that.

---
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BURDEN of EMPIRE

"There is no comfort in history for those who put their faith in forms; who think there is safeguard in words inscribed on parchment, preserved in a glass case, reproduced in facsimile and hauled to and fro on a Freedom Train."

"A government that had been supported by the people and so controlled by the people became one that supported the people and so controlled them. Much of it is irreversible."

"We have crossed the boundary that lies between Republic and Empire."

"Garrett's three trenchant brochures are indispensable to anybody who wishes to understand 'the strange death of liberal America' and desires to do something to check these dolorous and fateful trends in our political and economic life." —PROFESSOR HARRY ELMER BARNES, historian.

"His keen perception and his forceful direct language are unsurpassed by any author." —PROFESSOR LUDWIG VON MISES, economist.

"This triad is must material for those who would be informed of the past, aware of the present, and concerned about the future." —STATE SENATOR JACK B. TENNEY, California.

"The most radical view of the New Deal was that of libertarian essayist and novelist Garet Garrett..." —PROFESSOR MURRAY ROTHBARD.
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No Hardship

I have suffered no hardship or embarrassment whatsoever [as a result of the publicity over the appearance of my letter in the IHR Newsletter. See the Sept.-Oct. Journal, p. 38], and I deem it a great honour to be mentioned in [the new anti-Revisionist book] Holocaust Denial.

You will appreciate that in our struggle to maintain our freedom and independence in a fatherland of our own, it is of great importance to maintain our contacts with the outside world.

Thank you for the new format of the Journal.

L. F. Stofberg
House of Assembly
Parliament of South Africa
Cape Town, South Africa

A Whopper?

...The photo of a supposed massacre of German troops by US soldiers of the 45th Division, on page 7 of the May-June Journal, and the accompanying text, upon reading the story ... does not add up to my visualization of what a massacre would look like ...

I contacted the Museum of the 45th Infantry Division in Oklahoma City, and spoke with the curator about this. He explained that the “massacre” never happened ...

I think you fell for a whopper. You are entirely, as a matter of policy, too anti-US. This attitude was reflected previously in your condemnation of the A-bomb against the Japs ...

Edward J. Toner, Jr.,
Howell, N.J.

Gut-Wrenching Photograph

Of the countless photographs that have been taken and published over the years, few stand out with greater emotional impact than the familiar images of the flag-raising by Marines on Iwo Jima, Ruby's shooting of Oswald, or the explosion of the airship Hindenburg.

Another photograph with this same impact is the one showing German guards being summarily killed at Dachau, which appears in the May-June Journal (p. 7). Its impact is as gut-wrenching as the camera can make it. Do we know exactly who took it, why he took it, and how he got by with it. Who commanded the 157th Regiment, 45th Division? Have any of the US soldiers shown here been identified? How may we get a copy of this photo?

W. B.
Auburn, Wash.

Yes, we know the precise circumstances under which this photo was taken. This is US Army photograph No. SC 208765, and is on file in the Pentagon photo archives. Copies can be obtained either from the Pentagon or from the National Archives in Washington, DC. This photograph was taken by Arland B. Musser, a T/4 with the US Army Signal Corps. It was cleared by Army censors, although the official caption text is quite misleading.

The most detailed account of this massacre is Dachau: The Hour of the Avenger, a memoir and investigation by Howard Buechner. It is available from Thunderbird Press, 300 Cuddihy Dr., Metairie, LA 70005. As Buechner establishes, the person most responsible for the massacre is Jack Bushyhead (now deceased), who was then serving as a First Lieutenant with the 3rd Battalion, 157th Infantry Regiment, of the 45th US Army Division.

We also recommend the 54-page booklet, Dachau: Reality and Myth, by John Cobben. (It is available from the IHR for $5.00, plus $1.00 shipping.)

— The Editor

Terrific Pressure

When an attempt was made to show the new Irving video across Australia, Zionist and Jewish outfits threatened violence against the scheduled venues. All were forced to shut down, except the Brisbane venue. Police at the Sheraton Hotel, Melbourne, were told of a bomb threat, which seems to have been a hoax, but the meeting was nevertheless shut down on their advice. So things in Australia seem to be at about the same level as those in Canada.

Nevertheless, despite terrific pressure, censors refused to ban or give a restricted rating to the Irving video ["The Search for Truth in History"], and that shows courage and integrity on their part.

Thanks for publishing [in the March-April Journal, p. 48] my warning about the pending “Racial Vilification” law. As yet, this bill has not been passed. I thank you for alerting readers.

Geoff Muirden, Secretary
Australian Civil Liberties Union
283 Lygon St.
Carlton, Vic. 3053
Australia

Lipstadt's New Book

Deborah Lipstadt's new book, Denying the Holocaust, is appearing now in response to the considerable inroads that "Holocaust denial" has been making in recent years, particularly among educated Americans.

The author's main purpose, it seems, is to discourage still larger numbers of Americans from open-mindedly considering the arguments of Holocaust revisionists. Lipstadt tries hard to convince the reader that "Holocaust deniers" should never, under any conditions, be given a public or academic forum, particularly in the mass media, to present their views.

The "deniers," she argues, are really demonic racists and Nazis engaged in a grand conspiracy with a hidden anti-Jewish agenda. She dismisses revisionist
arguments as spurious but sometimes clever fabrications. Because they cannot be regarded as valid or legitimate “ideas,” “positions” or “arguments,” revisionist views must never be addressed in any respectful way.

Lipstadt seems to have little faith in democracy, the power of reason or the salutary role of open discussion in a free society. While not putting it so bluntly, she argues that the public is too stupid to understand history.

It is “naive to believe that the ‘light of day’ can dispel lies, especially when they play on familiar stereotypes,” writes Ms. Lipstadt (pp. 207-208). “Light is barely an antidote when people are unable, as was often the case in this investigation, to differentiate between reasoned arguments and blatant falsehoods. Most sobering was the failure of many of these student leaders and opinion makers to recognize Holocaust denial for what it was.”

That this view is given respectful consideration in our society (to judge by the many laudatory reviews her book has received) is cause for grave concern. It is particularly troubling that even many scholars seem ready to despair of the power of right reason.

Lipstadt’s essentially polemical work is filled with distortion and misrepresentation. I found that while she maintained a relatively sober tone for much of it, she seemed to come unglued when writing the chapter about Dr. Arthur Butz. While reading it, I was moved to write the word “lie” at six different places in the margin. Particularly glaring is her clumsy and dishonest attempt to portray Butz as a wild-eyed, irresponsible conspiracy theorist.

B. A.
Chicago

Lipstadt’s “Fine Scholarship”

About half a page of Lipstadt’s book, Denying the Holocaust, is devoted to historical revisionism in Australia (pages 12-13). Claims by Lipstadt that I am “the leader” of the Australian League of Rights, that I have claimed that the Holocaust is a “gigantic lie,” and that Fred Leuchter has visited Australia, are all incorrect, and amount to an “assault on truth.”

I am not “the leader” of the Australian League of Rights, and am not now, and never have been even a member of the group. I understand that the League is a Christian group, that it promotes an economic theory of social credit, and that it believes in an international socialist conspiracy orchestrated by the left-wing Fabian Society. I am not a Christian, do not believe in social credit, and far from believing in a Fabian conspiracy theory, am a long-standing member of the Fabian Society, and a former member of its executive.

The only organisations I belong to, apart from the Fabian Society, are the Society of Labor Lawyers, Amnesty, the Free Speech Committee, the Voltaire (Free Speech) Institute, and the Australian Civil Liberties Union, of which I am President. It was because of my interest in freedom of speech, and my opposition to censorship, including censorship of history, that I became interested in historical revisionism. While I agree with the growing number of Jewish writers that the extent of the Jewish Holocaust has been exaggerated, I have never said it is a “gigantic lie.”

The claim that Fred Leuchter has visited Australia is simply factually incorrect.

Lipstadt’s “assault on truth” continues in the footnote relating to the half page of text on revisionism in Australia (footnote 49 on page 239). The seven sentences in the footnote relating to Dr. Amice Morsey contain three errors of fact.

On the dust jacket of Lipstadt’s book, Michael Berenbaum, an official of the US Holocaust Memorial Council, praises this work as “fine scholarship.” After reading what Lipstadt writes about Australia, I cannot be both-
ing to Will, the thesis of this book is that “the Jews” benefited from the “Nov. 6, 1938, anti-Jewish rioting.” This, he goes on, is the “drift of Holocaust ‘revisionism’.”

While he chides one young reporter for failing to read Lipshtadt’s book, it is obvious that Will has not read Weckert’s study, nor does he have a grasp of the historical events of “Crystal Night” — which took place not on the 6th, but rather on the 9th of November. Neither does Weckert so crudely claim that “the Jews” benefitted from this outburst of violence. She wrote instead of “certain Zionist elements” which may have benefitted.

“Revisionism,” asserts Will, “is a term of scholarship hijacked by pseudo-scholarship in the service of antisemitism.” Just who can rightfully lay claim to this term, Will does not say. Would he grant the “Nov. 6, 1938, anti-Jewish events” which may have benefitted. Is that “the Jews” benefited from this outburst of violence? She wrote instead of “certain Zionist elements” which may have benefitted.

The claim that President Tudjman believes that only 900,000 Jews died in the Holocaust is without foundation, and derives from a selective mistranslation of a section of the book. . .

Do the “anti-Semitic hijackers” referred to by Will include Jewish “deniers” like Joseph Burg and David Cole?

D. H. Oldbridge, N.J.

The enemy has his hatred, and only his hatred.

R. K.
Milwaukee, Wisc.

Tudjman and Holocaust Revisionism

It has been brought to our attention that you are under the illusion that the President of Croatia, Franjo Tudjman, is in some way a supporter or sympathizer of your organization. Consistent with the claim your institute expounds, quite the reverse is true. As a historian and a decorated WWII Partisan who himself lost a brother to the Nazis, President Tudjman is fully aware of the evils of fascism...

Subsequent to Dr. Tudjman’s election as president, several Serbian scholars issued a highly selective and distorted translation of his historical study Wastelands of Historical Reality as part of a deliberate smear campaign against Croatia intended to justify their aggression throughout the former Yugoslavia. Several reporters mistakenly and uncritically took the mistranslation at face value, resulting in the articles you cite in your July-August newsletter . . .

The claim that President Tudjman believes that only 900,000 Jews died in the Holocaust is without foundation, and derives from a selective mistranslation of a section of the book. . .

Marian Gubic
Information Office
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Zagreb, Croatia

Maintain Standard

As a practising Roman Catholic and an intellectual follower of Socrates — who urged “Follow the argument wherever it leads” — I am fully aware of the real dangers of seeking truth through controversy. It is always possible that one may be proved wrong.

I am a retired journalist, my last post being that of Deputy Editor and Chief Reporter on the Catholic Pictorial, the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Liverpool. As a journalist, I repeatedly witnessed the problems that arise — even in Church circles, sadly — when one offers a view contrary to the prevailing wisdom of the age, especially if it seems to involve criticism of Jews or Blacks.

On occasions when I have spoken at public meetings, I experienced first-hand the blindness and deafness of Christians who are nominally committed to the search for truth, but who draw back when what they discover appears to conflict with what they are told by those who control the media and politics.

It takes great courage to tread the scholarly, as opposed to the propaganda, way. With this thought in mind, I reiterate the words in the concluding paragraph of the letter by I.H. in the July-August Journal: “The IHR has had a formidable impact because of its factual presentation of historical evidence and its scholarly analysis.” I concur with this writer’s appeal to always maintain a high standard.

Frank Brookes
Billinge, Wigan
Lanc., England

Praise for Docudrama Portrayal

A recent episode of the ABC television series “The Young Indiana Jones Chronicles” (broadcast July 24) deserves praise. I was pleasantly astonished to see this docudrama’s generally accurate portrayal of the 1919 peace conference of Versailles, in which the victorious allied powers imposed their peace terms on Europe, the Middle East and part of Asia.

The Germans, who had agreed to an armistice in 1918 on the basis of Wilson’s “14 points,” were subjected to punitive and humiliating terms that violated solemn pledges. Even President Wilson was not spared in this episode, which points out his complicity.

Arnold Toynbee, the distinguished British historian, was shown predicting that the Versailles settlement would mean another war within 20 years.

Also faithfully depicted is the deceit of Britain and France in their violation of wartime promises of independence made to the Arabs, and to Lawrence of Arabia. British greed for oil in Iraq was also brought out.

This episode is all the more gratifying because others in this series have contained common historical distortions.

Robert John
New York City

Lessons from a Toronto Holocaust Class

Reading about the Penn State “Holocaust History” course (Sept.-Oct. Journal, p. 45), reminded me of my own experience in the win-
Peter Griffith, Crown Prosecutor in the first Zundel trial, and Alan Shefman of the League for Human Rights of the B’nai Brith (the Canadian counterpart of the ADL). At the back of the class sat a guilt-ridden Anglican minister, along with an official from the government agency euphemistically known as the “Human Rights Commission.” With the original course itinerary now completely discarded, the classroom had become a kind of intellectual battlefield. That ostensibly independent officials could be trotted out on such short notice for our modest little group speaks volumes. To the surprise of those in charge, we weren’t at all intimidated.

After Shefman was introduced, we were informed that tape recorders would not be permitted, even though Bialystok had specifically welcomed them on the first evening’s class (when he was looking forward to a Holocaust love-in). Ignored were our queries of what they were afraid of or even ashamed of. Shortly into Shefman’s talk it became apparent why he didn’t want his words recorded. He vehemently lit into the Institute for Historical Review, maligning — in a most mendacious manner — not only it but individually each member of the IHR Journal’s Editorial Advisory Committee as well. We were given no satisfactory answers to our requests for evidence of his malicious claims.

Griffith told us that the “definitive” new edition of Raul Hilberg’s book, The Destruction of the European Jews, contained conclusive proof of mass gassing. Unable to give any such evidence himself, he simply told us to read Hilberg’s book. When I asked Griffith if he believed that hearsay evidence should be admissible in court, he declared in a sanctimonious monolog that not only did he believe that the use of hearsay evidence was counter-productive to a fair trial, but that our society’s judicial rules of evidence did not permit it. When I pointed out that hearsay testimony had been permitted by the Nuremberg Tribunal, his tone changed to one of evasive rationalization. Griffith implied that the Tribunal was an omniscient body with correspondingly appropriate rules that were indispensable in dealing with such grotesque crimes. My retort that the Nuremberg courts were nothing more than victor-formulated bodies designed to convict the vanquished so unnerved him that he shouted at me to “shut up.” With Griffith and Bialystok trying to put the best light on their non answers, and Shefman sniping from the side lines with his ad hominem attacks, the evening passed quickly.

As we arrived for the next session, we were startled to find the classroom overflowing with people. What had begun as a small class of nine students — barely enough to justify a course — had grown into a gathering of 45 or 50, with not enough desks for everyone. Earlier that day, it turned out, Ernst Zundel had enjoined about the course. Surrounded by a gaggle of media people, he was trying to register. In an effort to thwart his effort by claiming that the course was already fully booked, they had packed the classroom, mostly with other teachers and some volunteers from Jewish organizations. During that evening’s session the guilt-ridden Anglican minister explained to the class just how thoroughly anti-Semitic the Bible was, and how this had set the climate that permitted the Holocaust to happen. I asked if he had studied the [Jewish] Talmud. He said that he had. To my question of whether there were anti-Christian or anti-Gentile passages in the Talmud, he embarrassingly retorted: “Nowhere near the anti-Semitic hate that is in the Bible.”

At the next class the following week, the room was once again full. This time, though, the teachers were gone, replaced by Jewish volunteers. They hoped to overwhelm us. When the intimidating shouts and insults failed to stem...
the inconvenient questions, whole evenings were taken up with dog-madrama video tapes that allowed no time for questions and discussion. Those in charge even tried to intimidate us one evening by having two plain-clothes detectives from the so-called ethnic squad sit at the back of the room. We recognized them from the Zündel trial. During the eight week course, unregistered people wandered in and out of the classroom as if this was a Holocaust remembrance social club or a kind of changing of the Holocaust defense guard.

Frustrated that nothing they tried seemed able to stem our blasphemous questions, Mr. Bialystok resorted to a kind of censor’s “final solution.” Forbidding any further questions during instruction sessions, he announced that there would be a half-hour period for questions at the end of each evening’s session. In practice we were lucky to get ten minutes; usually it was five. And with so many dedicated “seekers of truth” running interference, we were fortunate if we got in even a single skeptical question. More to the point, we never got even one cogent answer.

Typical was the performance of Harold Tropper, the author of None is Too Many, a book decrying Canada’s refusal to take a boatload of Jewish refugees. His not so subtle message — of Canadian guilt and complicity in the Holocaust for sending refugees back to what he claimed was certain death — was expected to be humbly accepted as gospel. “Why should Canadians feel guilty about refusing a boatload of aliens,” I impertinently asked, “when Israel is presently preventing hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from returning to their own homeland?” At that point all hell broke loose, with everyone shouting at once. Irrational statements, such as “don’t bring Israel into this,” were made. Tropper proclaimed (inaccurately) that “this wasn’t true,” and then refused to discuss the matter any further.

After the course had concluded, my wife tried for several weeks to arrange a meeting with the school principal. When she finally spoke with him, he seemed nervous and embarrassed, giving some pretty lame excuses for some of what had happened. He explained, for example, that the teachers who had packed the class had been invited for “educational” purposes. He was surprised and seemingly upset to learn about the two detectives who had been in the classroom. As a result of his meeting with my wife, he also learned that quite ordinary, middle class Canadians — and not trouble makers as Bialystok would have described us — could have trouble believing all the Holocaust stories.

While we didn’t learn anything new about Holocaust history, we did learn something about how the guardians of the cult think, and to what lengths they will go to foster and protect their creed. We also had the satisfaction of seeing the course dropped altogether from the night school curriculum.

John Mort
Toronto, Canada

Life Profoundly Altered

Over the years I have really appreciated The Journal of Historical Review. A number of Journal articles have been of absolutely outstanding quality, and I have no doubt that this trend will continue.

Holocaust Revisionism has profoundly altered my life. Apart from the fascination it engenders by revealing that things may not be what they seem, there is also the purely ethical and moral issue it tackles: were — and by implication are — the German people so beastly that they could commit crimes so horrible that they do not bear thinking about?

In such a climate of intense irrationality — for what else is the absence of thought on such an emotional issue? — one is forced against any better judgment to take sides: one becomes either pro- or anti-Jewish.

It is nonsensical to believe that when History proves, on closer examination, to be different from what we have been told, that this will only result in more prejudice. The opposite is true, as the late [Jewish, revisionist author] Joseph Burg saw so clearly. What is bound to cause anti-Semitism are the blind efforts of a section of organised Jewry and their allies to stamp out all debate on this burning issue, mostly by foul means — slander, banning, monopolisation of history, promulgation of anti-revisionist laws, and even violence. How different is the enlightened attitude of Alfred M. Lilienthal, who can see the real need to discuss openly and frankly even the very question of “anti-Semitism.”

A very strong point in favour of the Revisionists is the emphasis they place on material as well as wartime documentary evidence, as opposed to the “official” historians who over-rely on “eyewitnesses.” In this regard, one should single out Martin Gilbert who makes use of the latter kind of evidence with abandon, it would appear, in his book The Holocaust. By insisting on “what concretely took place?,” Revisionists enable us to look at the past in the cold light of day, and so diminish that impulse to irrationality. Many disturbing questions remain, but the truth will make us free, even if the emerging picture is not to our liking.

It was a pleasant surprise to see my February 1992 letter to The Natal Witness reproduced in facsimile in the IHR Newsletter No. 88 [July-August 1992, p. 4]. The enclosed letter by me was published (in part) in The Weekly Mail, July 3-9, 1992. This paper is somewhat left-wing, and is read countrywide mainly (I am told) by the better educated, and in particular academics.

C. Zaverdinos
University of Natal
Faculty of Science
Pietermaritzburg
South Africa
Perhaps ten years ago, surely twenty years ago, one could justifiably argue that there was no need to teach Holocaust revisionism in Holocaust courses, as revisionism was nothing more than a smattering of articles by unknown and scattered people. The story today is quite different."
— Dr. Carlos Huerta, Touro College, Jerusalem, writing in Martyrdom and Resistance, October 1991.

In 1978 while President Jimmy Carter was hosting the Camp David peace talks to great fanfare, the Institute of Historical Review was being founded in almost total silence. Yet the purpose of the Institute was not much different from that of the Camp David confab, that being world peace, albeit from a radically different approach — bringing history into accord with the facts to identify the true roots of conflicts and thus the possibilities for their peaceable resolutions.

Inspired by revisionist historians such as Harry Elmer Barnes and James Martin, the Institute began its existence with modest plans. To further revisionist history, the Institute would hold conferences, later publishing the papers presented at such conferences along with any other writings deemed sufficiently interesting and scholarly.

Thus it was that over Labor Day weekend of 1979, a small group gathered at the first-ever Revisionist Conference at Northrup University in Los Angeles, California. Speakers spoke. Papers were presented. And virtually no one outside a small circle took any note whatsoever.

That was soon to change. By the Spring of 1980, the first issue of the quarterly Journal of Historical Review was in the mail, containing six of the papers presented at the Conference, a book review, and a list of some 40 books for sale. With no more than 94 pages — 9 inches by 5-3/4 inches in size — soft-bound in gray stock, volume one, number one did not look like the spark that would ignite a worldwide controversy.

It was not the physical appearance of the Journal that was to inflame passions on a global scale, but the contents. Inside were addresses about the "Holocaust" by Dr. Arthur R. Butz, Robert Faurisson, Austin J. App, and Ditlieb Felderer. The first issue also contained Louis FitzGibbon's views on the Katyn Massacre, and an article by Udo Walendy about fake atrocity photographs. The Letters section of the issues that followed showed the intensity of feelings those in the "establishment" hold against revisionism.

Of course the material contained in the Journal did not spring up overnight. Many of the books offered had been available for some time, slowly making the rounds. Bradley Smith tells in his book, Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist, Part I, of being introduced to Holocaust revisionism in 1979 when a stranger handed him a photocopy of an article by Robert Faurisson that originally appeared in Le Monde. Arthur Butz' pathbreaking book, The Hoax of the Twentieth Century, had already been published in 1976. And articles in dissident periodicals such as The Spotlight made many aware that there was another side to history as taught.

The new Institute served to focus all the previously scattered work in this area. People interested in the work of App, Barnes, Butz, Faurisson, Felderer, Greaves, Irving, Larson, Martin, Rassinier, and others now found them readily available, and the appearance of a body of revisionist works all in one place proved synergistic.

Revisionists not only wrote about history, they were making it as well. News about the activities of the IHR and revisionists around the world was covered in the IHR Newsletter, which Journal subscribers received automatically. Newsy where the Journal was studious, and irreverent where the Journal was serious, the IHR Newsletter provided revisionist information in a more timely manner than the quarterly Journal schedule allowed.

The Journal's first editor was David McCalden, a native of Belfast, Northern Ireland, who played a decisive role in the founding of the IHR, and wrote under the name of "Lewis Brandon." Longer on enthusiasm than on attention to detail, from 1978 until his departure in 1981, he was instrumental in the genesis of the revisionist movement.

From McCalden's departure in 1981 until 1982, Tom Marcellus served as editor. Marcellus started at the bottom at the IHR and worked his way up to become director, a position he assumed in 1981 and still holds.

From 1982 through 1984, the Journal was edited by Keith Stimely, a gifted young writer who was astonishingly well-read, as can be seen by the number of book reviews he wrote during his tenure.

In 1986, the helm was assumed by Robert Berkel, a dedicated revisionist who served until publication of the Journal was suspended in 1987.
In 1988 it returned with the brilliant Theodore J. O'Keefe as editor. For the next four years, O'Keefe was virtually the voice of the IHR.

In 1992, O'Keefe passed the torch to our current editor, Mark Weber, who over the years had established himself as one of the most prolific contributors to the Journal, and a major contributor to the IHR Newsletter as well.

Under the stewardship of these capable individuals, the Journal not only grew, it also evolved into a nearly unassailable source of historical information, by virtue of the increasingly rigorous treatment of topics covered. At the same time, the Journal contained many articles that were original not only in the sense that they had never appeared elsewhere before, but also original in concept. The English translation of Hitler's declaration of war against the United States (Winter, 1988), the first English translation of Premier Tojo's prison diary (Spring, 1992), aerial photos of Treblinka (Summer, 1992), and the Auschwitz camp death certificates (Fall, 1992) are examples of the former, while virtually everything by Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson are examples of the latter.

As a result, the Journal came to be read by lay persons and academics around the world, and numerous Journal articles have been translated into other languages, and disseminated even more widely.

The maturation evident in the Journal from year to year is partially due to forces from within the revisionist community: the rest comes from responding to the inevitable criticism from the bulk of the historical community and others with a vested interest in preserving the status quo, in which political agendas determine what the accepted view of history will be.

Through all these attacks, whether physical, legal, personal, or (infrequently) scholarly, it can well and truly be said that critics have rarely been able to land any telling blows. Our most powerful enemies, armed with all their conventional historiography, are — when they deal with Journal articles at all — forced to misquote and mischaracterize our position to make their cases. More often, of course, they simply attack the author of the piece in hopes that others will not notice they are ignoring the facts.

Occasionally, as in the case of Jean-Claude Pressac or Kenneth Stern, an attempt is made to answer revisionist claims. In the case of Stern (whose book, Holocaust Denial, is reviewed elsewhere in this issue), revisionist claims are oversimplified and not directly answered.

In Pressac's works, on the other hand, revisionists have found a wealth of information that bolsters the revisionist position. In any event, even the strongest attacks now include admissions, either expressed or implied, that certain portions of the revisionist position are correct.

The main front on which the revisionist battle is being fought is to correct the Holocaust story. Here, the years since the publication of the first Journal have seen remarkable retreats from the standard Holocaust story, which used to include soap made from Jewish corpses, gas chambers at Dachau, and all manner of fiendish methods of murder (including nuclear devices). Revisionists have convincingly demonstrated virtually every facet of the traditional Holocaust tale to be untrue, or at least wildly exaggerated, resulting in an inexorable whittling down of the "accepted" Holocaust story to a tiny fraction of what it once was. Even so, the "six million" figure remains, indicating that there is yet more work to be done.

As readers know, the Journal is not wholly consumed with the Holocaust issue. In addition to the stated goal of re-examining the period surrounding the Second World War (because of the important social-political role it has had, and continues to have), the Journal has also examined key aspects of United States history, politics, race, culture, religion, current events, and personalities from around the world.

By any standard, the Journal has been influential far beyond its circulation, its budget, and what could be expected of an otherwise nondescript publication devoted to history. What has made the Journal successful, we believe, is this: In every area of study — in revisionism no less than in chemistry or math — while each new generation of scholars in turn questions the generation before it, there must also be a knowledge and a certainty that that which has gone before presents a solid foundation upon which new studies can be based. Where this certainty is lacking, there can be little progress.

In the treatment of twentieth century history, though, establishment historians have utterly failed in their responsibility to present and future generations. By demonstrating more sensitivity for short-term social-political considerations than for truth and historical accuracy, they have made themselves vulnerable to telling critique.

Until our current flawed view of the recent past is corrected via historical revisionism, there can be no truth, and where there is no truth, there can be no peace.

This, then, is the purpose of the Journal. The transition from a plain-cover, academic format to color covers, more photographs, and a magazine format we hope will both reflect the prominence we have thus far achieved, as well as garner new readers. In any case, the Journal will continue to offer the same high quality of subject matter and content that has elevated us to our current position.
To mark the publication of our first thirteen volumes of the Journal, we have compiled a listing of all items that have appeared in the Journal over the years, and are providing it here as a supplement to this issue. The main listing is arranged chronologically by volume and number, with individual entries arranged alphabetically by author and title within these classifications. Items with no author are arranged by title before the other listings. Each listing shows the page number where the item starts.

At the beginning of each entry is a reference number. This number is for identification purposes, and is used with the topic and author indexes. To use the topic and author indexes, locate the topic or author in which you are interested and note the numbers that follow the index listing. These numbers correspond to the numbers at the beginning of the entries in the main listing.
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