

The Journal of Historical Review

David Irving

*Churchill and U.S. Entry
Into World War II*

Prof. Anthony Kubek

*The Morgenthau Plan and the
Problem of Policy Perversion*

Victor Marchetti

*Propaganda and Disinformation:
How the CIA Manufactures History*

Herman Otten

*Christianity, Truth and Fantasy:
The Holocaust, Historical
Revisionism and Christians Today*

—Reviews—

*Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?
The "Final Solution" in History*

Hitler's Hometown: Linz, Austria, 1908-1945

The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME NINE, NUMBER 3/FALL 1989

Editor: Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

FRIEDRICH P. BERG, B.Sc.
The Historical Review Committee
Ft. Lee, New Jersey

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

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

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

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan

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

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

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

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine
Taby, Sweden

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

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
New Libertarian
Long Beach, California

MARTIN A. LARSON, Ph.D.
The Spotlight
Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY, Ph.D.
Research Chemist

JAMES J. MARTIN, Ph.D.
Ralph Myles Publishers
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Italy

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

IVO OMRCANIN, S.T.D.,
J.D.C., J.S.D., LL.D.
Indiana University of Pennsylvania (Ret.)
Washington, D.C.

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Badenweiler, West Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Verlag für Volkstum und
Zeitgeschichtsforschung
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

MARK WEBER, M.A.
The Historical Review Committee

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

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505. Subscriptions include the *IHR Newsletter*, containing news of interest to academic and lay Historical Revisionists, which is issued in alternate months of issue of *The Journal of Historical Review* except August. Combined subscription price is \$40 per year, \$65 for two years and \$90 for three years. Add \$10 per year for foreign subscriptions. Add \$20 per year for overseas airmail delivery. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in U.S. dollars drawable on a U.S. bank. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available on request. Appropriate, double-spaced manuscripts are welcomed by the editor, and must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
PTLA Catalog
EBSCO Librarians Handbook/Serials Directory
Ulrich's International Periodical Directory
Turner Periodical Catalog
Standard Periodical Directory
Swet's Subscription Service

ISSN: 0195-6752

**Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306
Torrance, California 90505**

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, CA 90505, United States of America. Domestic subscription rate: \$40 per year, foreign rate: \$50 per year.

Two copies of each reprint should be submitted to the publisher of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Table of Contents

Volume Nine, No. 3

Fall, 1989

Articles

Churchill and U.S. Entry Into World War II <i>David Irving</i>	261
The Morgenthau Plan and the Problem of Policy Perversion <i>Prof. Anthony Kubek</i>	287
Propaganda and Disinformation: How the CIA Manufactures History <i>Victor Marchetti</i>	305
Christianity, Truth and Fantasy: The Holocaust, Historical Revisionism and Christians Today <i>Herman Otten</i>	321

Reviews

Arno J. Mayer, <i>Why Did The Heavens Not Darken?</i> <i>Arthur R. Butz</i> <i>Robert Faurisson</i>	361
Evan Burr Buckey, <i>Hitler's Hometown:</i> <i>Linz, Austria, 1908-1945</i> <i>John M. Ries</i>	380
About the Contributors	384

From the Editor

This fall the Western media have marked the outbreak of war in Europe fifty years ago, on September 1, 1939, in strident and self-congratulatory tones. To the press, and to the professional historical establishment, the Second World War is still the “good war,” American’s and its allies’ crusade against evil made manifest in the person of Adolf Hitler and his followers.

From the time that Great Britain’s “blank check” to Poland in March 1939, which made war virtually inevitable, to the present, powerful interests have been at work to insure that the subsequent history of the war differ as little as possible from the Allies’ wartime propaganda (a propaganda which, to judge from the continuing obsession with German villainy in Hollywood and elsewhere, continues). Two basic themes—the “aggression” of Germany and its allies, and their unparalleled cruelty and brutality, culminating in the Jewish “Holocaust”—have become the touchstones for historical and social orthodoxy in East and West. To challenge the historical taboos of “the good war” has resulted in professional, and even physical, peril since 1945.

We who are seeking to revise the history of the Second World War by bringing it into accord with the facts have faced and fought far more determined foes than did the historians who established the truth about the origins, conduct, and conclusion of the First World War, according to no less an authority than Harry Elmer Barnes himself, the great Revisionist of both this century’s world wars. But those of us who have had to become expert at seeing the reality behind the shadows projected for us by Big Brother can readily perceive the clear fact—and a fact becoming more clear with every day—that it is we Revisionists who have seized the offensive and begun our relentless advance, and it is the entire Establishment which is now fighting defensively.

Surely, never before have we noticed as many “revisionists” throughout the length and breadth of the intellectual landscape. It is almost as if someone, somewhere, by attaching the Revisionist label to enough people, sought to distract attention from the genuine article. No “conspiracy theory” here though. All we wish to note is that all of a sudden the “R-word” seems to be on everybody’s lips. Since the Institute

(continued on page 304)

Churchill and U.S. Entry Into World War II

*(Paper Presented to the Ninth
International Revisionist Conference)*

DAVID IRVING

Churchill was a magnificent man, a wonderful writer, a brilliant speaker. Writing at his worst, he was better than most of us other writers writing flat-out at our best. I've said it often before and it's undoubtedly true. He had a habit of finding a cutting phrase, and when I look back on my own last 25 years of crime—my writing life as an author—I sometimes remember the sentence which I quote here in Volume II [of *Churchill's War*—ed.]:

A man's life is similar to a walk down a long passage with closed windows to each side. As you reach each window an unseen hand opens it; but the light that it lets in only increases by contrast the darkness at the end.

Beautiful piece of Winston Churchill descriptive writing. Yet he was a man who had very, very odd facets. He was a man who was almost a pervert, who liked to expose himself to people. You don't find this in the average Churchill biography. You'll find it in mine. Such flashes of mature insight were tempered by patches of behavior that witnesses could only describe as infantile. The same general, wearily watching Winston throw yet another tantrum, remarked *sotto voce* to Hugh Dalton, minister of Economic Warfare: "One feels that a nurse should come and fetch him away."

Some of his fetishes must have had their roots in his unsettled infancy. He had a whimsical habit of exposing himself, just like a naughty child, both to his young male secretaries and to his elders and betters. Each one thought that he was being uniquely privileged, but this happened so frequently that it cannot have been fortuitous. No matter how high ranking the personage—with the exception, it seems, of

His Majesty—he was likely to find himself received by Britain's prime minister in a state of total nudity on one pretext or another. Churchill frequently received his ministers or staff officers while sitting in or stepping out of the bath—these blessed folk being referred to afterwards as Mr. Churchill's "Companions of the Bath." He resembled, in the words of Brigadier Menzies, chief of the secret service, a "nice pink pig" wrapped in a silk kimono. "Sometimes," recalled "C" in 1967, "I had to talk to the PM when he was undressed and once, when in the bath, he mentioned he had nothing to hide from me." (On another occasion Churchill cautioned him to silence and pointed to his Persian cat, Nelson, looking out of a window: "He's in touch with the pelicans on the lake," he said, "and they're communicating our information to the German secret service!")

Not even foreigners were spared this ordeal: on August 26, 1941 he asked the butler at Chequers to bring Elliott Roosevelt to him. "I knocked on his door," wrote the president's son, "and entered. Churchill was dictating to his male secretary with a large cigar in his mouth . . . he was absolutely starkers, marching up and down the room." Others were treated with scarcely greater mercy—he would wear his white linen undergarments to receive the Canadian prime minister Mackenzie-King in May 1943: "He really was quite a picture but looked like a boy—cheeks quite pink and very fresh." (I'm not sure which cheeks he was referring to!)

It's fun, isn't it. You see, I'm English and you're American, or recently American, and we have this kind of love-hate relationship. I'm sorry that I don't speak your language; perhaps I'll just lay down a bit!

This is one of the basic problems that Churchill had in the war years: persuading the Americans to come in and fight his war for him. Because by 1940 it had become Churchill's war. It was no longer concerned with Poland, Poland was forgotten as soon as Poland was defeated, but the war by 1940 became a matter of self-prolongation. It had become important to Churchill's own political reign that the war continue.

Less than 20 per cent of Americans felt in June 1942 that there should be closer collaboration with Britain after the war. This is what the Gallup Poll found out in June of 1942. They saw the British as aristocratic, snobbish, selfish, arrogant and cold. (Now there's nothing wrong with being arrogant, we spend a lot of money sending our boys to school to teach them arrogance.) The Gallup Poll also found how the British, at this

time, saw the Americans: their image was one of conceit, cocksureness, gangsterism, graft and corruption (this sounds almost anti-Semitic, doesn't it?). Churchill generally was liked: 45 per cent liked him—25 per cent liked Chiang Kai-shek, 7 per cent liked Stalin. Those disliking him included the Negroes, the Irish, the Midwestern farmers and people of German descent—for some odd reason!

When Churchill came to the shores of the United States he did not receive unanimously favorable fan mail. The FBI files, which I've been going through for my Churchill research, contain some prize letters which were intercepted by the FBI, including this anonymous letter from a California mother of three:

Every time you appear on our shores, it means something very terrible for us. Why do you not stay at home and fight your own battles instead of always pulling us into them to save your rotten neck? You are taking foul advantage of our blithering idiot of a president. (June 19, 1942).

You see, if I'm known for anything as a historian, apart from being a pain in the neck, it's because I uncover things. And uncovering things does not necessarily mean you go into the archives and see something and say: "Look at this, this is something quite extraordinary." If you go into the archives long enough, ten or twenty years, you become what I would call a "gap-ologist." I can spot gaps in archives and they're much more difficult to spot, because they've been papered over and the files have been closed and it's only by going through the archives over a period of many years that you get the gut feeling that something isn't there that should be there. And you get this kind of gut feeling when you look into the American archives, and then you look in the British archives, and then you go to Australia and Canada and the other archives, and you think to yourself "Wait a minute, in the American archives I've seen a whole heap of documents on that but here I am in the archives outside of London, and yet there's a gap!" It takes a long time before you can put your finger on that gap—because, it's not there—there's not exactly a label saying "What's this gap. Try and spot what it is." So I've become a bit of a gap-ologist—I look for what is missing from the files. And particularly in the history of how we managed to drag you in in 1941—there are gaps. There are gaps in the files particularly relating to Japan and the United States. And there are gaps in the files all the way back to 1936, when the Americans first invaded the British Empire.

You don't know of this invasion because nobody makes a great fuss about it now, in view of the fact of our special relationship with you. There's not just one nation that has a special relationship with you, there's another one (every time that Israel is described as America's staunchest ally, Mrs. Thatcher winces!) And the fact that occasionally you've done the dirty on us is neatly overlooked. The fact that you robbed us blind in 1940-41 is overlooked. The fact that back in 1936 President Roosevelt sent U.S. Marines to invade Canton Island, at that time a British possession in the Phoenix Islands in the South Pacific peopled at that time by only one British Resident (capital "R" British Resident), who had his native wife (they lived in a grass hut and they had the Union Jack ran up on a flag pole). Pan Am needed that island for an interim stopping point on its flights down to the South Pacific—and so Roosevelt sent the Marines to throw the British out!

Now, you may find it surprising that there's no reference to this in the British archives. But it is referred to in the catalog of the British Archives. You'll find it says: "American policy: Canton Island; closed until the 21st century." All pages referring to this painful episode are closed until 2017—so I'm not going to be able to see them! This is a typical example of the gaps you look for. You'll find the papers on them in the American archives, clearly enough, which is how I first came to find out about this—in the private papers of Harold Ickes, who was the Secretary of the Interior at that time. This was part of his purview.

I think Professor Warren S. Kimball, who is a great Churchillologist in the American university system at Rutgers University, was the first person to draw attention to the gaps in the British archives relating to the Japanese files. For all of the intelligence files relating to Japan have been withdrawn, and not just any files relating to Japan, but precisely the month before Pearl Harbor, gone: out of the British files.

I humbly add to this the fact that if you look a bit further you can see other gaps—if you look at the biography of Winston Churchill written by Martin Gilbert and published by Heinemann, he's the authorized Churchill biographer (which rather implies that nobody else ought to write about Churchill, but I've arrogated to myself, in my arrogant way, the job of writing an un-authorized biography), if you look at Martin Gilbert's biography, you'll find on one page of volume six that something has clearly been removed referring to November the 26th, 1941, which is a very important day in the history of

pre-Pearl Harbor. November 26, 1941 is the day when we prevailed on the Americans to stand firm with the Japanese, thereby insuring that war would break out. And on that day in the Martin Gilbert biography, you'll find a paragraph has obviously been removed at some time because there's been reference to a letter that Churchill wrote to the president that has been taken out on that day—and we know it's gone because in the next paragraph Martin Gilbert rather foolishly continues with the words: “. . . on the same day such and such a thing happened!” And it no longer means the same day. So you could spot where the gap was. It's obviously all been shuffled up again and the pages have been reset, for something has been taken out relating to November 26, 1941.

If you look into the American archives under that date, and you go into the National Archives building on Pennsylvania avenue in Washington D.C., and look at all the telegrams that went between London and Washington on that date, about forty of them went through embassy channels, you can see the serial numbers of the telegrams, and suddenly there are two telegrams that had serial numbers that are not in the archives—they have vanished from the archives! And this kind of thing didn't happen. If a serial number was allocated to a telegram and that telegram number was not used, then a blank page goes into the archives with a reference number “not used.”

So two telegrams have been removed from the archives, because there's a gap in the numbering. And we don't know precisely what happened on November 26th, except by odd allusions to it in the diaries of Roosevelt's staff. So the gaps begin to be significant. And then you realize what was making you unhappy about the British and American archives—and it's a huge thing . . . it's so big that you wonder why you didn't discover it in the first place! And it's the big things that people often don't notice. Just like, for example, in the famous case of the Adolf Hitler diaries that were published back in 1983. I was interested in the chemical test of the glue on the string and the ink and the paper, and so on—but it was the big thing that all of us overlooked, I've got to admit. This was the fact that when I saw the diaries—there was 62 of them stacked up on the table—all identical Adolf Hitler diaries in his handwriting, apparently authentic, and yet the thing that should have occurred to all of us at that time was obvious. The fact that if there were 62 diaries, all identical, on that table in 1983 this meant that back in about 1920 Adolf Hitler had gone

into his local stationers and said: "I want 62 diaries please . . . I'm going to write a diary!" You see? None of us spotted that. I have to admit that, although I'm rather ashamed to admit it. And so it is with the archives over the water, in London, and here in Washington.

In Washington the American government has now released all their Japanese intercepts. Everything that was decoded from the Japanese diplomatic files, and some of the naval files, and military signals and water company messages and so on, that we were decoding in 1940 and 1941 and onwards, by the famous "Magic" machines, the diplomatic code "Purple," and various other codes of that series, has now been released to the National Archives in Washington by the NSA (the National Security Agency). Millions of pages of intercepts that were generated by the Japanese and decoded by the American army and navy cryptographers during the Second World War are in the American archives. In the British archives there is not one single page of a Japanese message decoded by the British.

This is not easily spotted, because it is a gap! There is no kind of gap on the shelves with a sign saying, "Here's where the British decrypts will eventually come when they are released." They just keep very quiet about them!

For example, a few months ago, I came across a very low-level order by Churchill on security. They're looking at the movements of the Japanese foreign minister. Churchill's chief of staff, a man called Ismay, writes to Churchill, saying "Well, what do we do about the attached document?" And the attached document, which is quite obviously, from the content, an intercept of a Japanese message of February 1941, has been withdrawn by the British government. And there is a withdrawal sheet there saying that the attached document had been withdrawn but you don't know what it is. You only know from inference from the covering letters that it is an intercept of a Japanese message.

So what does all this mean? It means that we British were definitely reading Japanese signals in the years before Pearl Harbor. I will elaborate shortly upon which particular codes we were reading, and it means that we are so ashamed of what we were getting out of those signals that we dare not admit: A, that we were getting Japanese messages, and B, we dare not take the risk of releasing any of those messages in the archives in case some clever David Irving comes along five years from now and sees what inferences to draw from them. We are entitled to draw a further inference, C, from this, and this is

that the people who are hiding things are doing so out of a basically guilty conscience.

The Americans have not hidden any of their Japanese intercepts so far as we're aware. I think any authorized historian would go along with me on that particular claim. The Americans have been enormously up front about releasing all their intercepts now into the National Archives, in fact it's an embarrassing profusion of intercepts—we don't know what to do with them—there are millions of them. No one historian has time to go through them all, they're so many. And yet, we British have not released a single page. You don't even find scattered misfiled pages in the archives—all have sedulously been weeded out of the files.

I think that what happened was this: back in September of 1939 we began reading the Japanese fleet operational code, JN-25 (JN: Japanese Navy), and these Japanese naval intercepts were being read by us, finally, at a much higher level than the American cryptographers were capable of. I could read out to you various documents in the course of this evening if I wanted to show the displeasure that the Americans felt with us that we were not releasing to them everything that we had. George Marshall wrote letters to the President about it. A man called McCormack was sent to Britain in 1943 to find out if there was any way of getting the British intelligence authorities to release still more of their intercepts, because the Americans had by that time realized that we were decoding more than we were releasing. And we are left with the problem of trying to work out why we have not released the JN-25 intercepts to the archives in Britain, and whether we're entitled to draw conclusions from this. It's a gap and it's an embarrassing gap. I think this is one reason why, as Warren Kimball has pointed out, certain British foreign office files relating to Japan from September-October and particularly from November of 1941 have been withdrawn completely from the British archives even though they're just about Japan, apparently, not necessarily containing intercept material. They've been withdrawn from the archives in violation of our 30-year rule and they're not going to be put into the archives until long after all of us in this room are dead. This again is the action of a guilty conscience.

My colleague, John Costello, a very fine writer, who has written detailed books about Pearl Harbor, has made formal applications to the Ministry of Defense in Britain and he has been told: "It would not be in the national interest for these

files to be released." Not in the national interest! Now, nearly fifty years later, we still can't be told what happened before Pearl Harbor?

Let's have a look at some of the other gaps so you can see the way that we've all been misled and how some of your most famous historians have not found out how we've been misled. Let us look, for example, at the private diary of Henry Stimson. Henry Stimson, the American secretary of war, conservative, Republican, elderly gentleman, upright, fine, decent, wrote a very detailed diary. As did a number of cabinet members – thank God – he dictated them onto a dictaphone disk. When he retired at the end of each day he would dictate onto a disk and the next day the secretary would type up what the boss had dictated the day before. These diary entries are sometimes 25 or 30 pages long, and if you go to Yale University you can read the Henry Stimson diary in original. I do emphasize the importance to any of you who want to write or want to see what true history is: don't read "printed" versions of diaries, read the original if you can. If you can't, then get microfilm copies or photocopies, because that's the only way you're going to get a feel for where the faking has been done.

I remember reading one of Rommel's diaries: Rommel had just lost a particularly stupid battle in November of 1941, and he realized a week or two later, the stupid mistake he had made, and he had his secretary, a corporal, retype the page in the diary – correcting history after the event! The corporal sat down and religiously typed it out, and he made the mistake that all of us make on the first day of any new year, he put the wrong year at the head of the page: November 1942! This is a clear give-away.

The same thing happens in the Henry Stimson diary, in the month before Pearl Harbor. If you look in the original diary you will find clear evidence that the pages of the Stimson diary have been tampered with before Pearl Harbor. Probably by him, himself.

Every secretary has her own idiosyncrasies: they indent by a certain number of words at the beginning of a paragraph, they leave two or three spaces after a period or comma, they underline the date or they don't, they write 23 lines to a page or whatever. And Stimson's secretary, being a top-flight Washington secretary, did just that. She typed the diary meticulously. Which means, of course, that if she takes out a paragraph on a page, or takes out a sentence or two sentences

and retypes it, you can spot it. And if somebody else does it, of course, retypes it two or three years later, you can spot it even better, because it's a different secretary by then.

If you look in the Stimson diary you'll find that in November and October 1941, two months before Pearl Harbor, that repeatedly passages have been taken out of the Stimson diary, and that page had been retyped by a different secretary for the reasons I just described. And on Pearl Harbor day itself, December 7, 1941, we find that from page three onward the whole diary has been retyped. Again, by the same secretary, the one who retyped it three or four years later, because it always contains the same idiosyncrasies of the second lady and not the original secretary.

How many historians discovered that? And are we entitled to draw any conclusions as to what went in and to what's been taken out? Well, as luck would have it, on November 4, 1944, Stimson had a strange telephone call from Henry Morgenthau. Henry Morgenthau, secretary of the treasury, telephoned Henry Stimson, deeply troubled because the Morgenthau plan was being accused of costing the lives of two divisions of GIs. Morgenthau telephones Stimson and begs for absolution. He says: "Say it isn't so, Henry!" And if you go into the Morgenthau Diary, in the Roosevelt library in Hyde Park, you'll find this very interesting entry penciled in, which again, nobody else has spotted—not even Arthur Schlesinger Jr. so far as I know—November 4, 1944, 8:45: "Telephoned Henry Stimson, Cold Springs, and urged him to do something [to deny Dewey's claim that the Morgenthau Plan had prolonged the war]. He sounded tired, more tired than ever. He said he was tired out from working the last two weeks on the Pearl Harbor report, to keep out anything that might hurt the president." So there you've got it! Round about the same time he was going through his diaries, thinking: My God, did I write that down in the diaries? Better cut that out." "Miss Moneypenny, can you retype these pages for me?" It's a cover-up.

Again, you can spot what's gone out of those pages. Because if you read the whole of 1941, throughout all the other months Stimson is writing down, every day, the details of the Magics that he gets, the intercepts of the Japanese messages, the diplomatic reports. Stimson is writing them down every day until suddenly, just before Pearl Harbor, around November the third, every reference to Japan dries up suddenly. From November the third onwards, right through until November

the twenty-sixth, there's no reference to Japan at all in his diaries, apparently, in the edited version. Now that's a likely story. What he's done is he's gone through cutting out everything! Because he's very scared indeed, because here is piece of evidence after piece of evidence that the Japanese are up to something. So he's gone through the diaries and cut out these references.

Now in the British Archives there's another gap, and again it only comes to you when you've been working on the subject intensively in the other archives. This concerns the "Winds message." I won't go into a complicated description of what the "Winds message" was. Suffice it to say that the Japanese had realized that when war broke out, they would need some cryptic way of telling their embassies abroad who was going to be the enemy and when war was going to break out. They decided to tell the various embassies abroad to watch out in the local Japanese weather forecast that was broadcast around the world—an ordinary weather forecast broadcast from Tokyo. These distant embassies in London, Rome, and Berlin, were to watch for certain messages about which way the wind was blowing, and whether it was going to rain. And this "Winds message," which was issued from Tokyo on November 19, 1941, was decoded by us—this preparatory message, from November the twenty-fifth, we should say—was decoded by us, the British and Americans, on November the twenty-fifth. Messages went out to all our listening posts: Singapore, Hong Kong, the east and west coasts of the United States, and in Britain—to listen for the slightest sign of the "Winds execute" transmission.

In the American archives there are tons and tons of documents about the "Winds message," in the SRH series in the National Archives, Record Group 457. You'll find that there are expositions on it, there are summaries of it, there are deliberations and accusations and debates and Pearl Harbor hearings about the "Winds message." We British were asked to keep our ears open for the "Winds message" too. Because obviously we might equally likely pick up the "Winds message." Because such are the idiosyncrasies in the propagation of radio waves that we sometimes pick up radio messages broadcast from Japan that the Americans can't pick up. So we were listening out for it, too. And yet, if you look in the British archives relating to Japan, if you look in the BBC archives too, you won't find even a reference to the "Winds message," let alone the search for it, let alone the result. Did we

or did we not pick up the "Winds execute" message which gave us sufficient warning, as it gave the Americans, in fact on December the fourth, three days before Pearl Harbor, Japan was about to attack Britain, about to attack the United States, but was not about to attack Russia.

Well, I think that we did. I think that our intelligence services did pick up the "Winds message" and that Churchill either did or did not communicate that vital information to the United States. We'll come to that matter in a minute.

Churchill's great nightmare throughout 1941 was that he was going to find himself blundering into war with Japan—alone. And that the United States would hang out until the last minute and then not come in. This is written very large in all of Churchill's deliberations both inside his cabinet and in private. But of course Churchill's deliberations inside his cabinet didn't mean very much because Churchill's cabinet had about as much brains as the band on the Johnny Carson Show. You see, Churchill knew that Roosevelt wanted war, but Churchill was familiar with Roosevelt's basic problem: namely, that the American people did not want war. Churchill did all he could to help Roosevelt out of his dilemma.

We were reading the German submarine codes. We knew where the German submarines were in the Atlantic, so Churchill took pains to ensure that our convoys coming across the Atlantic, escorted by American ships, would head directly to where the German U-boats were, in the hopes that the U-boats would sink an American ship. This was the kind of thing that we can see going on now that we're gradually getting access to all the files. You now begin to understand where the British national interest is: that these things should not be released.

Back in 1941, Churchill's biggest problem was the Ambassador, Joseph P. Kennedy, the American ambassador in the Court of St. James. Joseph P. Kennedy, one of my favorite characters of World War Two, father of President Kennedy, who was probably not one of my favorite characters. Joseph Kennedy was a glorious, Irish, Catholic bigot. Roosevelt had a sense of humor in appointing him to London and he admitted that he had only done it as a bit of a joke. Churchill found it anything but a joke when he became Prime Minister.

Kennedy had a habit of reporting back to Washington the truth! When Kennedy went to ask Chamberlain, the Prime Minister, why he shouldn't have Churchill in his cabinet, Chamberlain's reply was that "the man was very unstable and

he's become a fine two-fisted drinker." Churchill knew what Kennedy was reporting because we were reading the American diplomatic codes as well, and Churchill did everything he could to get rid of Kennedy—by fair means or foul. In fact Kennedy, as his diaries make plain (we've got certain fragments of Kennedy's diaries, which are quite interesting, because he was viciously anti-Semitic). Kennedy believed that Churchill was capable of stooping to anything to bring the United States in to war. In one telegram he reports back to Washington that he thinks that Churchill is on the point of bombing the U.S. Embassy in London. He believed that Churchill, in 1940, was about to bomb the American Embassy in London and claim that the Germans had done it! Later on, in 1940, when Kennedy decides to go back to Florida for a vacation, he takes the plane down to Lisbon, and he boards the USS *Manhattan* to sail back across the Atlantic, and in a bit of a panic because he knows who he's dealing with, he's dealing with Churchill, he sends a telegram to the State Department saying: "Please, will you announce that if the USS *Manhattan* is torpedoed and sunk, it will not be considered a *casus belli*, that the United States will not declare war over this because I have reason to believe that Churchill is planning to torpedo the USS *Manhattan* knowing that I'm on board!" Now these telegrams are not contained in the published volumes of the foreign relations of the United States. I found them in the archives (they are in Suitland, Maryland) and I quoted them in the first volume of my Churchill biography as well as even more hilarious telegrams in the subsequent volume. They do show that Kennedy had correctly assessed what Churchill was up to. He was trying to drag the United States into the war by hook or by crook.

In the middle of 1940 Churchill hit on the idea of buying from the United States, 50 destroyers, World War I destroyers, which were completely useless, and exchanging them for valuable pieces of British Empire real estate. He gave to the United States bits of the Caribbean islands, that were our colonies, he gave bits of Newfoundland, and bits of British Guiana, in return for 50 destroyers, that were so useless, in fact, that not one saw action in World War Two, except, I think, for the *Campbelltown* which was only fit to be towed across the English Channel laden with dynamite and blown up in the French dock gates in St. Nazaire in March 1942. It wasn't a very good bargain, in other words. In the words of

Adolf Berle, the American undersecretary of state, writing in his diary: "With one single gulp we have managed to obtain a large part of the British Empire, in return for nothing." Namely those 50 destroyers. This was one of the methods that Churchill was using in an attempt to bring the United States closer and closer to the brink of war.

Another method that he used was far more cynical. As he said to Ambassador Kennedy in June or July 1940: "You watch, when Adolf Hitler begins bombing London and bombing towns in Britain like Boston and Lincoln, towns with their counterparts in the United States, you Americans will have to come in, won't you, you can't just stand aside and watch our suffering." But he knew from code-breaking, he knew from reading the German air force signals, which were broken on May 26, 1940, that Hitler had given orders that no British town was to be bombed. London was completely embargoed. The German air force was allowed to bomb ports and harbors and dockyards, but not towns as such. Churchill was greatly aggrieved by this. He wondered how much longer Hitler could afford carrying on war like this. Hitler, as we know, carried on until September 1940 without bombing any English towns. The embargo stayed in force, we can see it in the German archives now, and we know from the code-breaking of the German signals that Churchill was reading Hitler's orders to the German air force: not on any account to bomb these towns. So there was no way that we could drag in the Americans that way unless we could provoke Hitler to do it. Which was why, on August 25, 1940, Churchill gave the order to the British air force to go and bomb Berlin. Although the chief of the bomber command and the chief of staff of the British air force warned him that if we bombed Hitler, he may very well lift the embargo on British towns. And Churchill just twinkled. Because that was what he wanted—of course.

At 9:15 that morning he telephoned personally the bomber commander, himself, to order the bombing of Berlin, 100 bombers to go and bomb Berlin. They went out and bombed Berlin that night, and Hitler still didn't move. Then Churchill ordered another raid on Berlin and so it went on for the next seven or ten days until finally, on September 4th, Hitler lost his patience and made that famous speech in the Sport Palace in Berlin in which he said: "This madman has bombed Berlin now seven times. If he bombs Berlin now once more, then I shall not only just attack their towns, I shall wipe them out!" ("Ich werde ihre Städte ausradieren!") A very famous speech. Of

course German schoolchildren are told about the Hitler speech, but not told about what went first. They're not told how Churchill set out deliberately to provoke the bombing of his own capital. And on the following day Churchill ordered Berlin bombed again. And now of course the Germans started bombing the docks in London, the East End of London, finally the city of London and the West End on November 6 and 7, 1940. In September 1940 7,000 Londoners were killed in the bombing as the result of Churchill's deliberate provocation. The files are there, the archives are there. No wonder Harold Macmillan didn't want my book published!

Still the Americans didn't come in. Kennedy was still the ambassador. Churchill moved heaven and earth to have him dismissed and recalled to the United States. Churchill, you see, had been secretly conniving with Roosevelt ever since the outbreak of the war. In fact, we have to say that although these telegrams, from October 1939 onwards, showed Churchill conniving with Roosevelt, we have to wonder what went on between these two men in private, even before the exchange of telegrams. I think, personally, that secret emissaries passed to and fro between these two men.

We know that Roosevelt sent Judge Felix Frankfurter, one of his closest intimates and advisors, to Britain. We know that Frankfurter came over and we know the kind of advice he gave to Churchill, and that was before the war. We know that Churchill frequently sent his own intimates back to Roosevelt. More significantly we know that even though Churchill was only a minister at that time, not even Prime Minister, just the First Sea Lord, the navy minister, Roosevelt telephoned him, frequently.

I don't know, frankly, why Neville Chamberlain put up with it as the prime minister: that the president, the head of state of a neutral power, should go over the head of the Prime Minister, behind his back, behind the back of his own cabinet, in telephone conversations in time of war with a minister, with a subordinate minister, an ambitious subordinate minister, in the shape of Winston Churchill. Possibly because Chamberlain was tapping the telephone and preferred to have a devil he did know to a devil he didn't know! Unfortunately, these telephone conversations between Churchill and Roosevelt, which went on long after Churchill became prime minister, of course, are not in the archives. I have left no stone unturned to try and find the transcripts of those telephone conversations because that is the two men speaking to each

other, through their own mouths and ears and the telephone system. Not through committees, not through telegrams being drafted by undersecretaries and so on, but they were really conferring, conspiring, and conniving with each other.

In the United States these telephone conversations were censored and intercepted by the Department of the Navy. It was the Navy's job to carry out the censorship of the telephone and telegraphic communications in the United States. And unfortunately Harry Truman—no great statesman, God bless him, in the best of times—at the end of World War Two ordered that the office-of-censorship records were to be kept closed in perpetuity. So if those transcripts of those telephone conversations are in those files, we're never going to know what those two men said to each other. But we need to know what they said to each other. In Britain, unfortunately, no transcripts have been released. I find it inconceivable that there isn't somewhere down the telephone line, at each end, there wasn't a shorthand secretary somewhere taking down what these two men said.

There's no doubt at all that they did their major work on the telephone. When Rudolph Hess made his misguided flight to Scotland in 1941, and Churchill kept him locked up under lock and key as the secret prisoner of the British secret service, Roosevelt was desperate to find out about what was going on in Britain and wanted to have some special propaganda movies made of Rudolph Hess. Finally one of Roosevelt's private staff wrote him a memorandum, which I think is highly significant. The memorandum said: "I think it's time for a telephone job." A telephone job! As though it's a kind of key word—a buzz word—inside the White House. The memorandum goes on: "This isn't one which we can put around through the usual channels in the State Department—it's got to be done by a telephone job." I think these are the channels that historians should start looking for when they're trying to find out about the lead up to Pearl Harbor. They've got to get those transcripts of those telephone conversations.

There's a key cabinet meeting of November 7, 1941, a cabinet meeting that's referred to in the Henry Stimson diary and in the private diary of Claude Wickard, oddly enough the secretary of agriculture. You wouldn't think you'd find military secrets in the diary of the secretary of agriculture, but that's just the kind of place that I look. I remember I was sitting in the archives next to Arthur Schlesinger, the famous writer

on Roosevelt, and I drew his attention to these Wickard diaries, handwritten diaries recording Roosevelt's cabinet meetings, which are not recorded officially anywhere else. And Schlesinger's jaw dropped and he said: "Jeez, I didn't know there were these things." On November 7, 1941 Roosevelt held a cabinet meeting in which he revealed that Churchill had telephoned him a few days earlier, and recommended a preemptive attack on Japan. You see, now you're beginning to get the picture of who is pushing whom! We were trying to get the United States in the war somehow, by hook or by crook! And the methods we used in those pre-war years, and in the first years of the Second World War, to bring the United States in—I think are methods you've never even dreamed of.

First of all, we were the ones, I'm sure, in a telephone conversation between Churchill and Roosevelt on the night of the 24th to 25th of July 1941, who persuaded Roosevelt to take the fateful step of issuing sanctions against Japan, sanctions whereby Japan would receive no more oil, no more vital raw materials, sanctions which drove Japan into a corner because oil was running out. She was fighting a war in China, and had no other way of continuing that war. Unless she went to war herself against, for example, the Dutch East Indies, where she could get hold of the oil she needed. I think that it was Churchill that took that step. We had been doing all we could in the 1940-1941 period to drag the United States in. We had deliberately routed the American convoys towards German submarines.

Sir William Stephenson, remember, the man called "Intrepid," the head of the British secret service in the United States—Sir William Stephenson had been feeding fake documents to Roosevelt through the intelligence service of the OSS, to William Donovan, Wild Bill, the man we ourselves had appointed the head of the American secret service—an extraordinary coincidence you might think. We were feeding documents to him to feed on to Roosevelt proving to him [Roosevelt] that Hitler was about to invade South America. For example, an unfortunate major, Elias Del Monte, who was the Bolivian military attaché in Berlin, found his signature at the foot of a letter that he had written to his government at La Paz describing German plans to invade Bolivia. Fortunately Del Monte was recalled immediately to La Paz, cashiered and dismissed. Bolivia declared war on Germany. All the result of a letter which we ourselves (the British secret service) had

faked. All this came about in 1972. When it came out, Del Monte, who was still alive, was reinstated with full honors, promoted to general and there was a grand parade in his honor at La Paz. One of the extraordinary episodes of World War II!

A British intelligence agent duped the governor of Dutch Guyana into believing that a German raider was busy in their waters. So that country also declared war on Germany. August 2, 1941, we passed fake documents to Bogota claiming evidence of plans to cause rioting in Bogota. The Colombians didn't play along. In 1942 we went a stage further. Now this is not a rather shaky memory presented forty years later on "60 Minutes," but is recorded in the State Department archives. In May 1942 American ambassador in Bogota sends a rather worried telegram to the State Department saying that I have been approached by our British counterpart saying that the head of their SIS section, Stagg, attached to their embassy in Bogota, has received orders from his headquarters to assassinate the Colombian foreign minister, and has requested the American embassy for technical assistance in carrying out his mission. Are we to go ahead with this? And the State Department wrote right back: "You are not to go ahead with this! We totally disagree with this kind of operation and we are getting rather fed up with what British secret service getting up to in South America!"

I was puzzled about this. I thought: had this unfortunate Columbian foreign minister got a record of neo-Nazi activities, perhaps? Was he a disbeliever in the Holocaust? Was there some reason to justify his being terminated—I think that's the modern phrase—by the British secret service?

So I went to great trouble. I checked all the diplomatic books, looked up all the Staggs in the archives, and found a Louis Stagg, who had been honorary consul in Graham Greenesque fashion in Havana, Cuba, and who eventually had been posted further to South America. He was alive and well and living in Paris. I went to interview him and yes, it was true: he had been instructed to assassinate the Columbian Foreign Minister. So I contacted the Columbian authorities, could they give me a small cameo of this Prime Minister, was he particularly pro-German? "Oh no, he was very pro-British!" The plot thickens, why would we want to assassinate a pro-British Columbian Foreign Minister in May, 1942? The answer is: he was due to retire anyway, at the end of that month! And the blame was going to be put on the Germans for

carrying out the assassination! This is all in volume two. Needless to say Macmillan is probably not going to publish this one either.

On Navy Day, October 27, 1941, Roosevelt issued a statement on American ship sinkings. "History has recorded who fired the first shot," he said. "Hitler has often protested that his plans of conquest do not extend across the Atlantic ocean. His submarines and raiders prove otherwise. So does the entire design of his new World Order. For example," says Roosevelt, "I have in my possession a secret map made in Germany by Hitler's government—by the planners of the New World Order." Printed by Her Majesty's Stationers office in London. "It is a map of South America and a part of Central America as Hitler proposes to organize it. Today in this little area there are fourteen separate countries. The geographical experts of Berlin, however, have ruthlessly obliterated all existing boundary lines and have divided South American into five vassal states, bringing the whole continent under their domination. This map makes clear the Nazi design, not only against South America, but against the United States itself." I must say that since I'm an Englishman—we must take credit for this kind of thing—we printed that map, we gave it to Stephenson, the man called "Intrepid," who gave it to Donovan, who gave it to the OSS, who gave it to the White House, who gave it to the president, who gave it eventually to the Roosevelt archives, where it is now to be seen in the Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, New York. The genuine fake Nazi map proving that Hitler was planning to invade South America. As though Hitler hadn't had enough on his plate! At a time when he was having a lot of trouble outside of Moscow, he was apparently planning, with his left hand to invade South America and then march on up U.S. 1 to Washington.

Now, was Roosevelt being naïve? The answer is no, of course. He knew perfectly well that this had been furnished him by the British secret service. He was trying to frighten his own public into wanting war.

The other people who were coming into Churchill's court in this particular match were the Zionists. They had been giving Churchill a lot of trouble, in fact, ever since the beginning of the war. They were rather unhappy because they had gone a long way towards financing his climb to power in the mid-1930s. But now that he was in office, as happens so often, he wanted them to go away. But they didn't. They kept on beating a path to No. 10 Downing Street, asking for a Jewish

army, asking for an arsenal of munitions in Palestine, and threatening a lot of trouble if he didn't go along with their plans.

Churchill had, however, no other alternative but to ignore them for the time being. You see, there was a rising tide of anti-Jewish feeling in Britain throughout the early war years. You won't find this in the published histories, of course, but it's there in the archives: in the records of the letters censorship in Britain, in the records of the ministry of the interior, the home secretary. There's a great deal about the problems being caused by anti-Semitic feelings. Nobody in authority could overlook the rising tide of anti-Jewish feeling in Britain. I've written on this in volume two. The stereotype of the lazy, artful, racketeering Jew, is to be found in the private writings of many government officers, including Anthony Eden. In part it was an after-echo of Hitler's propaganda, in part the independent perception by the native British people themselves, who had seen the penniless immigrants arrive from Europe and rise to positions of rapid affluence. I quote from a document: "The growth of anti-Semitism in Britain is partly the result of Jewish refugees being able to fend for themselves better than other refugees," wrote Robert Bruce Lockhart, the shrewd director of Psychological Warfare, commenting on publicly reported black-market cases. He would remark in a later wartime entry in his diary on the large numbers of taxis "filled with Jews" making for the Ascot horse races. In March 1941 he learned that Lord Beaverbrook had inquired about Air Vice-Marshal John Slessor, "Was he a Jew, was he a defeatist?" In July Eden's secretary observed in his diary: "The war hasn't made people more pro-Jew," to which he added three weeks later: "The Jews are their own worst enemy by their conduct in cornering foodstuffs and evacuating themselves to the best billets," and so on.

The insidious rise of anti-Semitic feeling was something which Churchill could not ignore. So no matter how often Zionists came to him, Churchill couldn't knuckle under and say, "Very well then, you can have your own Jewish state, I promise to make a public declaration in that respect and we will already start arming a Jewish army." There were Jewish units in the British army, they fought very well in certain areas, but he was not prepared to pay more than lip-service to the Zionists at this time.

Now, I've had private access to the private papers of Chaim Weizmann, who was the first president of the State of Israel and who was the head of the Jewish agency. And it's very interesting to see from these private papers and the records of his meetings with Churchill throughout the war years, precisely how this bargaining, haggling, and blackmail, in fact, went on.

On August 27, 1941, Weizmann hinted for the first time of the leverage the American Jews could exert on President Roosevelt. He reminded Oliver Harvey, who was Eden's secretary, that the Jews were an influential ethnic lobby in the United States (*Quoi de neuf?* as the French say: what's new!). The U.S. secretary of the treasury, Henry Morgenthau Jr., was particularly keen, he said, that Britain should allow more Jews to settle in Palestine. "[The] president's entourage is very Jewish," noted Harvey, who made a careful note of Weizmann's remarks. However, the Zionist leader could not get near Mr. Churchill. (I've got Churchill's appointment cards. I rented them from the man who stole them, and we can see how often Weizmann *didn't* get to see Churchill.)

By September 10, 1941, Weizmann was writing an extraordinarily outspoken letter to Prime Minister Churchill in which he again recalled how the Jews of the United States had pulled their country into war before, and could do it again—provided that Britain toed the Zionist line over immigration into Palestine. He reminded Churchill that two years had passed since the Jewish Agency had offered to Britain the support of the Jews in Palestine and throughout the world. A whole year had passed, he added, since the prime minister had personally approved his offer to recruit Jews in Palestine, but for two years, Weizmann complained, the Jewish Agency had met only rebuffs and humiliation.

"Tortured by Hitler as no nation has ever been in modern times," he continued, "and advertised by him as his foremost enemy, we are refused by those who fight him the chance of seeing our name and our flag appear amongst those arrayed against him." Artfully associating the anti-Zionists with the other enemies populating Mr. Churchill's mind, Weizmann assured him that he knew this exclusion was not of his own [Churchill's] doing. "It is the work of people who were responsible for Munich and for the 1939 White Paper on Palestine." After describing his four-month tour in the United States, Weizmann came to his real sales pitch. "There's only one big ethnic group which is willing to stand to a man for

Great Britain and a policy of all-out aid to her: the five million American Jews. From Secretary Morgenthau, Governor Lehman [of New York State], Justice Felix Frankfurter, down to the simplest Jewish workman or trader, they are conscious of all that this struggle against Hitler implies." British statesmen themselves, he reminded Churchill, had often acknowledged that it was those Jews who has effectively brought the United States into the war in 1917. "They are keen to do it, and may do it again."

"But," he admonished, "you are dealing with human beings, with flesh and blood. And the most elementary feeling of self-respect sets limits to service, however willing, if the response is nothing but rebuffs and humiliation." All that he was asking for now was a formation of a Jewish fighting force. That would be signal enough for the Jews of the United States.

This is the kind of blackmail that Churchill had to put up with from the Zionists throughout the Second World War. And of course, when the blackmail didn't work they set about assassinating our people in the Middle East. It's an odd thing that is often forgotten by the admirers of Begin and Shamir and the rest of them, that when the rest of the world was fighting Hitler the Zionists in the Middle East were fighting us! They had nothing better to do with their time!

Felix Frankfurter, in fact, crops up in the Japanese intercepts. Sure enough, on November 18, 1941, the Japanese found a man called Schmidt who had gone and had a long talk with Justice Felix Frankfurter. The message intercepted (by the U.S. Navy and decoded by them) is a telegram in code from Nomura in Washington to Tokyo describing his talks with Schmidt, who had seen Frankfurter on the evening of the eighteenth. Schmidt had said that only Hitler would benefit if a U.S.-Japanese war broke out. If Japan made the first move, the war would be popular in America. Frankfurter, however, said: "Germany had been smart in that she has consistently done everything possible to prevent arousing the United States. Therefore, regardless of how much the President tries to fan the anti-German flame, he cannot make the desired headway."

Now what a scandalous statement that is! Here's the one country, Germany, trying to prevent a war and the other country—Roosevelt—neutral—trying to fan the flames of anti-German feeling to fuel the war. Yet it is the Germans who are called the criminals, and the Americans who do the prosecuting. And it all turns up in this Japanese signal about

Frankfurter and another Austrian Jew called Schmidt.

So then came the problem of Japan . . . how to drag the United States in. I come back to the fact that we were very probably reading the Japanese signals at a higher level than the Americans were capable of reading. We had been in the code-breaking business much longer than the Americans. By 1940 we had 3,000 code-breakers working in our Bletchley Park installations and we had sub-units operating, devoting themselves exclusively to breaking the Japanese signals. They were compartmented so that each group didn't necessarily know what the others were doing. At a time when we had 3,000 working on it the Americans had 180! So it's no surprise that we were doing better than the Americans at this time. We were reading, I think, the Japanese fleet code JN25. When we now go into the American archives we find the JN25 signals that the Americans managed to break several years later, signals from 3 or 4 weeks before Pearl Harbor, which show quite clearly that if anybody read those signals they would know that Pearl Harbor was going to be attacked.

I think that it is a reasonable conclusion for us to draw—a conclusion based on the fact that we are too ashamed to reveal any of our Japanese intercepts in the British archives—that we were, in fact, reading JN25 intercepts in 1941. Churchill, in whose hands all of the threads of the intelligence community came together, Churchill, with his Olympian view of what was going on around him, was the man who insisted that the war intelligence be fed to him uncensored, unedited and unscreened. Churchill knew by the middle of November of 1941 that the Japanese were about to attack America, and quite probably he knew the attack was going to be on the Pacific Fleet in Hawaii. He probably never dreamed that it was going to be so successful as it was. But we know what he did know about the other elements of the intelligence puzzle because there are references in the British and in the American archives to steps that he then took. We know that he knew that on December the first, second, third, and fourth, those days before Pearl Harbor, the Japanese had sent out signals to their embassies in London, and in Washington, and Hong Kong and Singapore, of course, to their diplomatic missions abroad to destroy their code machines.

Now, when you tell your foreign ambassador to destroy his code machines, that's a pretty final step. That means something is about to happen—something very ugly. And if you then tell him also to use special chemicals to destroy all

the secret files, that falls in the same category. And that also makes plain why you are then going to rely on your foreign ambassador to listen out for a cryptic weather report message, as being the final clue to when and where that ugly thing is going to happen.

We got those messages. We intercepted Tokyo instructing the Japanese ambassador in Berlin to go and tell Hitler that war was about to break out sooner than anyone may dream. We intercepted the messages to the Japanese embassy in London, and in Washington and in Hong Kong, and in Singapore, instructing the Japanese ambassador to destroy his code machines, and to use chemicals to destroy all his secret files.

On December the 7th, Pearl Harbor day, Churchill invited the American ambassador, no longer John Kennedy, but a rather soft, flabby liberal, John G. Winant, to come and see him, and have lunch and dinner with him out at his private house at Chequers, a stage where so many dramatic events in Churchill's life had taken place. The opening and closing of windows to which he referred. Lunch passed normally. When dinnertime came, Churchill, rather mysteriously, ordered his little American-built portable radio to be set up on the dinner table. It had been given to him by a visiting American, Hopkins, a few months before, a \$20 radio set of a kind that when you opened the lid, it came on. But in those days, if you remember, it didn't come right on, it took a minute or two to warm up. And Churchill didn't quite grasp these new-fangled things, portable radio-sets, and he looked at his watch for the nine o'clock news—in England always the main news time and lifted the lid. The news that finally came trickling through was of a great British operation in the Western desert. Operation Crusader, a battle against Rommel. The battle is proceeding well, Montgomery expects to make fresh headway tomorrow, and the rest of it.

And Churchill couldn't understand what had gone wrong. Eventually, rather disgruntled, he closes the lid and takes the radio away. It isn't until fifteen minutes later that his butler comes rushing in, and says to the prime minister: "Have you heard the news? The Japanese have bombed the American fleet at Pearl Harbor!"

If you read Churchill's memoirs, you will see this little scene half described. If you read Winant's memoirs—which I've read in the manuscript form in his papers—you see the same scene described from Winant's point of view. But it isn't until you go

to the BBC's archives and get the script of that night's broadcast that you see what's happened. The news of the bombing of Pearl Harbor has come in only a minute or two before the news broadcast. So the broadcaster has taken his first page of his script, which is all about the successful triumph of the British offensive in the Western Desert in Africa—on top of that he has written in one line saying that: "We are getting reports of a Japanese attack on the American fleet in Pearl Harbor. More about this later." Then he goes straight on, a matter of 10 or 15 seconds to talk about the attack against Rommel. Right at the end of the news broadcast he says, "Now back to the main item of today's news, which is coming in, about the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor." And if you look at the BBC script—the actual typescript—you can see how this happened, Churchill had expected to get that first item. That's why the radio was on the table. He didn't get it. That little scene is proof in my mind that Churchill knew about Pearl Harbor.

If you go into the Boston University Library, you'll find another little clue. This is in the private diary of British newspaper man Cecil King. He was the director and editorial chief of our tabloid, fringe newspapers, the *Mirror* and *Pictorial* group of newspapers during the war years. He wrote genuine diaries, which filled two suitcases. Little pocket diaries, written in fountain-pen-ink. You can always tell when diaries like that are genuine, for when you write a genuine diary, the ink changes a little bit from day to day: these are genuine diaries. A few days after Pearl Harbor, Cecil King writes in his diary: "Had a most interesting lunch with Hugh Cudlip." Now Hugh Cudlip was another famous British newspaper owner and proprietor. Not just a nobody, but somebody who moved in high circles, somebody who the big-wigs in Downing Street couldn't ignore. Cecil King writes in his diary: "Interesting lunch with Hugh Cudlip. He has told me the most extraordinary fact, that we knew about Pearl Harbor five days in advance!" There it is, a little clue, where you wouldn't expect to see it, that we knew about Pearl Harbor five days in advance.

Churchill telephoned Roosevelt as soon as the news came over, as soon as he had confirmation of the attack and said: "Now we are all in the same boat." If you look in the papers of those who were with Roosevelt in those days, you will find more evidence of faking. Harry Hopkins, for example, that day wrote a one page typescript description of his session with

Roosevelt, and it's a glowing description of how Roosevelt turns to him and says: "I have done all I can to prevent wars. All my life I've been dedicated to preventing just what has happened today." But what you spot there is that they are retyped; all Harry Hopkin's other papers are rather messy: there are little bits of typescript on odd scraps of paper, typed and overtyped and with additions. But on Pearl Harbor it's a beautiful typescript—it has been recopied at a later date. So again you get the evidence that something is going on between these two men, Churchill and Roosevelt, that isn't quite kosher.

Frances Perkins, the labor secretary, wrote in an oral interview years later that she caught a glimpse of the old man's eyes in a cabinet meeting at the White House that night, a kind of shifty glimpse that she knew from years of working with him, an unwillingness to look her in the eye, which told her he knew that he had done something dirty. But she couldn't be precisely sure what. And so it was with Winston Churchill. Churchill was convinced that he had done the decent thing. Professor Donald Watt, one of our great English historians now, has commented that the suspicion must arise that Churchill deliberately courted war with Japan in order to bring America in. This is true, he went over the top in pushing America towards war. I think that Churchill deliberately allowed the attack on Pearl Harbor to go ahead in order to bring the Americans in. He did everything to avoid having the Pacific Fleet warned.

Commenting on this, Sir Richard Craigie, the British Ambassador in Japan, who was horrified when war broke out, said in a memo that we had taken every step that was wrong. We could have avoided war with Japan, we could have kept the Japanese out, and yet everything that we've done has brought them in. Churchill commented in 1943 on this memorandum: "It was a blessing that Japan attacked the United States, and thus brought America unitedly and wholeheartedly into the war. Greater good fortune has rarely happened to the British Empire than this event which has revealed our friends and foes in their true light, and may lead, through the merciless crushing of Japan, to a new relationship of immense benefit to the English-speaking countries and to the whole world."

That was Churchill. But of course, the benefit was not ours or the Empire's. Within six months we had lost every single possession we had in the far east. Singapore, Hong Kong,

Burma—the Japanese even seemed on the point of invading India. It was the beginning of the end of the Empire. In fact, we never got those colonies back. They were gone. So how Churchill can regard that as being a grand effort is only explicable from the point of remembering that Churchill was half American. His mother was American—he was never really a true Englishman.

The only blessing for President Roosevelt, in conclusion, was when Churchill came to the White House. That December Churchill came to the White House, where he had his first conference with Roosevelt, who was now in the same boat. Churchill would afterward say to one of his chiefs of staff, who was still using the same delicate language used in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, about the need to avoid creating a war with Japan with the United States out. Churchill had said: "We can now speak more robustly. We only had to use that kind of language when we were wooing the Americans. Now she is in the harem with us. All in one boat!" When Churchill went to the White House that month, December 1941, he bestowed on Roosevelt that same "Order of the Bath, Companion of the Bath," which he has bestowed on many of his friends. Churchill sent for the president to come see him in his room. The president was wheeled in, creaking in his wheelchair along the floorboards of the White House, and he found Churchill standing there stark naked in front of him! Thereby Roosevelt became a Companion of the Bath. He was in the hot water up to his eyeballs with Winston Churchill.

Until those gaps in the archives are filled in, we're not going to be entirely sure what dirty tricks we employed in order to drag him in, but I've given you a foretaste of what is in volume two of *Churchill's War*.

The Morgenthau Plan and the Problem of Policy Perversion

(Paper presented to the
Ninth International Revisionist Conference)

PROF. ANTHONY KUBEK

The Morgenthau Diaries consist of 900 volumes located at Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, New York. As a consultant to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, I was assigned to examine all documents dealing with Germany, particularly ones related to the Morgenthau Plan for the destruction of Germany following the Second World War. The Subcommittee was interested in the role of Dr. Harry Dexter White, the main architect of the Plan.

Secretary of the U.S. Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. served in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet from January of 1934 to July of 1945. Before Morgenthau was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, he had lived near Roosevelt's home at Hyde Park, N.Y. for two decades and could be counted as one of his closest and most trusted friends. His appointment was clearly the culmination of twenty years of devotion to, and adoration of, his neighbor on the Hudson. According to his official biographer, Morgenthau's "first joy in life was to serve Roosevelt, whom he loved and trusted and admired."¹

The Treasury Department under Secretary Morgenthau had many functions that went beyond anything in the Department's history. The Morgenthau Diaries reveal that the Treasury presumed time and time again to make foreign policy. In his *Memoirs* Secretary of State Cordell Hull described it in these terms:

Emotionally upset by Hitler's rise and his persecution of the Jews, Morgenthau often sought to induce the President to anticipate the State Department or act contrary to our better judgment. We sometimes found him conducting negotiations with foreign governments which were the function of the State Department. His work in drawing up a catastrophic plan for

the postwar treatment of Germany and inducing the President to accept it without consultation with the State Department, was an outstanding instance of this interference.²

Actually it was Dr. Harry Dexter White, Morgenthau's principal adviser on monetary matters and finally Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who conducted most of the important business of the Department. The Diaries reveal that White's influence was enormous throughout the years of World War II. Shortly after Morgenthau became Secretary in 1934, White joined his staff as economic analyst on the recommendation of the noted economist, Prof. Jacob Viner of the University of Chicago. Then 42 years old, White was about to receive a doctorate in economics from Harvard University, where he previously had taught as an instructor. He moved up quickly in the Treasury Department, named in 1938 as Director of Monetary Research and in the summer of 1941 acquiring an additional title as "Assistant to the Secretary." Articulate, mustachioed, and nattily dressed, he was a conspicuous figure in the Treasury but remained unknown to the public until 1943, when newspaper articles identified him as the actual architect of Secretary Morgenthau's monetary proposals for the postwar period.

The Diaries reveal White's technique of dominating over general Treasury affairs by submitting his plans and ideas to the Secretary, who frequently carried them directly to the President. It is very significant that Morgenthau had access to the President more readily than any other Cabinet member. He ranked beneath the Secretary of State in the Cabinet, but Hull complained that he often acted as though "clothed with authority" to project himself into the field of foreign affairs. Morgenthau, Hull felt, "did not stop with his work at the Treasury."³

Over the years White brought into the Treasury a number of economic specialists with whom he worked very closely. White and his colleagues were in a position, therefore, to exercise on American foreign policy influence which the diaries reveal to have been profound and unprecedented. They used their power in various ways to design and promote the so-called Morgenthau Plan for the postwar treatment of Germany. Their actions were not limited to the authority officially delegated to them: their power was inherent in their access to, and influence upon, Secretary Morgenthau and other officials, and in the opportunities they had to present or withhold information on which the policies of their superiors

might be based. What makes this a unique chapter in American history is that Dr. White and several of his colleagues, the actual architects of vital national policies during those crucial years, were subsequently identified in Congressional hearings as participants in a network of Communist espionage in the very shadow of the Washington Monument. Two of them worked for the Chinese Communists.

Stated in its simplest terms, the objective of the Morgenthau Plan was to de-industrialize Germany and diminish its people to a pastoral existence once the war was won. If this could be accomplished, the militaristic Germans would never rise again to threaten the peace of the world. This was the justification for all the planning, but another motive lurked behind the obvious one. The hidden motive was unmasked in a syndicated column in the New York *Herald Tribune* in September 1946, more than a year after the collapse of the Germans. The real goal of the proposed condemnation of "all of Germany to a permanent diet of potatoes" was the communization of the defeated nation. "The best way for the German people to be driven into the arms of the Soviet Union," it was pointed out, "was for the United States to stand forth as the champion of indiscriminate and harsh misery in Germany."⁴

Anyone who studies the Morgenthau Diaries can hardly fail to be deeply impressed by the tremendous power which accumulated in the grasping hands of Dr. Harry Dexter White, who in 1953 was identified by J. Edgar Hoover as a Soviet agent. White assumed full responsibility for "all matters with which the Treasury Department has to deal having a bearing on foreign relations . . ."⁵ He and his colleagues had Secretary Morgenthau's complete approval in the formulation of a blueprint for the permanent elimination of Germany as a world power. The benefits which might accrue to the Soviet Union as a result of such Treasury planning were incalculable.

When members of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee asked Elizabeth Bentley, who was a courier between White and Soviet agents, whether she knew of a similar "Morgenthau Plan" for the Far East, she gave the following testimony:

Miss Bentley: No. The only Morgenthau Plan I knew anything about was the German one.

Senator Eastland: Did you know who drew that plan?

Miss Bentley: [It was] Due to Mr. White's influence, to push the devastation of Germany because that was what the Russians wanted.

Senator Ferguson: That was what the Communists wanted?

Miss Bentley: Definitely, Moscow wanted them [German factories] completely razed because then they would be of no help to the allies.

Mr. Morris: You say that Harry Dexter White worked on that?

Miss Bentley: And on our instructions he pushed hard.⁶

When J. Edgar Hoover testified before the Subcommittee on November 17, 1953, he affirmed this testimony:

All information furnished by Miss Bentley, which was susceptible to check, he said, has proven to be correct. She had been subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations; her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviews by the courts and has been found to be accurate.

Mr. Hoover continued:

Miss Bentley's account of White's activities was later corroborated by Whittaker Chambers; and the documents in White's own handwriting, concerning which there can be no dispute, lend credibility to the information previously reported on White.⁷

Morgenthau hit the ceiling when he got a copy of the *Handbook for Military Government in Germany*, which was designed for the guidance of every American and British official upon entering Germany. The *Handbook* offered a glimpse of a very different kind of occupation that Treasury officials were hoping for. Its tone was moderate and lenient throughout. Germany was not only to be self-supporting but was to retain a relatively high standard of living.

Morgenthau wasted no time in showing the *Handbook* to President Roosevelt, who immediately rejected its philosophy as too soft. Impressed by the critical memorandum White had prepared, the President killed the *Handbook* and sent a stinging memorandum to the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, and a copy of which was sent to Hull. "This so-called *Handbook* is pretty bad," Roosevelt began, and he instructed that "all copies" be withdrawn immediately because it gave him the impression that Germany was to be "restored just as much as The Netherlands or Belgium, and the people of Germany brought back as quickly as possible to their pre-war estate."⁸

Thus both Hull and Stimson were put on notice by the President that the State and War Departments must develop harsher attitudes towards Germany or be bypassed in the formulation of that policy. According to General Lucius Clay, suppression of the *Handbook* eventually had a "devastating effect on the morale of American officials responsible for disarming Germany."⁹

Meanwhile the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had earlier completed their own prospectus and directive for postwar Germany. In the State document there was to be no "large-scale and permanent impairment of all German industry."¹⁰ JCS 1067, as the military directive was numbered, was unmistakably akin in spirit to the "soft" State Department prospectus. Moreover, it was in "harmony" with the *Handbook*—that is to say, this draft not only tolerated but actually encouraged friendly relations between American soldiers and German civilians. From various inter-departmental meetings with State and War, a new version of JCS 1067 finally emerged. It completely reversed the spirit of the original draft. It was largely the handiwork of Harry Dexter White. It is indeed remarkable how the Treasury intervened and eventually got the State and War Departments to alter their basic policy on postwar Germany.

In the realm of finance, of course, the Secretary of Treasury would naturally be involved in the postwar treatment of Germany. But Morgenthau delved deeply into matters altogether unrelated to economics. The Germans needed psychiatry, Morgenthau told White. He said he was interested in "treating the mind rather than the body," and in planning "how to bring up the next generation of children." It might be wise to take the whole Nazi SS group out of Germany, he thought, and deport them to some other part of the world. "Just taking them bodily," he told White, and he "wouldn't be afraid to make the suggestion" even though it might be very "ruthless . . . to accomplish the act."¹¹

Regarding the punishment of Nazi leaders, White suggested that a list of "war criminals" be prepared and presented to American officers on the spot, who could properly identify the guilty and shoot them on sight. Morgenthau remarked jokingly that a good start could be made with Marshal Stalin's "list of 50,000"—a reference to Stalin's vodka toast to Roosevelt and Churchill at the Teheran Conference.¹²

The disposition of the Ruhr Valley was one of the main topics discussed in one of the many Treasury meetings. For

many years the coal fields of the Ruhr had been essential to the German economy. The British economist John Maynard Keynes had said after World War I that the Kaiser's empire was built "more truly on coal and iron than on blood and iron."¹³ Coal was the backbone of all German industry, vital to her electric power and to her chemical, synthetic oil, and steel industries.¹⁴ It was Morgenthau's persistent view, therefore, that the Ruhr should be "locked up and wiped out," and he was positive that the President was in "complete accord" on this point.

As the discussion proceeded, White shrewdly intimated that it might be better to place the Ruhr under international controls which would "produce reparations for twenty years." This was a straw proposal that Morgenthau promptly rejected. "Harry, you can't sell it to me at all," he said, "because it would be under control only a few years and the Germans will have another *Anschluss*!" The only program he would have any part of, Morgenthau declared, was "the complete shut-down of the Ruhr." When Harold Gaston, the Treasury public relations officer, interrupted to ask whether this meant "driving the population out," Morgenthau replied: "I don't care what happens to the population . . . I would take every mine, every mill and factory and wreck it." "Of every kind?" inquired Gaston. "Steel, coal, everything. Just close it down," Morgenthau said. "You wouldn't close the mines, would you?" inquired Daniel Bell, one of the Secretary's assistants. "Sure," replied Morgenthau, and he reiterated that the only economic activity which should remain intact was agriculture—and that could be placed under some type of international control. He was for destroying Germany's economic power first, he said, and then "we will worry about the population second."

Morgenthau seemed very confident that the President would not waver in his support of a punitive program for postwar Germany. Any effective plan, however, would have to be executed within the next six months, or otherwise the Allies might suddenly become "soft." The best way to begin, Morgenthau advised, was to have American engineers go to every synthetic gas factory, and dynamite them or "open the water valves and flood them." Then let the "great humanitarians" simply sit "back and decide about the population afterwards." Eventually the Ruhr would resemble "some of the silver mines in Nevada," Morgenthau said. "You mean like Sherman's march to the sea?" asked Dan Bell. Morgenthau answered bluntly that he would make the Ruhr a "ghost area."¹⁵

Such was the character of Secretary Morgenthau's views on the treatment of Germany. Never in American history had there been proposed a more vindictive program for a defeated nation. With the Treasury exerting unprecedented influence in determining American policy toward Germany, the fallacies of logic, evasion of issues and deliberate disregard of essential economic relationships manifest in the above conversation were incorporated in the postwar plan as finally adopted. Furthermore, no paper of any importance dealing with the occupation of Germany could be released until approved by the Treasury. The State and War Departments became virtually subservient to the Treasury in this area, normally their responsibility.¹⁶

At a meeting in the President's office, Morgenthau and Stimson presented their opposite views. Stimson objected vigorously to the Treasury recommendation for the wrecking of the Ruhr. "I am unalterably opposed to such a program," he declared, holding it to be "wholly wrong" to deprive the people of Europe of the products that the Ruhr could produce.¹⁷ The Treasury Plan, if adopted, would breed new wars, arouse sympathy for Germans in other countries, and destroy resources needed for the general reconstruction of ravaged Europe. He urged the President not to make a hasty decision, and to accept "for the time being" Hull's suggestion that the controversial economic issue be left for future discussion.¹⁸

At the Quebec summit conference between Roosevelt and Churchill in September 1944, Morgenthau was asked to explain his plan to the British. Churchill was horrified and "in violent language" called the plan "cruel and un-Christian." But Morgenthau hammered on the idea that the destruction of the Ruhr would create new markets for Britain after the war. He also promised Churchill an American loan of \$6.5 billion! Churchill "changed his mind" the next morning.¹⁹

Although foreign affairs and military matters were discussed in depth at the Quebec Conference, neither Hull nor Stimson were in attendance. The Treasury Department took precedence over State and War in negotiations regarding Germany.

The effects of Morgenthau's victory at Quebec were quickly felt in Washington. At a luncheon with Undersecretary of War Robert Patterson, Morgenthau brought up the Quebec agreement. Patterson said jokingly: "To degrade Europe by making Germany an agricultural country, isn't that offensive to you?" Morgenthau replied: "Not in the case of Germany."²⁰

Hull felt strongly that Morgenthau should have been kept out of the field of general policy, and so did Stimson. When Stimson heard of the President's endorsement of the Treasury plan at Quebec, he quickly drafted another critical memorandum. "If I thought that the Treasury proposals would accomplish [our agreed objective, continued peace]," he wrote, "I would not persist in my objections. But I cannot believe that they will make for a lasting peace. *In spirit and in emphasis they are punitive, not, in my judgment, corrective or constructive.*" He continued:

It is not within the realm of possibility that the whole nation of seventy million people, who have been outstanding for many years in the arts and the sciences and who through their efficiency and energy have attained one of the highest industrial levels in Europe, can by force be required to abandon all their previous methods of life, be reduced to a level with virtually complete control of industry and science left to other peoples . . . Enforced poverty is even worse, for it destroys the spirit not only of the victim but debases the victor. It would be just such a crime as the Germans themselves hoped to perpetrate upon their victims—it would be a crime against civilization itself.²¹

Word of "Morgenthau's coup at Quebec" leaked to the press with two results. One was that Roosevelt, because of the adverse reaction, evidently concluded that his Treasury Secretary had made "a serious blunder." The other was to stiffen German resistance on the Western front. Until then there was a fair chance that the Germans might discontinue resistance to American and British forces while holding the Russians at bay in the East in order to avoid the frightful fate of a Soviet occupation. This could have shortened the war by months and could have averted the spawning of malignant communism in East Germany.

How the Treasury officials were able to integrate basic features of their plan into the military directive, originally prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and known as JCS 1067, is fully disclosed in the Diaries. White saw to it that many elements of his thinking were embodied in JCS 1067. Previous directives for guidance of American troops upon entrance into Germany, which already had undergone six or more revisions of a stylistic nature, were now brought more in line with the punitive thinking of Morgenthau and White. A new directive, which called for a more complete de-nazification,

was, with some modifications, the spirit and substance of the Treasury plan. In the two full years that JCS 1067 was the cornerstone of American policy, Germany was punished and substantially dismantled in accord with the basic tenets of the Morgenthau Plan. JCS 1067 forbade fraternization by American personnel with the Germans, ordered a very strict program of de-nazification extending both to public life and to business, prohibited American aid in any rebuilding of German industry, and emphasized agricultural rehabilitation only.

Subsequently, JCS 1067 became a severe handicap to American efforts in Germany. It constituted what may be called without exaggeration a heavy millstone around the neck of the American military government. It gave only limited authority to the United States military government by specifically prohibiting military officials from taking any steps to rehabilitate the German economy except to maximize agricultural production.

Through various channels, White had gathered information concerning the kind of policy directives other departments had in preparation. This he was able to achieve through a system of "trading" which Morgenthau had initiated at his suggestion. As Elizabeth Bentley told the Internal Security Subcommittee, "We were so successful getting information . . . largely because of Harry White's idea to persuade Morgenthau to exchange information." Treasury officials, for example, would send information to the Navy Department, and the Navy would reciprocate. There were, according to Miss Bentley, at least "seven or eight agencies" trading information with Morgenthau.²²

At the Yalta Conference on February 4, 1945, the question of postwar treatment of Germany was the most important item on the agenda. The President's conduct suggests the powerful effect on his thinking of White's masterplan and Morgenthau's salesmanship. On the major points regarding Germany the President easily capitulated to the Soviets. Stalin and Roosevelt were in general accord that the defeated Germans should be stripped of their factories and left to take care of themselves. But Churchill wished to preserve enough of the existing economic structure of Germany to permit the defeated nation to recover to some degree.

In his book *Beyond Containment*, William H. Chamberlain assesses Yalta as a tragedy of appeasement:

Like Munich, Yalta must be set down as a dismal failure, practically as well as morally . . . The Yalta Agreement . . . represented, in two of its features, the endorsement by the United States of the principle of human slavery. One of these features was the recognition that German labor could be used as a source of reparations . . . And the agreement that Soviet citizens who were found in the Eastern zones of occupation should be handed over to Soviet authorities amounted, for the many Soviet refugees who did not wish to return, to the enactment of a fugitive slave law.²³

After President Roosevelt returned from Yalta, State Department officials grasped an opportunity to push through their own program for postwar Germany. On March 10, 1945, Secretary of State Edward Stettinius submitted for the President's consideration the draft of a new policy directive for the military occupation of Germany. The prime movers in this strategy were Leon Henderson, James C. Dunn, and James W. Riddleberger, the departmental expert on German affairs. They purposely did not consult with Treasury officials because they knew there would be major objections from them. The March 10 memorandum was a reasonable substitute for the rigorous JCS 1067, which was so pleasing to White and Morgenthau. It was based on the central concept that Germany was important to the economy recovery of Europe. It provided for joint allied control of defeated Germany, preservation of a large part of German industry, and a "minimum standard of living" for the German people. The memorandum had no provision for dismemberment, and Germany was to begin "paying her own way as soon as possible."²⁴

When Morgenthau saw a copy of the State Department memorandum, he became so furious that he immediately telephoned Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy to voice his complaints. "It's damnable, an outrage!" he exclaimed. "Riddleberger and these fellows are just putting this thing across . . . I'm not going to take it lying down." The State Department plan, if adopted, would have spelled complete defeat for Morgenthau and White. "It makes me so mad," Morgenthau raged, "I think the President should fire Jimmy Dunn and two or three other fellows."²⁵

Several days later, armed with a memorandum drafted by White, Coe, and Glasser, he hurried to the White House. He was disturbed to find Roosevelt's daughter, Anna, and her husband, Maj. John Boettinger, caring for the President,

“whose health by that time was faltering to the point where mental lapses could be expected.” Roosevelt apparently no longer thought that Morgenthau had “pulled a boner” with his destroy-Germany plan and when Boettinger commented “You don’t want the Germans to starve,” the President replied “Why not?” Morgenthau told White he was worried about Boettinger’s attitude. The question one may ask is did the Soviets know what the American people did not know—that Roosevelt was close to death and liable to blackouts at any moment?

Morgenthau reported jubilantly, however, to his “team” that the President had accepted his plan as “a good tough document.” He confided in his diary:

We have a good team, they just can’t break the team . . . It is very encouraging that we had the President back us up . . . they tried to get him to change and they couldn’t—the State Department crowd. Sooner or later, the President just has to clean his house. I mean the vicious crowd . . . They are Fascists at heart . . . ²⁶

The State Department was sorely disappointed that the President had rejected their March 10th memorandum. It was a severe defeat for Riddleberger, Dunn, and others who were advocating a reasonable program for Germany. Morgenthau felt that the new JCS document should declare unmistakably that the State Department paper of March 10 was officially withdrawn. White asked McCloy and General Hilldring whether everyone in the War Department would understand that the new document “superseded” the March 10 memorandum. McCloy assured him that everyone would be duly notified. White then asked whether it would be perfectly “clear” in the Army that the Treasury document “took precedence over and caused the revision of any document contrary to it.” General Hilldring answered there would be no problem here.

A cardinal point of dispute between the Treasury and the Department of War resided in the question of the treatment of German war criminals. Stimson advised the President to have trials rather than the “shoot on sight” policy advocated by Morgenthau. Stimson believed the accused should have a right to be heard and be allowed to call witnesses to his defense.²⁷

Another subject of controversy between the Treasury on the one side and the State and War on the other was the question of reparations. The Treasury believed that reparations should

be limited to whatever the Allies could wring out of defeated Germany at the end of the war. Morgenthau and White were dead set against the old concept of long-term reparations payments, because such annual tribute would necessitate the re-building of industry on a large scale in Germany. They wished to make the Germans "pastoral" and then throw upon them the full responsibility for taking care of themselves. The World War I application of "reparations" would result in nothing more or less than the revitalization of German industrial might. In their thinking this specter loomed large indeed.

White and his colleagues were careful not to jeopardize postwar relations with the Soviet Union. They frequently expressed their fears of Western encirclement of Russia. They thought that those individuals in the American government who wished to restore Germany were motivated by the idea that a strong Reich was necessary as a "bulwark against Russia." This attitude was certainly responsible for many of the current difficulties between Washington and Moscow.

At one of the interdepartmental meetings a dispute developed over the question of compulsory German labor as restitution for war damages in Russia. Treasury officials were boldly advocating the creation of a large labor force with no external controls. This view was challenged by War, State and other departments as treating 2 or 3 million people as slave labor. Morgenthau reminded his opponents that the whole issue of compulsory labor had already been decided upon at Yalta. "We are simply carrying out the Yalta agreement," he exclaimed, and anyone who is going to protest ". . . is protesting against Yalta . . ." It is significant that five months previously, President Roosevelt had sent a memorandum to Morgenthau to the effect that if "they [Russia] want German labor, there is no reason why they should not get it in certain circumstances and under certain conditions."²⁸

White opined that if the Russians needed two million German laborers to reconstruct their devastated areas, he saw nothing wrong with it; it was "in the interest" of Russia and even Germany that the labor force come from the ranks of the Gestapo, the S.S., and the Nazi party membership. "That's not a punishment for crime," he stated, "that's merely a part of the reparations problem in the same way you want certain machines from Germany . . ."²⁹

As long as Morgenthau was Secretary of the Treasury, White performed adroitly in his strange Svengali role. But

fundamental changes in the management of American foreign policy occurred after Harry Truman became President. While the President was still a Senator, he read in the newspapers about the Morgenthau Plan, and he didn't like it. Morgenthau wanted to come to Potsdam, threatening to resign if he was not made a member of the U.S. delegation. Truman promptly accepted his resignation.

What were the final results of the Morgenthau Plan? What actual effect did it have on Germany? "While the policy was never fully adopted," wrote W. Friedmann, "it had a considerable influence upon American policy in the later stages of the war and during the first phase of military government."³⁰ Although President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill eventually recognized the folly of what they had approved at Quebec, Morgenthau, White, and the Treasury staff saw to it that the spirit and substance of their plan prevailed in official policy as it was finally mirrored in the punitive directive known as JCS 1067.

In a very definite way JCS 1067 determined the main lines of U.S. policy in Germany for fully two years after the surrender. Beginning in the fall of 1945, to be sure, a new drift in American policy was evident, and it eventually led to the formal repudiation of the directive in July of 1947. Until it was officially revoked, however, the lower administrative echelons had to enforce its harsh provisions. "The military government officers," writes Prof. Harold Zink, "were unable to see how Germany could be reorganized without a substantial amount of industrialization. They tried to fit the Morgenthau dictates into their economic plans, but they ended up more or less in a state of paralysis."³¹

As White had certainly anticipated, the economic condition of Germany was desperate between 1945 and 1948. The cities remained heaps of debris, and shelter was at a premium as a relentless stream of unskilled refugees poured into the Western zones, where the food ration of 1,500 calories per day was hardly sufficient to sustain life. As Stimson, Riddleberger, and others had predicted, the economic prostration of Germany now resulted in disruption of the continental trade that was essential to the prosperity of other European nations. As long as German industrial power was throttled, the economic recovery of Europe was delayed—and this, in time, led to serious political complications. To nurse Europe back to health, the Marshall Plan was devised in 1947. It repudiated, at long last, the philosophy of the White-Morgenthau program.

The currency reforms of June, 1948, changed the situation overnight. These long overdue measures removed the worst restraints, and thereupon West Germany began its phenomenal economic revival.

After all this has been said, an implicit question haunts the historian. It is this: if the Morgenthau Plan was indeed psychopathically anti-German, was it also consciously and purposefully pro-Russian? The Secretary of the Treasury never denied that his plan was anti-German in both its philosophy and its projected effects, but no one in his department ever admitted that it was also pro-Russian in the same ways. In his book, *And Call It Peace*, Marshall Knappen suggested in 1947 that the Morgenthau Plan "corresponded closely to what might be presumed to be Russian wishes on the German question. It provided a measure of vengeance and left no strong state in the Russian orbit."³²

In document after document the Diaries reveal Harry Dexter White's influence upon both the formative thinking and the final decisions of Secretary Morgenthau. Innocent of higher economics and the mysteries of international finance, the Secretary had always leaned heavily on his team of experts for all manner of general and specific recommendations.³³ White was the field captain of that team; on the German question he called all the major plays from the start. As a result of White's advice, for example, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was ordered in April, 1944 to deliver to the Soviet government a duplicate set of plates for the printing of the military occupation marks which were to be the legal currency of postwar Germany. The ultimate product of this fantastic decision was to greatly stimulate inflation throughout occupied Germany, and the burden of redeeming these Soviet-made marks finally fell upon American taxpayers to a grand total of more than a quarter of a billion dollars.³⁴ White followed this recommendation with another, in May of 1944, which again anticipated the emerging plan. This time he urged a postwar loan of 10 billion dollars to the Soviet Union.³⁵

Remember that, in her testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952, the confessed Communist courier Elizabeth Bentley charged that White was the inside man who prepared the plan for Secretary Morgenthau, and "on our instruction he pushed hard." Also, J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI charged that White was an active agent of Soviet espionage, and despite the fact he had sent five reports to the

White House warning the President of White's activities, Truman promoted him to a position at the United Nations. When the shocking story of White's service as a Soviet agent was first revealed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell in a Chicago speech, it created quite a stir of public charges and counter-charges by then retired Harry Truman.

The concentration of Communist sympathizers in the Treasury Department is now a matter of public record. White eventually became Assistant Secretary. Collaborating with him were Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, Irving Kaplan and Victor Perlo, all of whom were identified in sworn testimony as participants in the Communist conspiracy. When questioned by Congressional investigators, they consistently invoked the Fifth Amendment. In his one appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948, White emphatically denied participation in any conspiracy. A few days later he was found dead, the apparent victim of a heart attack (which is questioned by some investigators). Notes in his handwriting were later found among the "pumpkin papers" on Whittaker Chambers' farm.³⁶ In a statement before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1953, Attorney General Brownell declared White guilty of "supplying information consisting of documents obtained by him in the course of duties as Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, to Nathan Gregory Silvermaster . . ."³⁷ Silvermaster passed these documents on to Miss Bentley after photographing them in his basement. When asked before two congressional committees to explain his activities, Silvermaster invoked the Fifth Amendment.

Never before in American history had an unelected bureaucracy of faceless, "fourth floor" officials exercised such arbitrary power over the future of nations as did Harry Dexter White and his associates in the Department of the Treasury under Henry Morgenthau, Jr. What they attempted to do in their curious twisting of American ideals, and how close they came to complete success, is demonstrated in the Morgenthau Diaries, which I had the privilege of examining and which were published by the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate in 1967.

Notes

1. John Morton Blum, *Years of Urgency, 1938-41: From the Morgenthau Diaries* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 3.
2. *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948), Vol. 1, pp. 207-208.
3. *Ibid.*, 1, p. 207
4. Issue of September 5, 1946.
5. December 15, 1941, *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, Final Report*, July 30, 1953, p. 29.
6. *Institute of Pacific Relations*, pt. 2, pp. 419-420.
7. *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments*, pt. 16, p. 1145.
8. August 26, 1944, *Book 766*, pp. 166-170. *Morgenthau Diaries*, Hyde Park.
9. Lucius Clay, *Decision in Germany* (New York, Doubleday and Co. 1950), p. 8.
10. *Book 777*, p. 70 et seq.
11. August 28, 1944, *Book 767*, p. 1.
12. September 4, 1944, *Book 768*, p. 104.
13. John Maynard Keynes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (New York, Harcourt Brace and Co. 1920), p. 81.
14. B.H. Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 123.
15. September 4, 1944, *Book 768*, p. 104.
16. November 21, 1944, *Book 797*, pp. 256-258.
17. September 9, 1944, *Book 771*, p. 50.
18. *Ibid.*; Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service in Peace and War* (New York, Harper & Row, 1948), pp. 573-574.
19. October 18-19, 1944, *Book 783*, pp. 23-39.
20. September 27, 1944, *Book 776*, p. 33.
21. September 15, 1944, *Book 772*, pp. 4-9. (*Italics mine.*)
22. *Institute of Pacific Relations, Hearings*, pt. 2, p. 422.
23. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953), pp. 36-46.
24. March 10, 1945, *Book 827-1*, pp. 1-2.
25. March 19, 1945, *Book 828-2*, p. 233; March 20, 1945, *Book 830*, p. 24.
26. March 23, 1945, *Book 831-2*, p. 205, et seq.
27. September 9, 1944, *Book 771*, p. 50 et seq.
28. December 9, 1944, *Book 802*, pp. 241-248.
29. May 18, 1945, *Book 847*, pp. 293-299.
30. W. Friedmann, *The Allied Military Government of Germany* (London: Stevens & Sons, Ltd., 1947), p. 20.

31. Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), pp. 187-189.
32. Marshall Knappen, *And Call It Peace* (University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 53-56.
33. *The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes: The First Thousand Days* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953), I, 331.
34. For this strange story in detail, see *Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase*, Interim Report of the Committee on Government Operations, December 15, 1953 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953).
35. May 16, 1944, *Book 732*, pp. 97-99.
36. *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments*, pt. 16.
37. *Ibid.*, pt. 16, pp. 1110-1141.

(continued from page 260)

which published this journal has been alone among all other journals, publicizing Historical Revisionism ever since its founding, we add one and one together.

The Mathematics of Revisionism

In spite of the monumental setbacks our publisher has experienced since its founding ten years ago, Historical Revisionism is steadily moving ahead, at an increasing cadence. The setbacks we speak of, of course, have been in the realm of the suppression of our works and the persecution of our contributors; of which the arson of our headquarters, with the concomitant nearly total destruction of our physical possessions on July 4, 1984, was clearly the most damaging. As far as our findings and the quality of our research and publications we apologize only for a few typographical errors.

Historical Revisionism is "an idea whose time has come." You have heard that phrase repeated endlessly, from the typewriters of advertising writers hawking everything from dental floss bikinis to disposable finger nails. But for those of us who try to perceive the realities which move history, Revisionism is clearly coming into its own, which is to say, truth is moving ahead.

Events are happening today at the speed of 186,000 miles per second—the speed at which light and electricity move. Is it really possible to bottle up historical truth much longer? If you think so, ask Mr. Gorbachev or any of the legions of demonstrable frauds in the U.S. who are very free with their baseless assertions but who become as silent and empty as their own future when they are asked the simplest of question by any half-educated Historical Revisionist.

* * * * *

This issue of *The Journal of Historical Review* features four papers which were presented to IHR's Ninth International Historical (and history-making) Conference.

David Irving, Great Britain's foremost independent historian, who has been turning his breakthroughs in the archives and in the original sources into bestsellers for the past quarter century, previews the eagerly awaited second volume of *Churchill's War* with hilarious as well as sobering glimpses of a Churchill unknown to the mythmakers. With his customary wit and verve, Irving conducts readers on a guided tour through the Churchillian years of infamy which led up to America's "day of infamy" at Pearl Harbor. (continued on page 320)

Propaganda and Disinformation: How the CIA Manufactures History

VICTOR MARCHETTI

*(Paper presented to the
Ninth International Revisionist Conference)*

In the eyes of posterity it will inevitably seem that, in safeguarding our freedom, we destroyed it. The vast clandestine apparatus we built up to prove our enemies' resources and intentions only served in the end to confuse our own purposes; that practice of deceiving others for the good of the state led infallibly to our deceiving ourselves; and that vast army of clandestine personnel built up to execute these purposes were soon caught up in the web of their own sick fantasies, with disastrous consequences for them and us.

—Malcom Muggeridge
May 1966

That, in a nutshell, sums up what the CIA has accomplished over the years through its various clandestine propaganda and disinformation programs. It has unwittingly and, often, deliberately deceived itself—and the American taxpayer. The CIA is a master at distorting history—even creating its own version of history to suit its institutional and operational purposes. It can do this largely because of two great advantages it possesses. One is the excessively secret environment in which it operates, and the other is that it is essentially a private instrument of the presidency.

The real reason for the official secrecy, in most instances, is not to keep the opposition (the CIA's euphemistic term for the enemy) from knowing what is going on; the enemy usually does know. The basic reason for governmental secrecy is to keep you, the American public, from knowing—for you, too, are considered the opposition, or enemy—so that you cannot

interfere. When the public does not know what the government or the CIA is doing, it cannot voice its approval or disapproval of their actions. In fact, they can even lie to you about what they are doing or have done, and you will not know it.

As for the second advantage, despite frequent suggestions that the CIA is a rogue elephant, the truth is that the agency functions at the direction of and in response to the office of the president. All of its major clandestine operations are carried out with the direct approval of or on direct orders from the White House. The CIA is a secret tool of the president—every president. And every president since Truman has lied to the American people in order to protect the agency. When lies have failed, it has been the duty of the CIA to take the blame for the president, thus protecting him. This is known in the business as “plausible denial.”

The CIA, functioning as a secret instrument of the U.S. government and the presidency, has long misused and abused history and continues to do so. I first became concerned about this historical distortion in 1957, when I was a young officer in the Clandestine Services of the CIA.

One night, after work, I was walking down Constitution Avenue with a fellow officer, who previously had been a reporter for United Press.

“How are they ever going to know,” he asked.

“Who? How is ‘who’ ever going to know what?” I asked.

“How are the American people ever going to know what the truth is? How are they going to know what the truth is about what we are doing and have done over the years?” he said. “We operate in secrecy, we deal in deception and disinformation, and then we burn our files. How will the historians ever be able to learn the complete truth about what we’ve done in these various operations, these operations that have had such a major impact on so many important events in history?”

I couldn’t answer him, then. And I can’t answer him now. I don’t know how the American people will ever really know the truth about the many things that the CIA has been involved in. Or how they will ever know the truth about the great historical events of our times. The government is continually writing and rewriting history—often with the CIA’s help—to suit its own purposes. Here is a current example.

Just last month in Moscow, there was a meeting, a very strange meeting. Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara met with former Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko and a member of the Cuban Politburo. These three men, along with lesser former officials of their governments, has all been involved in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, and they had gathered in the Soviet capital to discuss what has really occurred in that monumental crisis, which almost led to World War III.

Since I, too, had been personally involved in that crisis, I took some interest in the news reports coming out of Moscow concerning the doings of this rather odd gathering of former officials. Much to my surprise, I learned that Robert McNamara was saying that neither he nor the U.S. intelligence community realized there actually had been some 40,000 Soviet troops in Cuba in the autumn of 1962. The former defense chief of the Kennedy administration was also saying that he and the U.S. government did not realize that the few dozen medium and intermediate range missiles the Soviets had tried to sneak into Cuba were actually armed with nuclear warheads and ready to be fired at targets in the U.S. Furthermore, he was claiming that the U.S. did not understand that this huge military build-up by the Soviets had been carried out to protect Cuba and to prevent the U.S. from attacking the island's Communist regime. He added, for good measure, that he was surprised to learn from the talks in Moscow that the Soviets and Cubans thought the U.S. had plans to bring down the government of Fidel Castro through the use of force. According to McNamara, the entire Cuban missile crisis was a dangerous misunderstanding that came about because of the lack of communication among the governments involved in the near catastrophe.

Well, when I heard what McNamara and the band were playing in Moscow, I said to myself, "Either McNamara is getting a little dotty in his old age and doesn't remember what really happened during the Cuban missile crisis—or there's some other reason for this." Well, it soon became apparent that McNamara was not senile. What, then, is the reason for these curious—and false—"admissions" in Moscow? The reason is that the United States and the Soviet Union have decided to become friends again, and Washington wants to set the stage for rapprochement with Castro's Cuba.

It has evidently been decided by the powers that be in the U.S. to have a little meeting in Moscow and tell the world that

we were all mixed up about Cuba and we didn't know what was going on there in 1962, because we weren't communicating well with the Soviets at the time. Thus, the American people would see how close to war we had come, how we should communicate more with the Soviets, and how they weren't really very bad guys after all. For that matter, neither were Fidel and his gang. Therefore, it would follow that we should in a few months from now get on with disarmament and whatever else is necessary to bring about the new internationalism that is forming between east and west. At the same time, we should begin rebuilding the bridge to Cuba, too.

But to create the proper atmosphere for the coming rapprochement with Moscow and, later, Cuba, it was necessary to scare the American public and the world into thinking that the crisis of October 1962 was worse than it really was. To do that, McNamara, Gromyko, *et al.* were playing a little game—their own distorted brand of historical revisionism. They were rewriting history to suit the present purposes of their governments.

Now, I thought, what if I were a reporter. Would I be able to see through this little charade that was going on in Moscow? Probably not. I began studying the “knowledgeable” syndicated columnists. They were writing things like, “. . . My God, we never did understand what the Soviets were up to in Cuba. Yes, we better do something about this.” What McNamara and friends were saying in Moscow was now becoming fact. It's becoming fact that we, the U.S. government, did not really know what was going on during the missile crisis. That is a lie.

If there was ever a time when the CIA in the United States intelligence community and the United States Armed Forces really cooperated and coordinated their efforts with each other, it was during the Cuban missile crisis. The Cuban missile crisis is probably one of the few examples—perhaps the only one—of when intelligence really worked the way it was supposed to work in a crisis situation.

I was there at the time, and I was deeply involved in this historical event. A colleague and friend of mine, Tack, my assistant at the time, and I were the original “crate-ologists”—which was an arcane little intelligence art that we had developed. We had learned through a variety of tricks of the trade, and some of our own making, to be able to distinguish what was in certain crates on Soviet merchant ships as they went into Cuba, into Indonesia, into Egypt,

Syria, and other places. We could tell if a crate contained a MIG-21, or an IL-28, or a SAM-2 missile.

We did this in such an amateurish way that we dared not tell anyone our methods. While the National Photographic Interpretation Center employed 1,200 people in its office in downtown Washington, using state-of-the-art equipment to analyze aerial and satellite photography, Tack and I would sit in our office, feet up on the desk, using a beat-up old ruler to measure photos taken from U.S. submarines. I'd measure a crate on the deck of the Soviet freighter, say about three-quarters of an inch in the photograph.

"Tack, do you think they could fit a Mig-21 in there?"

He'd thumb through an old Air Force manual and say, "Mig-21, fuselage length 25 feet."

"Well?"

"Take the tail off, and we can fit it in."

"Okay, let's call it a Mig-21."

We were pretty good at this. We had other aids to identification, of course. We were able to learn when the Soviets were preparing shipments, and from which ports they were sailing. We knew which personnel were involved, and the ships' destinations. Thus we could alert the navy, which sometimes conducted overflights, sometimes tracked them with a submarine.

We had an attaché in Istanbul row out in the middle of the night with a Turk whom he'd hired, looking for three things in a Soviet freighter: its deck cargo, how high it was riding in the water, and its name.

By these and other sensitive means we were able to learn, in the summer of 1962, that the Soviets were carrying out an unprecedented arms build-up in Cuba. While some of the other agencies, namely the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, didn't agree with us, CIA director John McCone was able to get President John Kennedy to authorize more intelligence overflights. The overflights revealed that the Soviets were building SAM (Surface-to-Air Missiles) launching sites to protect the build-up. Further overflights revealed the construction of launching sites for Soviet MRBMs (Medium Range Ballistic Missiles) capable of carrying nuclear warheads to most cities in the United States. We know exactly how many there were, where they were, and that they had not yet been armed, because the warheads hadn't arrived yet.

Thus McNamara is lying when he claims that the Soviet missiles in Cuba were armed and ready for launch against the United States. On the contrary, we were watching the ships which carried the warheads; American ships enforcing the blockade which President Kennedy had ordered boarded a Romanian ship (which we knew carried no arms), and the Russian ships bringing the nuclear warheads turned around in mid-ocean and went home.

It is also quite untrue that there were forty thousand Soviet troops in Cuba. We knew that there were only ten thousand of them, because we had developed a simple but effective way of counting them.

The Soviets had sent their troops over on passenger liners to disguise the military buildup. Some genius back in Moscow must have then said: "But these guys need to wear civilian clothes; let's put sport shirts on them." But someone at the department store said: "We've only got two kinds." So half the troops wore one kind, half of them the other. They weren't very hard to spot.

Then, too, Soviet soldiers are a lot like our own. As soon as the first group got established, the colonel sent them out to paint some rocks white and then paint the name of the unit, 44th Field Artillery Battalion or whatever, on the rocks. All we had to do was take a picture of it from one of our U-2s. So it was easy to establish a Soviet troop strength of far below 40,000. Thus, McNamara is agreeing to a second lie.

The big lie, however, is that the Soviet Union came into Cuba to protect the Cubans. That was a secondary, or bonus, consideration. The primary reason for the build-up was that the Soviets at the time were so far behind us in nuclear strike capability that Khrushchev figured he could make a quantum leap by suddenly putting in 48 missiles that could strike every city in America except Seattle, Washington.

Nor did we come as close to war as many think, because Khrushchev knew he was caught. His missiles weren't armed, and he hadn't the troops to protect them. Kennedy knew this, so he was able to say: "Take them out." And Khrushchev had to say yes.

I must admit that at the time I was a little concerned, and so was my buddy Tack. We were manning the war room around the clock, catching four hours of sleep and then going back on duty. My wife had the station wagon loaded with blankets and provisions, and Tack's wife was standing by on alert. If either of them got a phone call with a certain word in

it, they were to take our children and drive to my home town in the anthracite region of northeastern Pennsylvania. We figured they'd be safe there: if you've ever seen the coal region with its strip mines you would think it had already been bombed, and we were hoping the Soviets would look at it that way too.

Last month's conference in Moscow is an example of how history is being rewritten. Any historian who relies on what he reads in the newspapers, on the statements from McNamara and the Russians and the Cubans will not be learning the truth.

The CIA has manufactured history in a number of ways over the years not only through its propaganda and disinformation but through the cover stories it uses for their operations, and the cover-ups when an operation falls through. Then there is "plausible deniability," which protects the president.

All these techniques have one thing in common, and depend on one thing: secrecy. Secrecy is maintained not to keep the opposition—the CIA's euphemistic term for the enemy—from knowing what's going on, because the enemy usually does know. Secrecy exists to keep you, the American public, from knowing what is going on, because in many ways you are the real enemy.

If the public were aware of what the CIA is doing, it might say: "We don't like what you're doing—stop it!," or "You're not doing a good job—stop it!" The public might ask for an accounting for the money being spent and the risks being taken.

Thus secrecy is absolutely vital to the CIA. Secrecy covers not only operations in progress, but continues after the operations, particularly if the operations have been botched. Then they have to be covered up with more lies, which the public, of course, can't recognize as lies, allowing the CIA to tell the public whatever it wishes.

Presidents love this. Every president, no matter what he has said before getting into office, has been delighted to learn that the CIA is his own private tool. The presidents have leapt at the opportunity to keep Congress and the public in the dark about their employment of the agency.

This is what was at the basis of my book, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*. I had come to the conclusion, as a member of the CIA, that many of our policies and practices were not in the best interests of the United States, but were in fact

counterproductive, and that if the American people were aware of this they would not tolerate it.

I resigned from the CIA in 1969, at a time when we were deeply involved in Vietnam. And how did we get into Vietnam on a large scale? How did President Lyndon Johnson get a blank check from Congress? It was through the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The American people were told by President Johnson that North Vietnamese motor torpedo boats had come after two American destroyers on the night of August 4, 1964. This was confirmed by the intelligence community.

The fact of the matter is that while torpedo boats came out and looked at the U.S. destroyers, which were well out in international waters, they never fired on them. They made threatening maneuvers, they snarled a bit, but they never fired. It was dark and getting darker. Our sailors thought they might have seen something, but there were no hits, no reports of anything whizzing by.

That was the way it was reported back: a bit of a scrape, but no weapons fire and no attempt to fire. Our ships had not been in danger. But with the help of the intelligence community President Johnson took that report and announced that we had been attacked. He went to Congress and asked for and received his blank check, and Congress went along. Everyone knows the rest of the story: we got into Vietnam up to our eyeballs.

Every president prizes secrecy and fights for it. And so did President Nixon, in my case. When I came to the conclusion that the American people needed to know more about the CIA and what it was up to, I decided to go to Capitol Hill and talk to the senators on the intelligence oversight subcommittee. I found out that Senator John Stennis, at that time head of the subcommittee, hadn't conducted a meeting in over a year, so the other senators were completely ignorant as to what the CIA was doing. Senators William Fulbright and Stuart Symington would tell Stennis, "Let's have a meeting," but he was ignoring them. The other senators wrote Stennis a letter urging him to at least hear what I had to say in a secret executive session, but he continued to ignore them.

Then I would meet Fulbright—at the barber shop. He was afraid to meet me in his office. I would meet with Symington at his home. I would meet with senators at cocktail parties, as if by chance. But still they couldn't get Stennis to convene the intelligence subcommittee.

Senator Richard Schweiker of Pennsylvania told me he had learned more about the workings of the intelligence community in one afternoon of conversation with me than in six years of work on the intelligence subcommittee. That didn't surprise me, because I, several years before, had done the budget for CIA director Richard Helms. It was feared that the Senate appropriations subcommittee might have some hard questions about the growing cost of technical espionage programs. Director Helms had evidently been through this before, however.

As Helms put it, he and the CIA's head of science and technology, Albert (Bud) Wheelon, staged a "magic lantern show" for the committee, complete with color slides and demonstrations of the CIA's most advance spy gadgets: a camera hidden in a tobacco pouch, a radio transmitter concealed in some false teeth, a tape recorder in a cigarette case, and so on. One or two hard questions were deflected by Senator Russell of Georgia, who chaired the committee and was a strong supporter of the agency. There were, of course, no slides or hi-tech hardware to exhibit the programs the CIA wanted to conceal from Congress, and the budget sailed through the subcommittee intact.

What I learned in my dealings with Congressmen, in the CIA and after leaving, was that the men who wanted to change the situation didn't have the power, while those who had the power didn't want any change. With Congress a hopeless case, and the White House already in the know and well satisfied to let the CIA continue to operate in secrecy, I decided to talk to the press. I gave my first interview to *U.S. News and World Report*, and that started the ball rolling. Soon I was in touch with publishers in New York, talking about doing a book.

I soon got a telephone call from Admiral Rufus Taylor, who had been my boss in the agency, but by that time had retired. He told me to meet him at a motel in the Virginia suburbs, across the Potomac from Washington. My suspicions aroused by the remoteness of the room from the office, I was greeted by Admiral Taylor, who had thoughtfully brought along a large supply of liquor: a bottle of scotch, a bottle of bourbon, a bottle of vodka, a bottle of gin . . . "I couldn't remember what you liked," he told me, "so I brought one of everything."

I began to make noise: flushing the toilet, washing my hands, turning on the television. Admiral Taylor was right behind me, turning everything off. I kept making noise, jingling the ice in my glass and so on, until the admiral sat

down. There was a table with a lamp on it between the admiral's chair and the one which he now told me to sit down on. He looked at me with a little twinkle in his eye: the lamp was bugged, of course.

We talked, and Admiral Taylor told me the CIA was worried about what I might write in my book. He proposed a deal: I was to give no more interviews, write no more articles, and to stay away from Capitol Hill. I could write my book, and then let him and other retired senior officers look it over, and they would advise me and the agency. After that the CIA and I could resolve our differences. I told him, "Fair enough." We had a drink on it, and went out to dinner. That was our deal.

What I didn't know was that a few nights later John Erlichman and Richard Nixon would be sitting in the White House discussing my book. There is a tape of their discussion, "President Nixon, John Ehrlichman, 45 minutes, subject: Victor Marchetti," which is still sealed: I can't get it. Ehrlichman told me through contacts that if I listened to the tape I would learn exactly what happened to me and why.

Whatever the details of their conversation were, the president of the United States had decided I should not publish my book. I was to be the first writer in American history to be served with an official censorship order served by a court of the United States, because President Nixon did not want to be embarrassed, nor did he want the CIA to be investigated and reformed: that would have hampered his ability to use it for his own purposes. A few days later, on April 18, 1972, I received a federal injunction restraining me from revealing any "intelligence information."

After more than a year of court battles, *CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* was published. The courts allowed the CIA to censor it in advance, and as a result the book appeared with more than a hundred holes for CIA-ordered deletions. Later editions show previously deleted words and lines, which the court ordered the CIA to restore in boldface or italics. The book is therefore difficult to read, indeed something of a curiosity piece. And of course all the information which was ordered cut out ended up leaking to the public anyway.

All this was done to help the CIA suppress and distort history, and to enable presidents to do the same. Presidents like Harry Truman, who claimed falsely that "I never had any thought when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations," but who willingly employed the agency to carry out clandestine espionage and

covert intervention in the affairs of other countries. Or Dwight Eisenhower, who denied that we were attempting to overthrow Sukarno in Indonesia, when we were, and was embarrassed when he tried to deny the CIA's U-2 overflights and was shown up by Khrushchev at Paris in 1960.

John F. Kennedy, as everyone knows by now, employed the CIA in several attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro. We used everyone from Mafia hoods to Castro's mistress, Marita Lorenz (who was supposed to poison the dictator with pills concealed in her cold cream—the pills melted). I have no doubt that if we could have killed Castro, the U.S. would have gone in.

There was a fairly widespread belief that one reason Kennedy was assassinated was because he was going to get us out of Vietnam. Don't you believe it. He was the CIA's kind of president, rough, tough, and gung-ho. Under Kennedy we became involved in Vietnam in a serious way, not so much militarily as through covert action. It is a fact that the United States engineered the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem, South Vietnam's premier, and Ngo Dinh Nhu, his powerful brother. A cable was sent out to the ambassador which said, "If Lou Conein goofs up [Lucien Conein was a key CIA operative in Saigon], it's his responsibility." So when E. Howard Hunt faked these memos and cables when he was working for the "plumbers" on behalf of President Nixon (and against the Democrats), he knew what he was doing. That was his defense, that he wasn't really forging or inventing anything. "Stuff like that really existed, but I couldn't find it," he said. Of course Hunt couldn't find it: by that time the original documents were gone. But Hunt knew what he was doing.

President Nixon's obsession with secrecy led to the end of his presidency, of course. As indicated earlier, Nixon was determined to suppress my book. On several occasions after his resignation, Nixon has been asked what he meant when he said that the CIA would help him cover up the Watergate tapes, because "they owed him one." He has responded, "I was talking about Marchetti," in other words the efforts (still secret) to prevent *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* from being published.

Another instance of the Nixon administrations' attempts to suppress history is the ongoing attempt to cover up the details of the administration's "tilt" toward Pakistan in its conflict with India in the early 1970's. Although the basic facts soon emerged, Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Seymour Hersh's

account of the affair in his unflattering book on Henry Kissinger revealed that Morarji Desai, an important Indian political leader who later became Prime Minister, was a CIA agent. Kissinger spurred Desai to sue Hersh, and the case is still dragging on today, seven years later. I know what the truth is; Hersh knows as well, but as a conscientious journalist refused to reveal his sources. Here historical truth is caught between official secrecy and Hersh's loyalty to his informants; nevertheless, I have a great deal of admiration for Hersh for his firm stand.

It is a fact that a good many foreign leaders, including those often seen as "neutral" or even hostile to the United States, have been secretly on the CIA's payroll. For instance, when Jimmy Carter came into office, he claimed he was going to reform the CIA. No sooner than was he in the White House, they decided to test him: the news that Jordan's King Hussein had been paid by the CIA was leaked. President Carter was outraged, because now it was his CIA. His efforts to deny the relationship were defeated by Hussein's nonchalant frankness. He told the press, "Yes, I took the money. I used it for my intelligence service. And that's all I'm going to say on that subject."

There were a lot of other national leaders in Hussein's category. As I revealed for the first time in my book, Joseph Mobutu, a corporal in the Belgian forces in the Congo before its independence, went on the CIA payroll. That is why he rules Zaire today. The CIA paid the late Jomo Kenyatta, ruler of Kenya, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars a year, which he'd spend on drink and women. Therefore we ended up paying Kenyatta twice as much, telling him: "This is for you and this is for your party."

The CIA has funded individuals and movements across the political spectrum in West Germany. A prime example is Willy Brandt, former chancellor of the Federal Republic, who received much CIA support when he was mayor of West Berlin. Axel Springer, the Christian Democratic-minded press and publishing magnate, who pointed the finger at Brandt for working with CIA, was also a CIA asset, who used his publications to spread CIA propaganda and disinformation. It was a case of the pot calling the kettle black: I knew his case officer quite well.

This is the way the CIA sees its mission, the job it was created to do. The CIA is supposed to be involved with everyone, not merely the Christian Democrats or the Social

Democrats. The agency is supposed to have its fingers in every pie, including the Communist one, so that they can all be manipulated in whichever way the U.S. government desires.

An obvious area of disinformation and deception exists in our relationship with a nation often represented as our closest ally, Israel. I have often been asked about the relationship between the CIA and its Israeli counterpart, the Mossad. The CIA maintains some kind of liaison with virtually every foreign intelligence agency, including the KGB. These relationships vary from case to case, but our relationship with the Mossad was always a peculiar one.

When I was in the agency, the Mossad was generally not trusted. There was an unwritten rule that no Jews could work on Israeli or near Eastern matters; it was felt that they could not be totally objective. There was a split in the agency, however, and Israel was not included in the normal area division, the Near Eastern Division. Instead it was handled as a special account in counterintelligence. The man who handled that account, James Jesus Angleton, was extremely close to the Israelis. I believe that through Angleton the Israelis learned a lot more than they should have and exercised a lot more influence on our activities than they should have.

For his trouble, James Angleton, who died last year, was honored by the Israelis, in the way that the Israelis customarily honor their Gentile helpers. They decided to plant a whole forest for Angleton in the Judean hills, and they put up a handsome plaque in several languages, lionizing Angleton as a great friend of Israel, on a nearby rock. Israeli's intelligence chiefs, past and present, attended the dedication ceremony.

Later on, a television reporter of my acquaintance sought out Angleton's memorial during an assignment in Israel. After some difficulty, he was able to locate it, but something seemed odd about it. On closer inspection, Angleton's plaque turned out to be made, not of bronze, but of cardboard. Nor was the setting particularly flattering to Israel's late benefactor: the trees and plaque were at the edge of a garbage dump. My friend's British cameraman put it best: "This guy sold out his country for the bloody Israelis, and this is the way they pay him back!"

The CIA has distorted history in other ways than by outright coverups and suppression of the truth. One method was to produce its own books. For instance, one of its top agents in

the Soviet Union was Colonel Oleg Penkovsky. Penkovsky was eventually captured and executed. But the CIA was unwilling to let it go at that. The agency decided to write a book, which it published in 1965, called *The Penkovsky Papers*. This was purported to be drawn from a diary that Penkovsky had kept, a diary in which Penkovsky revealed numerous espionage coups calculated to embarrass the Soviets and build up the CIA.

Spies do not keep diaries, of course, and the Soviets were not likely to believe the exaggerated claims made for Penkovsky and the CIA in *The Penkovsky Papers*. Who was taken in? The American public, of course. More than once people have come up to me after a lecture and shown me the book as if it were gospel. I've told them, "I know the man who wrote it." "You knew Penkovsky?" they invariably ask, and I tell them, "No, I didn't know Penkovsky but I know the man who wrote the book."

Not just ordinary citizens were taken in by the Penkovsky deception, either. Senator Milton Young of North Dakota, who served on the CIA oversight subcommittee, said in a 1971 Senate debate on cutting the intelligence budget:

And if you want to read something very interesting and authoritative where intelligence is concerned, read *The Penkovsky Papers* . . . this is a very interesting story, on why the intelligence we had in Cuba was so important to us, and on what the Russians were thinking and just how far they would go.

Perhaps the most startling example of the CIA's manipulation of the publishing world is the case of *Khrushchev Remembers*. Khrushchev is still widely believed to have been the author. He is supposed to have dashed it off one summer and then said to himself, "Where will I get this published? Ah! Time-Life!" The tapes reached Time-Life, we all read it, and we told ourselves, "Isn't that interesting."

A little thought should be sufficient to dispel the notion that the KGB would allow Khrushchev to sit in his dacha dictating tape after tape with no interference. He certainly dictated tapes, but the tapes were censored and edited by the KGB, and then a deal was struck between the U.S. and the USSR, after it was decided, at the highest level, that such a book would be mutually beneficial. Brezhnev could use against some of the resistance he was encountering from Stalinist hardliners, and Nixon could use it to increase support for detente.

The CIA and the KGB cooperated in carrying out the operation. The tapes were given to the *Time* bureau in Moscow. Strobe Talbot, who appears on television frequently today and is *Time*'s bureau chief in Washington, brought the tapes back with him. I was present in an apartment in which he hid them for a couple of days. The tapes were then translated and a manuscript developed. During this period *Time* refused to let people who had known Khrushchev personally, including White House staff members, listen to the tapes.

Knowledgeable people began to tell me. "I don't believe this." "There's something mighty fishy here." When they read what Khrushchev was supposedly saying, they were even more incredulous. But the book came out, *Khrushchev Remembers*, accompanied by a massive publicity campaign. It was a great propaganda accomplishment for the CIA and the KGB.

I touched on *Khrushchev Remembers* in my book. I did not go into any great detail, merely devoting several tentative paragraphs to the affair. Just before my book was published *Time* was considering doing a two-page spread on me until they learned of my expressed reservations on the trustworthiness of *Khrushchev Remembers*. I began to get phone calls from Talbot and Jerry Schaechter, then *Time*'s bureau chief in Washington, telling me I should take out the offending passages.

I had written, correctly, that before publication Strobe Talbot had taken the bound transcripts of the Khrushchev tapes back to Moscow, via Helsinki, so that the KGB could make one final review of them. I told Schaechter and Talbot that if they came to me, looked me in the eye, and told me I had the facts wrong, I would take out the section on *Khrushchev Remembers*. Neither of them ever came by, the paragraphs stayed in my book, and in any event *Time* went ahead with the two-page spread anyway.

As I pointed out in the preface to *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* in 1974, democratic governments fighting totalitarian enemies run the risk of imitating their methods and thereby destroying democracy. By suppressing historical fact, and by manufacturing historical fiction, the CIA, with its obsessive secrecy and its vast resources, has posed a particular threat to the right of Americans to be informed for the present and future by an objective knowledge of the past. As long as the CIA continues to manipulate history, historians of its activities must be Revisionist if we are to know the truth about the agency's activities, past and present.

(continued from page 304)

Professor Anthony Kubek relates the almost incredible story of how a Soviet agent, Harry Dexter White, authored a plan aimed at the economic and physical destruction of the Germans, and then saw his plan adopted as official U.S. policy. Dr. Kubek, the world's leading authority on the revealing official diaries of White's boss, Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, examines the implications of the "policy perversion" by which Morgenthau and White helped torpedo a just peace with Germany.

Victor Marchetti, the first insider to blow the whistle on the CIA's policy of deceiving the American people, unmasks recent American-Soviet attempts to falsify the facts about the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, in which he played a key role. Then the former agent leads readers on an enlightening tour of the CIA's efforts to control and destroy recent American history.

The Reverend Herman Otten, the Lutheran dynamo who was the driving force in arranging last February's "Great Holocaust Debate" (aborted through no fault of his own), describes his own path to Historical Revisionism. The editor and publisher of *The Christian News* presents a case for Biblical truth and historical skepticism that makes his paper surely one of the most controversial to appear in *The Journal*.

Doubtless the two living deans of Holocaust Revisionism are Professor Arthur Butz of Northwestern and Professor Robert Faurisson of Lyon. Due to the great importance of Professor Arno Mayer's *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?*—the first book by an Establishment historian to implicitly challenge the Auschwitz myth—we are proud to feature the comments of both these learned and courageous men on Mayer and his book.

Then John Ries reviews an account of the social and political history of Linz—Adolf Hitler's hometown—during the forty years which preceded the *Anschluss*.

And then it's onward and upward into the second decade of *The Journal of Historical Review*!

—Theodore J. O'Keefe

Christianity, Truth and Fantasy: The Holocaust, Historical Revisionism and Christians Today

*(Paper presented to the
Ninth International Revisionist Conference)*

HERMAN OTTEN

The early Christians were champions of the truth, not myth and fantasy. They spoke and wrote on the basis of solid evidence. Peter wrote:

We didn't follow any clever myths when we told you about the power of our Lord Jesus Christ and His coming. No. With our own eyes we saw His majesty. God the Father gave Him honor and glory when from His wonderful glory He said to Him: "This is My son whom I love and with whom I am delighted." We heard that voice speak to Him from heaven when we were with Him on the holy mountain.

And we have a more sure word of prophecy. Please look to it as a light shining in a gloomy place till the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts. Understand this first, that no one can explain any written Word of God as he likes, because it never was the will of a human being that brought us God's Word, but the Holy Spirit moved holy men to say what God told them.¹

John concludes his Gospel: "This is the disciple who testified about these things and wrote this. And we know what he testifies is true."² John begins his first epistle: "It was from the beginning, we heard It, we saw It with our eyes, we looked at It, and our hands touched It—we're writing about the Word of Life."³ He concludes this epistle: "We know God's Son came and gave us the understanding to know Him who is real, and we are in Him who is real, in His Son Jesus Christ. He is the true God and everlasting life. Children, keep away from idols."⁴

The prophets and apostles who write the Bible presented facts, true history, not pious myths based upon some

emotional experiences. They carefully evaluated the evidence. Luke begins his Gospel:

Many have undertaken to plan and write a story of what has been done among us, just as we heard it from those who from the first became eyewitnesses and servants of the World. For this reason I too decided to check everything carefully from the beginning and to write it down in the proper order for you, excellent Theophilus, so that you too will be sure what you have heard is true.⁵

Jesus, who said: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, no one comes to the Father except by Me,"⁶ emphasized the importance of knowing the truth. He declared: "If you live in My Word, you are really My disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will free you."⁷

Today direct revelation, the very concept of truth, doctrine, and real history which can be known are being rejected right within the established churches. The very thought that God revealed Himself or any truths to man in propositions recorded in Holy Scripture is denied. Many contend that there is no such thing as absolute truth and that no one can say with absolute certainty what really happened. A professor we had for a course in philosophy at the University of Rochester in New York held up his pencil and told our class that if we believed the pencil were a cow or an elephant it would be a cow or elephant for us. Our response was that one may very well call it a cow but it certainly would not produce any milk.

Modern liberalism contends that there is no such thing as divinely revealed, authoritative, final doctrine, *doctrina divina*. However, the idea of propositional truth and revelation is taught by the Scriptures. The Holy Scriptures contain dogma, doctrine, real history, divinely revealed truth, which can be known.

While the Bible does use the term "truth" at times to mean such things as "loyalty," "faithfulness," etc., the Bible also teaches the idea of propositional truth, revelation, absolute truth, which man can know and express in doctrinal statements.

To the Samaritan woman who said, "I have no husband," our Lord replied that since she had had five husbands and since her present consort was not her husband, her answer was quite correct: "You've told the truth." Obviously Christ means "factual precision." He is not attributing "faithfulness" or "loyalty" to the woman.⁸

Of another woman we read in Mark that she came to Christ and “told Him all the truth.” Again this can only mean “factual precision.” Certainly she is not preaching the Gospel to Christ. She simply narrated the prosaic facts of her case.⁹

Martin Luther and other early Reformers had an intense desire to know and proclaim the truth in all areas. Luther, in his explanation of the Eighth Commandment: “Do not lie concerning your neighbor,” noted: “We should fear and love God that we may not deceitfully belie, betray, slander, nor defame our neighbor, but defend him, speak well of him, and put the best construction on everything.”

Christians are not free to believe or spread lies and myths about anyone or any people or nation. In short: *A Christian promotes truth, not lies and hoaxes.*

Revisionism

A Christian is not a revisionist in the sense that he wants to revise real history and distort what actually happened. Rather he is interested in learning and promoting facts, not lies, in every area. He is particularly vitally concerned about the true origins of all religions. Christianity is the only religion which is founded upon actual history. Unlike all other religions, it is founded upon actual events, which really happened in ordinary calendar history, not some kind of “history” which is above and beyond real history (the realm of myth). A Christian is not out to revise true history.

However, a Christian can be a Revisionist if by this is meant that a Christian is interested in revising what many consider to be history. *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* by Harry Elmer Barnes, who was not a Christian, was one of the first books I bought by a Revisionist during my college days in the early fifties. I still have this copy. Barnes noted in “Revisionism and the Promotion of Peace” in *The Journal of Historical Review* (Spring, 1982):

During the last forty years or so, Revisionism has become a fighting term. To so-called Revisionists, it implies an honest search for historical truth and the discrediting of misleading myths that are a barrier to peace and goodwill among nations. In the minds of anti-Revisionists, the term savors of malice, vindictiveness, and an unholy desire to smear the saviors of mankind.

Actually, Revisionism means nothing more or less than the effort to correct the historical facts, a more calm political atmosphere, and a more objective attitude. It has been going on

ever since Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457) exposed the forged "Donation of Constantine," which was a cornerstone of the papal claim to secular power, and he later called attention to the unreliable methods of Livy in dealing with early Roman history. Indeed, the Revisionist impulse long antedated Valla, and it has been developing ever since that time. It has been employed in American history long before the term came into rather general use following the first World War.

Revisionism has been more frequently and effectively applied to correcting the historical record relative to wars, because truth is always the first war casualty, the emotional disturbances and distortions in historical writing are greatest in wartime, and both the need and the material for correcting historical myths are most evident in connection with wars.

Growing Up in New York City During World War II

The October, 1988 *IHR Newsletter* announcing this conference referred to me as a "German-American." My parents came to this country from Germany as teen-agers. However, ancestors on both my mother's and father's side came to Germany from Sweden. I mention this because some have said I am a neo-Nazi, out to defend Germany because of my background. But Mother's mother refused to say "Heil Hitler." She insisted that she had only one *Heiland* (Savior) and that was Jesus Christ. Some feared she would be imprisoned. My father's father was one of the first Lutherans in Germany to leave the German territorial [state] church and helped form an independent church free from any government control. He vigorously protested against the liberal anti-Christian theology taught in many German universities and schools of higher learning. Perhaps much of the suffering that Germany has had to endure is because it had to such a large extent departed from God's Word.

I was fortunate to have a father, who, although he was an ordinary housepainter in New York City, was interested in world affairs and did considerable reading, including the writings of some Revisionists. Prior to WW II he followed the work of Charles Lindbergh and the America First Committee, which sought to keep the U.S. out of war. I can still recall sitting in front of our radio in a Bronx apartment on December 7, 1941 listening to reports of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. I was eight years old at the time but I remember Dad telling us that this was the beginning of the most devastating war the world had ever known and that President Franklin Roosevelt

was not entirely innocent in the affair. "F.D.R.'S WAR PLANS!—Goal is 10 Million Armed Men; Half to Fight in AEF—Proposes Land Drive by July 1, 1943 to Smash Nazis" were the headlines of the December 4, 1941 *Chicago Tribune*, three days before Pearl Harbor.

One of the first things we had to do many mornings during WWII was run to a local 'candy' store to buy a copy of the *New York Daily News*, which at that time was only 2 cents. In the evening Dad would come home from work with other newspapers to keep up with the latest news about the war. When the news came on the radio at supper time, the entire family had to be quiet so we could hear the reports. Dad would often comment, after coming home from a day of painting in the homes of some clergymen and college professors, that a good number of them were rather uninformed about what was really going on in the world. He told us that very few of them recognized that Roosevelt actually planned to get the U.S. into the war.

During our public school years in the Bronx, news and evidence of the war were constantly before us. Apartment houses near our public schools were vacated and thousands of WACS, WAVES and SPARS moved in. They regularly marched around our school and trained in what is probably one of the largest armories in the world, which was right across from our school. A few gold stars replaced blue ones in our church and as we walked to school from time to time we could observe in the windows of apartment houses where a gold star had been placed just the day before where there had been a blue one. Another American had died in the war.

Some of the forty families who lived in our apartment house were Jews who had recently come from Europe and still had relatives there. At times there were only two or three of us in some of our grade school classes who were not Jews. Many of our teachers and friends were Jews. We collected newspapers for the war effort in apartment houses where most of the tenants were Jews. Some had only been in this country for a short time and still had some contact with relatives in Eastern European countries.

Before and after the war our family helped European Jews and other refugees settle in this country. A few of them became Christians. Our congregation in New York, St. Mathew Lutheran Church, often called the oldest Lutheran church in the country, probably included more former Jews than any other Lutheran church in the U.S. At one time our pastor told us that there were about 80.

During the years immediately after the war our family sent hundreds of food packages to the destitute in Europe. Since we had no automobile, we children took many of these packages to the post office in our wagon.

We cannot recall any of the many Jews with whom we came into contact growing up in Manhattan and the Bronx from 1933-52 who acted as if he really believed that millions of fellow Jews were being gassed by the Germans.

Undergraduate Revisionist Studies

I attended Concordia College Institute in Bronxville, New York, which consisted of a four-year prep school and two-year junior college. The school had a high academic standing, and four years of Latin, two years of Greek, and four years of German were required of all students, in addition to the standard courses in English, history, mathematics, and science.

Following my Dad's example, I became an early and enthusiastic Revisionist, which got me into difficulty with some of my teachers at Concordia. During my senior year I gave a talk on Roosevelt, Pearl Harbor, and the forced repatriation of millions of Eastern Europeans back to the Communists. One of the resources I used was *The Crime of the Ages*, by Ludwig A. Fritsch. The book included a pamphlet with an endorsement from Dr. Walter A. Maier, who at that time was speaker on the "International Lutheran Hour" and a professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

My history professor, who was an ardent fan of Roosevelt, almost exploded after I completed the speech. I had previously expressed some disagreement with this professor's views of the causes for the war and Roosevelt's parts in the war, but this was the final straw. A few of my classmates were prepared for a confrontation. I was sent to the principal to get "straightened" out. It didn't do much good and only led me to read more books by such Revisionist historians as Charles Tansill, George Morgenstern, Percy Greaves, John T. Flynn, Charles Beard, Admiral Theobald, etc. I was determined to read all I could about WW I and WW II. When I graduated from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, in 1957 I also received a Master's Degree in history from Washington University. One reason for majoring in history was because I was interested in writing a textbook on American history which would tell the truth about the origins of World War I and II.

Christian Influences for Revisionism

I. Dr. Walter A. Maier

My thesis at Concordia Seminary in 1957 was on the political and economic thought of Dr. Walter A. Maier, who was one of the best known American churchmen during the war years. 32 years ago I wrote:

From Maier's endorsement of *The Crime of the Ages* it is rather obvious that he accepted the Revisionist interpretation of World War Two. He concluded a letter of thanks to the author with the words, "It certainly tells the truth." The author of this book, Ludwig A. Fritsch, Ph.D., D.D., stated that Roosevelt and his associates led America into war in order to bring this nation out of the depression. He argues that Roosevelt was not able to solve the unemployment situation in spite of social legislation and huge spending. Since Hitler could not be induced to attack the United States, Fritsch maintains that Roosevelt had to engineer war "via the back door." Through various economic pressures Japan was supposed to have been sufficiently antagonized to attack Pearl Harbor. This was claimed to have permitted Roosevelt and his associates to stand before America and demand revenge for the sneak attack. Fritsch, whom Maier endorsed, wrote:

TELL OUR PEOPLE what Oliver Lyttleton, British Minister of Production, told the Chamber of Commerce of America June 20, 1944, as reported by the United Press: "Japan was provoked into attacking the United States at Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty of history ever to say that America was forced into the war." . . . TELL OUR PEOPLE, that before God and history, the load of responsibility for the chaotic conditions and the indescribable misery all over the world rests on our conscience; because we played havoc with prehistoric brutality and saved Bolshevism, making it a world menace. Without our intervention there would have been peace and order in Europe and the world long ago.¹⁰

II. Dr. Alfred Rehwinkel

Most of my professors at Concordia College (Bronxville), Washington University, Columbia University and Concordia Seminary (St. Louis), promoted the generally accepted line about Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt and the cause of both World War One and Two. Almost all of the few who were even aware of the Revisionist position refused to accept it. Dr. Alfred Rehwinkel, one of my advisors at Concordia Seminary, was one of the few who knew what was really going on in the world. Rehwinkel had been associated with Charles Lindbergh and the America First Committee. I often visited

him, even after graduating from Concordia Seminary. He was several times a guest speaker at our congregation in New Haven, Missouri. Rehwinkel had been president of Concordia, Edmonton and later St. John's College in Winfield, Kansas, founded in 1893 by J.P. Baden, a distant relative our family. My father, who was one of Rehwinkel's many admirers among the laymen, first became acquainted with him when Dad worked in the wheat fields in Kansas in the 1920's.

Perhaps one reason The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod's Concordia Publishing House has never published an excellent well written biography by Rev. Ronald Stelzer of Rehwinkel, known as "Rip," is because of his position on WW II. This biography notes:

To Rip "The Second World War was the bankruptcy of Western statemanship, and worse than that, it was the bankruptcy of Western morality." It was the impetus behind his 400 page unpublished manuscript entitled *War, The Christian's Dilemma*. Herein is depicted one side of the story that likely will never appear in the textbooks of American history. Against the backdrop of American and Allied atrocities in World War II, Rip analyzes the ethical problem of war as it is dealt with in the Old and New Testaments, the early Church Fathers, medieval Church history, by the Reformers and those in recent times . . .

Amidst the jubilant celebration of his countrymen over the German and Japanese surrender, Rip was profoundly unimpressed with the Allies' accomplishments on the battlefield and at the negotiating table. Fifteen years later an interviewer asked Rip, "Who do you think has had the worst influence on our modern world?" Rip spoke without hesitation, "The answer is very simple. The men who have had the most baneful influence on our whole world today are Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill." (Questionnaire prepared by Dr. William Beck of St. Louis at the request of Dr. O.A. Dorn of Concordia Publishing House.) In my own conversations with Rip he consistently referred to these two, but especially Roosevelt, as "contemptible warmongers, deceivers and fools." On occasion he has described them as "the architects of world chaos" or "the curse of our generation" and their acts as "stupendous stupidities" or "selling us down the river." . . .

Rip was a voice crying in the wilderness, a lonely prophet proclaiming God's judgment upon a nation that could see only that it had won a great war. "God's attitude regarding the dignity of human life has not changed. No government has the

where it will do some good. ADL responds to the needs of individual victims of prejudice, and fights against bigotry, racism and anti-Semitism.” Attached to your statement is a report titled “An ADL Special Report—HATE GROUPS IN AMERICA—A Record of Bigotry and Violence.”

Your special reports include a section titled “List of Extreme-Right Groups.” It says: “The following is a list of extreme-right groups that have operated in the U.S. in recent years. These groups espouse racism and/or anti-Semitism: many have engaged in violence.” Under a section title “List of Extreme-Right Publications” is *Christian News*, New Haven, Missouri-(no organization).”

Christian News wrote to Mr. Harold Singer, publisher of the *Jewish Journal*, Brooklyn, New York, on March 8: “An article in the February 19 *Jewish Journal* lists *Christian News* as part of the ‘Right Wing Hate Press.’ Could you please tell us why *Christian News* is considered part of the ‘hate press?’ Could you please send us the address of Mr. Abraham H. Foxman, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith?”

Christian News wrote to you on March 29: “A report in the February 19 *Jewish Journal* says that the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith lists *Christian News* as part of the Right Wing Hate Press.’ Could you please tell us why *Christian News* is considered part of the ‘hate press?’”

Perhaps you never received this letter. Could you now please answer these questions?

I then posed a series of questions to Mr. Foxman, asking to produce a single citation from *The Christian News* advocating or defending racial hatred, anti-Semitism, or violence. Then I put to him a series of questions on the factuality of the Holocaust, and on ADL’s willingness to engage in a debate on the issue.

The Christian News never received any response from the Anti-Defamation League and, as far as I know, *The Christian News* is still on the ADL’s list of hate and racist publications.

Two hoaxes often promoted by Christians are closely linked. According to one of them, Jesus Christ will establish a kingdom of peace on this earth and reign from Jerusalem for a thousand years. The other hoax represents the contemporary State of Israel as the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy.

Space does not permit me to show how widely Millennialism has infiltrated the fundamentalist, charismatic, evangelical and Reconstructionist movements. Such prominent churchmen as Jerry Falwell, Oral Roberts, Pat

Robertson, Dave Hunt, Carl McIntire, Rousas Rushdoony, Gary North, Robert Sumner, Billy Graham, Jimmy Swaggart, Jim Bakker, Hal Lindsey, and many others are all Millennialists of one sort or another. The State of Israel has welcomed the Israel First Milliennialists, who believe the State of Israel a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy, with open arms.

Millennialists often disagree with one another. Some of the hoaxes the Millennialists promote are rather bizarre. Hal Lindsey, the author of the bestselling *Late Great Planet Earth* (more than 20 million copies) says, in his *A Prophetical Walk Through the Holy Land*, that there will be such a terrific battle in Israel, involving hundreds of millions, that blood will flow up to the horses' bridles for 200 miles. Lindsey's book includes a map showing where this wide tide of blood will flow up to the horses' bridles for 200 miles. Lindsey and other Millennialists are quoted at considerable length in the CNE.¹⁸

Anyone who wants documents showing that the whole of Millennialism is a dangerous, anti-scriptural hoax, should consult *The Christian News Encyclopedia*.¹⁹

The Augsburg Confession, one of the confessions of the orthodox Lutheran Church, stated it well when it referred to the Millennialists of the Sixteenth Century as those who were spreading certain "Jewish opinions." The Augsburg Confession says in Article XVII:

Also they teach that at the Consummation of the World Christ will appear for judgment, and will raise up all the dead; he will give to the godly and elect eternal life and everlasting joys, but ungodly men and the devils He will condemn to be tormented without end.

They condemn the Anabaptists, who think that there will be an end to the punishment of the condemned men and devils.

They condemn also others, who are now spreading certain Jewish opinions, that before the resurrection of the dead the godly shall take possession of the kingdom of the world, the ungodly being everywhere suppressed.²⁰

The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in its Brief Statement correctly confesses after listing numerous Bible passages: "According to these clear passages of Scripture we reject the whole of Millennialism, since it not only contradicts Scripture, but also engenders a false conception of the kingdom of Christ, turns the hope of Christians upon earthly

goals, (1 Cor. 15:19; Col. 3:2), and leads them to look upon the Bible as an obscure book.”²¹

Another widespread delusion among Christians is that today’s Jews view the Old Testament in the same way as Christians, and that the Old Testament is the chief Jewish scriptural authority.

Jews today insist that the Talmud is their highest religious authority. They consider it to be far more authoritative than the Old Testament. When I was in Israel last year, various Israeli guides and leaders repeatedly told me that the Talmud was their most authoritative source of religious truth. A new translation of the Talmud is now in the process of publication.

The *Christian News Encyclopedia* includes some 160 pages from the 34-volume Socino edition of the Talmud.²² Few churchmen have studied the Talmud. Hardly anyone at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, has checked out the edition of the Talmud in the seminary’s library. Almost all the pastors and professors we asked about the Talmud say they had not read even a few pages.

Those who have read what Luther wrote about the Talmud should have at least some idea of the gross immorality and lies found in the Talmud. Fifty and more years ago some of the orthodox theologians of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, such as Lutheran Hour speaker Walter A. Maier, did not hesitate to point out the lies, racism, and immorality in the Talmud. The standard of morality promoted in the Talmud gives Israel the right to take land away from Arabs who have owned it for centuries. Today it seems that even many conservative theologians hesitate to expose the Talmud for “fear of the Jews.”

The Talmud reports that the Emperor Hadrian slaughtered some 800,000,000 million Jews at a time when most historians say there were about 2,000,000 Jews in Palestine. Gentiles are said to have fertilized their vineyards for seven years with the blood of Israel without using manure. Sixty-four million Jewish children, according to the Talmud, are supposed to have been slaughtered by the Gentiles in Bethar. Another section of the Talmud says that the Romans killed 4 billion Jews or “as some say” 40 million Jews. The blood of the slain Jews is to have reached the nostrils of the Roman horses and then, like a tidal wave, plunged a distance of one or four miles to the sea, carrying large boulders along with it, and staining

the sea a distance of four miles out. The bodies of Jews slain by the Gentiles were used to build a fence around Hadrian's vineyard, which is said to have been eighteen miles square, and the blood that was saved from the tidal wave was used to fertilize the vineyards for seven years.²³

Most Jews today are scarcely familiar with the Old Testament. They reject the real message of the Old Testament, the Messiah, Jesus Christ, and salvation only in Him.

The Roman Catholic church has long maintained that some of its saints have been able to raise people from the dead and that the Virgin Mary appears to some of them. An advertisement of *Raised From The Dead, True Stories of 400 Resurrection Miracles* by Father Albert J. Hebert, a book which has the imprimatur of Rome, says:

The raising of the dead is a miracle which, astonishing as it is, has been performed hundreds of times since the days of Christ. Our Lord told His Apostles to raise the dead (Matt. 10:8), and over the centuries many saints have done so—particularly great missionaries like St. Francis Xavier, St. Patrick, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Hyacinth, and St. Louis Bertrand, but also a multitude of other saints. The stories of these resurrection miracles are amazing: they include the raising of persons who had drowned, or persons with mutilated bodies, of persons who had been hanged, and of those whose bodies had already suffered decay, been reduced to skeletons, or been buried for several years.²⁴

Some Charismatics have requested us to publish their reports about Charismatics raising people from the dead. We asked them for the evidence but they never supplied us with any. Kenneth Copeland, a Charismatic who denies the deity of Christ and speaks in tongues, reports in his April, 1987 *Voice of Victory* that a leading African Charismatic has raised seven people from the dead.²⁵

Oral Roberts, one of the leading Charismatics of our day, says that he has spoken face to face with a 900-foot Jesus. Roberts and other Charismatics continually claim that God speaks directly to them, particularly when they are in need of money. There are millions who believe this hoax.

Dr. Percy Collett, who has been widely promoted by Charismatics, including the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship, claims that for almost six days he was literally in heaven. An advertisement prompting Collett says: "For 5½ earth

days he talked with God the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit. Elijah, Elisha, Abraham, Moses, Paul and others. He viewed the mansions of the saints, and toured the buildings NOW under construction."²⁶

Dr. Richard E. Eby, who claims that after he died Jesus sent him back to earth to tell people the truth, is now being promoted by charismatics. The Charismatic Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship says that:

In 1972, Dr. Eby fell two stories to his death. His blood had drained out into the ground from his crushed skull. He was instantly in a new body with the Lord. He shares this unique experience in Heaven with Jesus Christ as well as the dramatic return to life in his earthly body. He describes the marvels of life after death, and as a physician he includes a vivid description of his immortal body. Jesus sent him back to earth to tell the truth. Everyone has wondered about life after death—is it true? Where will I go? Is there really a Heaven? A Hell? This is your opportunity to meet someone who has actually experienced death and restoration, and find the truth for yourself.

Jimmy Swaggart, one of the tongues-speaking and healing Charismatics who has promoted Collett, said:

... you are going to be literally elated, excited and thrilled at what Dr. Collett is going to share. I could talk to this man for 10 years and never scratch the surface—what he saw, what has happened to him, and the move of the Holy Spirit, within his life . . . He has thrilled my soul and I think he's going to thrill yours as well . . .²⁷

The *Christian News* has for many years exposed the hoaxes promoted by such leading Charismatic preachers as Oral Roberts, Kathryn Kuhlmann, Jim Bakker, Jimmy Swaggart, Kenneth Copeland, Jack Coe, and others.²⁸

God speaks to man today through His Word, Holy Scripture, which is powerful and efficacious.²⁹

The Charismatics, and visionaries who accept the testimony of those who claim the Virgin Mary spoke to them at Fatima, Medujmorje, and elsewhere have been among those who accepted the Shroud of Turin as the Shroud of Jesus. However, even some conservative and evangelical Christians also believed the Shroud of Turin was the Shroud of Jesus, as we noted in a *Christian News* editorial titled: "Admit Mistakes—Even Some Conservatives Believed in Hoaxes—Recognize the Shroud of Turin is not Shroud of Jesus."³⁰

Millions of pilgrims have gone to Turin and many of them claim to have witnessed miracles. Such conservative publications as William Buckley's *National Review*, Billy James Hargis' *Christian Crusade*, *Human Events*, and even such scientific journals as the *American Medical News* and the *Industrial Research Development* have published articles and editorials supporting the hoax that the Shroud of Turin is the Shroud of Jesus. Some of our conservative friends took sharp issue with us for maintaining that the Shroud of Jesus was not the Shroud of Turin.

Rev. Jeff Gavin, a Lutheran Church-Missouri minister in Dacatur, Illinois, commented:

I am writing to comment on your article "The Shroud of Turin Is A Hoax," April 12, 1982.

I never considered *The Saturday Evening Post* to be a theological publication, yet compared to your article and your "scholarship" it appears I must reconsider my evaluation of the *Post*.

For some years, I have been interested in the Shroud, and must agree with the *Post's* conclusion "The man of the Shroud suffered, died and was buried the way the Gospels say Jesus was." You neglect to mention that Dr. McCrone was the only dissenting scientist among the STURP team of 40 scientists. The conclusion reached by the others all indicated that the Shroud cannot be a proven a hoax. What Dr. McCrone did find on the Shroud was not paint but iron oxide, a substance found in paint but also found in blood.

The amount of physical support for the authenticity of the shroud has filled many books and articles. I suggest you study some of them before you make your own conclusions.

Let me conclude by quoting a Biblical scholar far more knowledgeable than either of us. Dr. David P. Scaer of the Concordia Theological Seminary writes concerning the Shroud of Turin in an article in the C.T.Q. [*Concordia Theological Quarterly*] Jan. 1979 issue: "The image on the Shroud of Jesus portrayed in the Gospels . . . there is therefore no valid theological objection to identification of the Shroud of Turin as the Shroud in which Jesus was buried.

While we have often commended the *Concordia Theological Quarterly* (formerly *The Springfielder*) and have urged readers to subscribe (*Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 6600 North Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825), we still insisted that the Shroud of Turin was not the Shroud of Jesus. We did not retract our editorials on the shroud being a hoax simply

because various scientists and even some orthodox Christian professors concluded that the Shroud of Turin may very well be the Shroud of Jesus. The Shroud of Turin is not the only hoax some orthodox Christians accept as fact.

The October 14, 1988, *Washington Times* reported in a story titled "Triple Testing Finds Shroud Medieval Fake:"

Turin, Italy—The Shroud of Turin, revered by many Christians as the burial cloth of Jesus Christ, has been shown by carbon-dating tests to be a fake from the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic church said yesterday.

But Vatican officials said the mystery of how the blood-stained image of a crucified man has appeared on the yellowing cloth was still unsolved and the shroud would remain an object of veneration for the Church.

Turin Cardinal Anastasio Ballestrero told a news conference that tests by three laboratories—in England, the United States and Switzerland—showed with 95 per cent certainty that the cloth dated from sometime between 1260 and 1390.

The results of the carbon-dating tests should again show the folly of accepting as fact all the stories of visions, healings, relics, etc., which Rome, the charismatics, and even some misguided churchmen at times promote. Christians should not accept any hoax as a fact.

Other hoaxes *The Christian News* has exposed include the "new morality" and "situation ethics," the idea that sinful acts are permissible in various situations, thus superseding the teaching of the Bible. The veneration accorded such unrepentant adulterers as Paul Tillich and Martin Luther King, Jr. shows to what extent many within the various churches have swallowed these unscriptural notions.

Last but certainly not least among the hoaxes exposed in *The Christian News* is the Holocaust, the alleged slaughter of some six million Jews, most of them by gassing, in a planned attempt at extermination by the German government in the Second World War. Those not familiar with *The Christian News* may be surprised to learn that we have published hundreds of items supporting the Holocaust theory, and numerous letters defending the case for the Holocaust.³¹

The Revisionist Side

While *The Christian News* has given those who are convinced that the Germans exterminated six million Jews plenty of space to defend their position, the paper has also

published a good number of articles, letters, and reports by Revisionists who question the Holocaust story. Some of these articles, in the sections on the Holocaust, Revisionism, Israel, Jews, Germany, Millennialism, and Germany, have been reprinted in the *Christian News Encyclopedia*. We have included photographs of various documents pertaining to the Holocaust.

My father was a friend of Dr. Austin App, a Christian Revisionist honored at your conference last year. When Dr. App published his booklets on the Holocaust, he sent us copies and they were reviewed in *The Christian News* at a time when others hesitated to even mention them.³¹ We also published a long statement from a liberal pastor who took issue with Dr. App, and then printed Dr. App's response.³²

Some of the Revisionists whose writings have appeared in *The Christian News* are Mark Weber, Arthur Butz, Bradley Smith, Charles Weber, Jim Keegstra, Clarence Lang, Ernst Zündel, Walter Bodenstein, Robert Faurisson, Ratibor Ray M. Jurjevich, Martin A. Larson, William Stäglich, and Ditlieb Felderer.³³ We have repeatedly invited readers who disagree with the Revisionists to send us articles and letters showing where the Revisionists are in error. Many of our readers, some tell us the vast majority, including most of the thousands of clergymen and professors who receive *The Christian News*, accept as absolute fact that the Germans exterminated approximately 6 million Jews during World War II. We have noted, however, that some, particularly among our younger readers, are seriously questioning the Holocaust.

Last year when *The Christian News* reviewed Thies Christophersen's *The Truth of Auschwitz*, *The Christian News* published this special notice:

If any reader knows of someone who was at Auschwitz who is able to refute Thies Christophersen, or anyone who can show that Christophersen is either lying or sadly mistaken, please contact *The Christian News*. *The Christian News* is particularly interested in publishing a statement from someone who actually saw the gas chambers at Auschwitz, where some four million Jews are said to have been gassed by the Germans.³⁴

Christophersen was at Auschwitz when the Germans were supposed to be gassing millions of Jews, and states that there were no gas chambers and no mass extermination of Jews in Auschwitz.

Fred Leuchter, one of the leading U.S. experts in the construction of gas chambers, accepted the notion that the

Germans exterminated some six million Jews before he made a thorough examination of the matter last year. "The Leuchter Report—the End of a Myth—An Engineering Report on the Alleged Gas Chamber at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdenek, Poland" sets out the methodology and findings of the actual sites in Poland where the gassings were alleged to have occurred. Luechter's conclusion, after inspecting the sites and analyzing samples taken from walls and floors for total cyanide content, was unambiguous: the alleged gas chambers could not have been used, then or now, as execution gas chambers.

The publisher of the "Leuchter Report" comments (CNE, 2363):

David Irving, the distinguished British historian, has called the "Leuchter Report" a "shattering" document which was instrumental in hardening his belief that the whole of the Holocaust mythology was now open to doubt. It is a document which "Holocaust" historians can ignore only at the peril to their reputations as objective scholars. After the "Leuchter Report," the allegation of genocide perpetrated by the Germans against the Jews, using gas chambers as murder instruments, can no longer be upheld.

When *The Christian News* published a report on the Leuchter document, *The Christian News* noted:

Christian News welcomes a critique from anyone who still believes the Germans gassed six million Jews after he has read the "Leuchter Report." We have made similar offers to those who still believe in the Holocaust after they have read the words of Faurisson, Rassinier, Butz, Stäglich, and Feldereer. We have repeatedly discovered that those who believe the Germans gassed six million Jews have seldom read the writings of the scholars who maintain there were no gas chambers for the extermination of even a few Jews" (*The Christian News*, July 18, 1988).

Faurisson concludes his "The Problem of the Gas Chambers":

There was not a single "gas chamber" in even one of the German concentration camps; that is the truth. The non-existence of "gas chambers" should be regarded as welcome news; to hide this news in the future would be an injustice. Just as there is no attack upon religion if one portrays "Fatima" as a fraud, the announcement that the "gas chambers" are an historical lie is not an attack upon concentration camp survivors. One is merely doing one's duty by being truthful.

When *The Christian News* reviewed Wilhelm Stäglich's *Auschwitz Myth*, we made a similar challenge:

The Christian News now invites a response from anyone who can show that Wilhelm Stäglich's *The Auschwitz Myth* is in error. We would like to publish a review from anyone who has read the book and still believes that the Germans gassed four million Jews at Auschwitz.³⁵

No critic of the writings of such Revisionists as Arthur Butz, Charles Weber, Robert Faurisson, Wilhelm Stäglich, and Thies Christophersen has ever sent us any statement showing where their writings are in error.

The Christian News has insisted upon careful documentation and has always been willing to publish the other side in any matter. It is possible for even a careful scholar to use an oft-quoted statement without first checking its authenticity. In the past we have noted that quotations can be spuriously transferred from one writer to another. One of the first quotations we exposed as a phony was one which anti-Communists were quoting at the time. American Communist leader Gus Hall is supposed to have said, at the funeral of Eugene Dennis in 1961, "I dream of the hour when the last congressman is strangled on the guts of the last preacher . . ."

Our efforts to acquire any information which would refute the Revisionists have been sincere. We wrote to both Dr. Jacob Preus, former president of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and Rev. Richard Neuhaus, a prominent churchman, columnist for *National Review*, and editor of other publications, on April 3, 1984:

This year April 24 is the Annual Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust. Both of you have been among the Lutheran churchmen who have endorsed the idea of Holocaust Sunday . . . You have insisted that it is a fact that some six million Jews were killed by the Germans.

The Christian News has published a debate on Luther, the Jews, and the Holocaust. You will note that Pastor R.H. Goetjen maintains that the Holocaust never happened. He claims that Jews say far more ruthless things about Christians in their Talmud than Luther ever said about the Jews. We are inviting you to respond to what Pastor Goetjen says. We would appreciate if you could tell us the sources of your evidence that the Holocaust did occur.

Neither President Preus nor Editor Neuhaus responded.

Fostering Debate on the Holocaust

Five years ago *The Christian News* published a front page article entitled "The Christian News Invites Moellering and Goetjen to 'Debate'—Theologian Blasts Critics of Holocaust—Deplores Luther's 'Anti-Jewish Tirades.'" It began:

"Nothing has been more detrimental to the reformer's reputation than his anti-Jewish tirade," says Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod theologian Dr. Ralph Moellering in the January, 1984 *Cresset* of Valparaiso University.

Writing in an article titled "Lutheranism and the Holocaust—The Question of Culpability," the LCMS clergyman, who is currently the pastor of Grace Lutheran Church in El Cerrito, California, takes issue with some "crazies!" These "crazies" do not believe that the Germans actually exterminated some six million Jews. They excuse Luther's harsh words against Jews because of what the Jews say in their Talmud about Christ, Gentiles, Christians, and the Virgin Mary. Moellering observes that some of these "fanatics help keep alive belief in an international Jewish conspiracy dedicated to the undermining of Gentile civilization . . ."³⁶

One of the supposed "crazies" Moellering mentioned was Rev. Reinhold Goetjen. He referred to a letter Goetjen had written to *The Christian News*.³⁷ The Christian News invited both Moellering and Goetjen to submit essays of some 5,000 words on Luther, the Jews, and the Talmud. We invited each to submit their evidence for or against the truthfulness of the reports of the extermination of some six million Jews. The lengthy essays both submitted have been reprinted in the CNE. Goetjen sent us a rebuttal to Moellering's essay, but Moellering failed to respond to what Goetjen said about the Talmud and the Holocaust.³⁸ At the time Moellering wrote his essay, he had not read what the leading Revisionist scholars have written on the Holocaust.

Two years ago, the Rev. Mark Herbener, who is a member of the Board of Directors of the Dallas Memorial Center for Holocaust Studies and who is now a bishop in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, took sharp issue with us for publishing what Revisionists were saying about the Holocaust. He said he had been sending copies of *The Christian News* to such groups as the Anti-Defamation League. We welcomed the bishop's letter and made this proposal:

The Holocaust is being debated in various European countries. Let's set up a debate on the Holocaust which will

receive attention all over the U.S. Now would be a good time. Newspapers throughout the nation are mentioning the Holocaust in their reports of the current Demjanjuk trial in Israel.

Could your Memorial Center for Holocaust Studies get Nobel Prize winner Elie Wiesel, who is perhaps the chief spokesman for the Holocaust, to debate one of the leading Revisionists who claims the Holocaust is a hoax and that the Germans never gassed six million Jews?

If you are unable to get Elie Wiesel or someone else to debate the Holocaust, then perhaps you or someone else familiar with the arguments of the Revisionists could debate the same subject in *The Christian News*. *The Christian News* will give each side 6,000 words to present its case, 3,000 words to respond to the opposition, and then 1,000 words for a rebuttal to the response. If you can think of a fairer arrangement, please let me know. *The Christian News* wants to be as fair as possible to both sides.³⁹

Bishop Herbener refused to debate the Holocaust, declaring that "your proposition to debate has only wickedness in its intent."⁴⁰

In our response to the Bishop we included this statement:

The next issue of *The Christian News* will include some quotations from Wilhelm Stäglich's *The Auschwitz Myth*. An English translation of this book has just been published in this country. We welcome a thorough refutation of this book by your Center for Holocaust Studies. Perhaps you could persuade Elie Wiesel to review the book if he is unable to travel to Dallas to debate the Holocaust.

The Bishop responded:

I understand what you are after and I call it "wicked." It is called "Jew-baiting." It is one of the rankest forms of anti-Semitism I have seen. It is closely akin to racism, the kind of racism that produced the Holocaust in Germany . . .

The Bishop complained that if we had been sincere about getting the real facts on the Holocaust we would have suggested a debate with some Holocaust historians rather than an author like Elie Wiesel. We responded:

We suggested that your Center for Holocaust Studies get Elie Wiesel to debate, since his is known as the chief spokesman for the remembrance of the Holocaust and the leader of the Exterminationist viewpoint. However, if you can get Raul Hilberg, John Pawlikowski, Eva Fleischner, Byron Sherwin, or

Sybil Milton to debate with any of the leading Revisionists, that would be fine with us. Could you please contact them to see whether they would be willing to debate the Revisionists? It doesn't make any difference to us whom you get to defend your notion that the Germans gassed some six million Jews during World War II.⁴¹

We asked the Bishop some questions he had previously refused to answer:

1. Do you believe that Jews were gassed at Dachau during the war years, as was alleged at Nuremberg and elsewhere, or do you now concede that this story is not true? If you reject this story, why do you believe that the evidence at Dachau is less credible than the evidence for gassings at Auschwitz, Sobibor, and the other camps?

2. Do you believe the evidence that Jews were steamed at Treblinka? If so, why do you think that Holocaust historians now reject that evidence. If not, why not? Is the evidence for "steam chambers" any less credible than the evidence for "gas chambers?"

3. Do you believe the story that the Germans manufactured bars of soap from Jewish corpses during the war? If so, why do you think that Holocaust historians now reject the story? If not, are you ready to condemn those who spread this story as liars or misinformed defamers?

4. The prominent Jewish and former Auschwitz inmate Elie Wiesel wrote in his book, *Legends of Our Time*: "Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate—for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German." Do you agree with Wiesel?

5. Do you agree that spreading and supporting lies about the German nation and people is a violation of the commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor?"

Bishop Herbener was either unable or unwilling to answer these questions. IHR editorial advisor Mark Weber's "Open Letter to the Rev. Mark Herbener," which appeared both in *The Christian News* and *The Journal of Historical Review* (Summer 1988), presented a brief and lucid case for Holocaust Revisionism.

The April 13, 1987 *Christian News*, which published the challenges from "The Committee For Open Debate on the Holocaust," included an editorial which said:

The Christian News is sent to many church leaders, scholars, and professors who maintain that the Germans gassed about

six million Jews. We hope some of them will accept the offer to debate or urge some scholar they know to accept the offer. We would appreciate it if those who accept the offer of the "Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust" would send us a copy of their acceptance. We have no association with their committee and want to make certain that both sides receive fair treatment.

Perhaps we should also note that there appears to be a growing number of informed churchmen and scholars who no longer accept the Holocaust. However, some of them have warned us that the subject is too dangerous for *The Christian News*, even if we agree to give both sides equal opportunity to express their views.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center of Los Angeles was quick to reply. After accusing the Committee for Open Debate and the Institute for Historical Review of being "neo-Nazi," the Center told *The Christian News* that it is an absolute historical fact that the Germans gassed some six million Jews during WW II. When *The Christian News* suggested that the Simon Wiesenthal Center accept the challenge from the Committee for an Open Debate of the Holocaust, a spokesman for the center told *The Christian News* that just as Dr. Jonas Salk, the discoverer of polio vaccine, would never debate with a witch doctor, so the reputable historians and scholars at the Simon Wiesenthal Center would never debate with anyone who questions that the Germans gassed some six million Jews. According to the center, the gassing of the six million Jews is so certain as to be beyond debate.

The Simon Wiesenthal Centers' chief response was to tell a newspaper in the New Haven area that *The Christian News* was publishing material from a neo-Nazi group when it published a challenge to debate the Holocaust from "The Committee For Open Debate on the Holocaust."

Dr. Harry James Cargas of Webster University in St. Louis lectures widely on the Holocaust and is known as a fearless defender of the thesis that the Germans exterminated some six million Jews. Dr. Cargas wrote in the June 26, 1987 *St. Louis Dispatch*:

Adolph [sic] Hitler tried to implement the goal of eliminating all of the world's Jews. He died on the tax rolls of the Catholic Church, never having been excommunicated . . . The silence of Pope Pius XII regarding the murder of Jews is a scandal.

The Christian News wrote to Cargas:

We have been informed that you are one of the leading Holocaust scholars in the nation and that you have written several books on the subject.

The *Christian News* has just received the enclosed manuscript from the "Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust" and has been asked to publish it. (CNE, 2018)

However, we would like to give you or some other Holocaust scholar you know an opportunity to respond. Would it be possible for you to send us a response by September 10 for our September 14 issue? Possibly you already have an essay which answers those who question whether the Germans actually gassed some six million Jews during WW II . . .

Are you willing to debate the Holocaust in a forum with someone from the "Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust"? The *Christian News* would like to print the transcript of such a debate, particularly at the present time when the Holocaust and the Demjanjuk trial are so much in the news.

Dr. Cargas refused to send us an essay responding to the article we sent him from the Committee for an Open Debate of the Holocaust. He wrote: "I am not stupid—which I would be if I engaged in any discussion of the validity of the Holocaust."⁴²

Peglau Answers the Challenge

"Peglau Takes Up Gauntlet Against Revisionism—'DEBATE OF THE CENTURY' IS ON!" A news release from the self-styled Exterminators of Revisionism, which appeared in the March 7, 1988 *Christian News*, said in part:

Defense attorney Glen Louis Peglau has informed *The Christian News* that he and a team of lawyers, theologians and congressmen are challenging the leadership of the Revisionist movement, who say the Holocaust never happened, to an open debate in Washington, D.C. in mid-February, 1989.

It is already being billed as the "Debate of the Century" by pro-Holocaust supporters. Peglau and his team will take the position that over 6,000,000 Jews were murdered by the Nazis during the reign of the "3rd Reich" in the 1930's and 1/2 of the 1940's.

It is high time we prove beyond a reasonable doubt before the whole world, in open debate before the global media, that the Holocaust was a real part of history. This must be done now to stop the ridiculous contentions of the Revisionists that the Holocaust is only a figment of the Zionists' imagination. Their anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi propaganda must be stopped in this generation.

"It was because *The Christian News* began a focus on the issue of the Revisionist claims that we decided to silence their ridiculous claims for all history. To say the Holocaust never existed is like saying World War II never happened. This whole Revisionist position is motivated by a pro-Nazi, anti-Semitic mentality that can no longer be tolerated in the world. The distorting of history is an affront to the whole human race. Even though Stalin murdered more human beings than Hitler did it was Hitler's intent to stamp out a whole race of people in one generation . . .

"Two months ago the editor of *The Christian News* and I interviewed for television a fine West German pastor who confessed that the Nazis had killed over 6,000,000 Jews in concentration camps . . .

"It is also doubtful in my mind whether the Revisionists can get one responsible theologian on their side. I assure you we will have at least four of the most responsible, conservative, Bible-believing theologians on our side. These men are godly men who are above reproach. One of them may not only be a theologian, but an attorney as well, Peglau explained . . .

"History will always owe a debt to the editor of *The Christian News* for his bringing the issue of the Holocaust, and the Revisionist position, to the attention of the world, and specifically to the attention of Bible-believing Christians who haven't fallen for the nonsense Revisionists have promulgated.⁴³

This news release from the self-proclaimed Exterminators of Revisionism in the April 4, 1988 *Christian News* reported, in part:

Attorney Glen L. Peglau announced that America's best-selling Christian author, Hal Lindsey, has agreed to be one of the debaters in the "Debate of the Century" in Washington, D.C. in mid-February, 1989, on the side of those that support the fact that over 6,000,000 Jews were slaughtered by the "Third Reich" in the reign of Adolf Hitler . . .

Dr. Lindsey is the most widely read Christian author in all of history . . .

The Revisionists only want three or four debaters on each side of the debate. Peglau has asked for 15 debaters to be on each side of the Holocaust issue. Attorney Peglau believes that Revisionists cannot get 15 scholarly debaters for their position in the debate . . .

Peglau is indeed on a course to get the greatest Christian scholars in the West to take up the cause of the Holocaust for "The Debate of the Century." It looks like Peglau is putting together the best in Christendom.⁴⁴

“Debate of the Century’ Peglau Selects Anderson As Final Debater,” a press release from the Committee to Exterminate Revisionism in the October 30, 1988 *Christian News* noted:

Defense Attorney Glen Peglau has finalized his debating team with the addition of the renowned Palm Springs, California attorney Thomas A. Anderson.

According to Peglau:

Attorney Anderson is a Christian lawyer who has served as the president of the California Trial Lawyers Association.

Anderson is a brilliant lawyer who, Peglau states, is one of the three ranking top lawyers in California, along with Melvin Belli and Marvin Michelson. Anderson is considered one of the leading debaters in modern history. Anderson is a close personal friend of Christian apologist Josh McDowell. Anderson is a lawyer's lawyer who anybody is afraid to take on in a court room. We've two of the great lawyers in modern history with Anderson and Montgomery on our team. Hal Lindsey's track record of over 50,000,000 of his books being sold speaks for itself.

Honestly Seeking the Truth

The Christian News has attempted to be fair to both sides in this debate by printing their news releases exactly as they send them to us. We commented in the March 21, 1988 *Christian News* in an editorial on the debate:

The Christian News commends both the “Extermiantors of Revisionism” and the Revisionists for agreeing to debate. It is true that *The Christian News* has had much more contact with members of The Committee for Extermination of Revisionism and with others who believe the Germans gassed some six million Jews during World War II. Several of them have for years contributed many articles to *The Christian News*. On the other hand, we have not met any of the leading Revisionists and really only know some of them through their writings. Years ago we met the top executive of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and we have spoken on the phone with a spokesman for the Simon Wiesenthal Center and with Mr. Mark Weber of the Committee for the Open Debate of the Holocaust.

We have confidence in the integrity and honesty of the debaters Attorney Peglau has said will defend the position that the Germans gassed some six million Jews during World War II. We are in accord with the theological position of most of them. While we certainly take issue with the theology of some

of the Revisionists who have sent us material for publication, we have no reason to question their honesty. Some Revisionists are atheists, others accept the anti-scriptural and unscientific myth of evolution and, as Peglau has correctly observed, do not believe the Bible. A good number of Revisionists appear to be taking a rather cynical attitude toward Christian theologians who insist that the evidence clearly indicates that the Germans Gassed six million Jews during World War II. They question the ability of these theologians to think clearly and properly evaluate evidence . . .

We hope that both sides in this debate will keep it on a calm, low key level, where neither side resorts to emotionalism to win but where both sides carefully look at the evidence. Logic and clear facts and not feelings should govern the conduct of both sides. Honest men are persuaded by facts not by some docudramas they see on television.

Now is a good time to carefully examine the evidence for the gassing of some six million Jews. Enough years have passed to minimize the emotionalism which prevails after every war and yet we are still close enough to WW II to establish what really happened. This is not some minor peripheral issue. The support Israel receives is based to a large extent upon the reality of the Holocaust. The leadership of major denominations in our nation urge thousands of congregations to conduct worship services which call to remembrance the gassing of six million Jews by the Germans. The Holocaust is being used as one reason various Germans, Ukrainians and other Eastern Europeans should be sent back to Communist nations.

Perhaps it would be well if both sides in the debate submit to the other side several months before the debate any documents they intend to introduce. This way all will have the opportunity to check the authenticity of the document. Such a policy could also save considerable time. While this may not be the practice followed in many debates, we consider the "Debate of the Century" to be different than many debates. Both sides should only be interested in the truth and not in winning some debate. Both sides should follow *The Christian New's* long-standing motto: "Put all the facts on the table and let the chips fall where they may."

After the debate is over, we hope that one side or the other will have the courage to say to the other: "Thanks. We appreciate that you have shown us the truth. We regret that we have been so sadly misled all these years and we will do our best to see that from now on only the truth is told about the Holocaust."⁴⁵

A Thwarted Proposal for Debate

February 15, 1989

Mr. Glen Peglau, Chairman
Committee For the Extermination of Revisionism
67660 Quijo
Palm Springs, California 92264
Mr. Mark Weber and Mr. Bradley Smith
Committee For Open Debate On the Holocaust
Box 931098
Los Angeles, CA 90093

Dear Gentlemen:

Mr. Glen Peglau has just informed us that there may not be a debate on the Holocaust in February 21 in Torrance. According to Mr. Peglau, a team of three members of the Police Intelligence Division visited Pastor Wilbur Wacker and Hal Lindsey and "inferred" a "bomb threat." Mr. Peglau said that this was the first time such a police committee ever visited Hal Lindsey and because of the "inferred" bomb threat Lindsey has "been through hell and back."

Mr. Peglau said he was extremely embarrassed for putting Pastor Wilbur Wacker into so much difficulty and danger. Mr. Peglau expects a riot in front of Pastor Wacker's church if the debate is held as planned. He also noted that the other members of his team will be in court the day of the debate. While Mr. Peglau said he had no evidence as to who was "inferring" the alleged "bomb threat," he repeatedly emphasized that it was not the Jewish Defense League or "the Jews." While he said some "leading Jews" asked him not to go ahead with the debate, he said there was a "small minority" of Jews who thought it would be in order for him to go ahead with the debate.

Mr. Peglau said that in no way should the refusal of his committee to appear at the debate on February 21 be interpreted as a refusal to debate the Holocaust. He told us that he was now proposing a September 23 date for the debate at a secluded place in Palm Springs where there would be no danger of any riot of bomb threats. He said that Dr. John Montgomery and Hal Lindsey are still thoroughly convinced of their position that the Germans exterminated some six million Jews and are eager to face the Revisionists and answer their arguments. Mr. Peglau noted that perhaps Bible scholar and "genius" Walter Martin will take Attorney Anderson's place in the debate.

Since I was not entirely certain what was going to happen, I made the following proposal to Mr. Peglau without mentioning the dates:

Christian News in its issue of April 3, 1989 will publish a 5,000 word (approximately) statement from each of the four debaters of both sides. Each side will then have about 20,000 words.

The May *Christian News* will publish a response of approximately 10,000 words from each team to the other side. The space can be divided up in whichever way a team may decide.

The June 5 *Christian News* will then publish a rebuttal to the response of each team from the opposing team. This statement should be no longer than 5,000 words.

Christian News should have the copy six days before the publication date.

Such an approach will give each side time to contact experts for resource information to refute the other side. The Exterminationists, for example, could consult the Simon Wiesenthal Center, such authorities as Raul Hilberg, the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum or any other place which claims to have material to refute the Revisionists.

Mr. Peglau agreed to this proposal of a written "debate" whether or not you gentlemen are ever able to get together for a debate face to face.

It appears to me that a bomb threat should not prevent a debate, but Mr. Peglau said it was a life threatening matter and that he had a family to care for.

I will leave it up to you gentlemen to contact the various members of your team with this proposal. If the time schedule is not acceptable or if you have some suggestions to improve the format, please let us know. I would also appreciate it if the Revisionists would let us know if they, along with Mr. Peglau and the Exterminationists, will participate in the written debate we are now proposing.

Sincerely yours,

Herman Otten

P.S. If one side in this "debate" sends us its statements and the other does not, we will still publish the statements we receive.

[The "Exterminationists of Revisionism" did not show up for the debate. Dr. Faurisson, Dr. Countess, Mark Weber and Bradley Smith presented the Revisionist case to four empty

Revisionists and Exterminationists

The Christian News has probably published more material and reports from those who are convinced the Germans exterminated some six million Jews than any other religious newspaper. *The Christian News* has repeatedly invited those who are convinced that this Holocaust is a fact to send us their evidence. We have published what they have sent. Last year, when we were in Israel as a guest of Israel, we visited Yad Vashem and saw the "evidence" there for the Holocaust. Throughout our school years and entire ministry most of our teachers and associates have accepted the Holocaust as fact. As far as I know this is probably the first time I have spoken to a group where the majority probably does not believe the Germans gassed some six million Jews.

While Revisionists have responded to the writings and evidence of the Exterminationists have presented, the Exterminationists seldom respond to the writings of the Revisionists. An Exterminationist like Dr. John Warwick Montgomery considers them rather unscholarly and like the works of the "flat earth" society people, even though when he made this analysis he had not yet read the scholarly writings of such leading Revisionists as Arthur Butz, Wilhelm Stäglich, Robert Faurisson, Mark Weber, Charles Weber, Paul Rassinier, Harry Elmer Barnes, Clarence Lang, Ernst Zündel, Austin App, et al. Dr. Montgomery is not alone, among those who believe the Germans exterminated six million Jews, in having read very little of what the Revisionists have written.

The real Revisionist scholars, on the other hand, show in their writings that they are thoroughly familiar with the works of the Exterminationists.

I have repeatedly asked theologians and pastors who say they are convinced that the Germans gassed six million Jews, if they have read any of the writings of the Revisionists. Most admit they have not. Even a good number of our conservative friends who subscribe to *The Christian News* and who believe in the Holocaust say they don't have time to read the articles by Revisionists in *The Christian News*. They claim they already know the truth about the Holocaust, so "why waste time" reading about it.

chairs, an audience of over one hundred people, and Los Angeles press on February 21 at the Quality Inn in Torrance, California. —Ed.]

They tell us that they have seen enough TV programs on the subject to know that the Germans exterminated six million Jews. Forty years ago, when we tried to tell our professors and some clergymen the truth about Pearl Harbor, WW II, and forced repatriation of thousands back to the Communists, we found out how uninformed intelligent professors and pastors could be. Thirty-five years ago we discovered how uninformed church officials could be about what was being taught at seminaries and colleges they promoted. As the years went by we discovered how modern man, with all his scientific research and great learning, could still fall for the hoaxes we have mentioned in this essay, one of which is clearly what is now referred to as the Holocaust.

While most Revisionists appear to be opposed to the construction of the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C., right next to some of our nation's most cherished monuments, I say let it be built! One day it will serve as a monument to the stupidity of modern man, who can still accept a hoax as a fact. Hopefully it will then serve as a reminder to study all the facts and evidence and repudiate all hoaxes.

The day is surely coming when all the evidence showing that the Germans never exterminated six million Jews can no longer be suppressed. Truth is not determined by majority vote. I learned this lesson in high school, and since then have repeatedly discovered how the majority of scholars, even within our churches, can be in error. That our presidents, senators and congressmen all are supposed to be convinced that the Germans killed six million Jews, that almost all of our nation's professors and churchmen are said to maintain that the Holocaust is a fact, doesn't make it a fact.

There is no dispute over the fact that large numbers of Jews were deported to concentration camps and ghettos, or that many Jews died or were killed during World War II. Revisionist scholars have presented evidence, which Exterminationists have not been able to refute, showing that there was no German program to exterminate Europe's Jews and that the estimate of six million Jewish wartime dead is an irresponsible exaggeration. (CNE, 2918).

The Holocaust, the alleged extermination of some six million Jews (most of them by gassing) is a hoax and should be recognized as such by Christians and all informed, honest and truthful men everywhere.

Here are the reasons which have impressed me as particularly persuasive in coming to my own conclusion that the Revisionist view of the Holocaust story is the correct one:

- There is no convincing or substantial evidence for the allegation of mass killings in gas chambers in the wartime German camps. Careful investigation—in particular that carried out by American engineer Fred Leuchter—has thoroughly discredited the “gas chamber” extermination claims.

- A number of former camp inmates—including some who were interned in the notorious Auschwitz-Birkenau camp—have declared that the wartime German camps were not extermination centers.

- The most reliable statistics available cannot be reconciled with the legendary “six million” figure. The best evidence indicates that no more than a million or perhaps a million and a half European Jews perished from all causes during the war years.

- Neither the major Jewish organizations in the United States, nor the wartime Allied governments, nor the International Red Cross, nor the Vatican acted as if they seriously believed the wartime extermination propaganda.

- Although the German government kept extensive and detailed records of its wartime Jewish policy, not a single document has ever been found which substantiates or even refers to an extermination program or policy. Instead, the voluminous German records confiscated by the Allies at the end of the war clearly show that the German “final solution” program was one of emigration and deportation, not extermination.

- Even prominent Jewish “Exterminationist” historians now acknowledge that the stories of gassings, and extermination in camps in Germany proper are not true, in spite of the fact that such claims were once seriously made, particularly at the great Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946.

- The Holocaust story now centers on just six former camps in what is now Communist-ruled Poland, and the so-called “evidence” presented to prove mass exterminations in these camps is qualitatively no better than the now discredited “evidence” once cited for the exterminations in the camps in Germany proper.

- Much of the so-called “evidence” presented by the “Exterminationists” over the years has already been thoroughly discredited. For example, the well-known horrific photographs of piles of corpses taken in camps in western Germany at the end of the war are now acknowledged to be photos of victims of disease and malnutrition who perished as indirect victims of the war in the final weeks and months of the conflict. Also, so-called “confessions”—such as those of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss—have been shown to be untruthful and extracted by torture. Many of the official reports and testimonies presented as “evidence” by the prosecution in the Nuremberg trials has since been shown to be lies.

- The fact that so many Jews “survived” German rule during the war—many of them even in so-called “extermination” centers such as Auschwitz-Birkenau—is enough to show that there was no German program or policy to exterminate the Jews of Europe.

Christians and the Holocaust Hoax

The Holocaust is a hoax and the time has come for Christian scholars and pastors to recognize this and stop perpetrating a hoax as the truth. A Christian is not free to believe and promote a lie about any person or nations, as we said in our introduction. True Christian scholars should at least read what the Revisionists are saying.

Many have said to us: “What difference does it make? The truth of the Holocaust is of no concern to Christians.” Nonsense! A Christian is not free to believe and promote a lie about any person or nation. A Christian is guided by truth and facts, not emotions and majority opinion.

If Christians can accept as historical fact the Holocaust, despite all the powerful evidence that it is a hoax, what does that say about their ability to evaluate evidence? What about their scholarship? Is it any wonder that some Revisionists, who have made a careful study of the Holocaust, question the scholarship of Christians, so many of whom swallow as absolute truth what is clearly a hoax?

I have been told numerous times, even by theologians who claim to be orthodox: “I don’t care whether it was six million or one Jew, even one is too many.” Such an attitude shows contempt for the truth. A Christian is to show true love and the Apostle Paul tells us that love is “happy with the truth” (1 Cor. 13:6). The writing of Proverbs tells us: “Speak out for

those who can't speak, for the rights of those who are doomed. Talk up, render fair decisions, and defend the rights of the poor and needy people" (Proverbs 31:9).

A Christian bases his faith upon facts and absolute truth, not feelings and emotion. A Christian recognizes that only God is all-knowing. A Christian is willing to listen to evidence and evaluate various viewpoints. He doesn't close his mind to the facts and evidence. He doesn't start out with the assumption that the Jew is right and the German is wrong or that the Jew is wrong and the German is right. He looks at the evidence. Those who say they don't care if it was six million or one are showing a despicable attitude toward truth. They are saying: "We don't care about the truth." Such an attitude is sinful and worldly. Is it any wonder that so many then go on to act as if they don't care about another man's wife or his property? The truth as to the Holocaust is a moral issue. Those who maintain the Germans exterminated some six million Jews, most of them by gassing, are seeing to it that the Christian Church can no longer avoid speaking out. Churches are being pushed, as never before, to have special services commemorating the Holocaust.

A Christian is ready to change his opinion if the evidence shows he is wrong. This essay demonstrates how often we have afforded the "Exterminationists" opportunity to refute the Revisionists.

Some tell us that we are not showing love to the Jews and are being racists and anti-Semitic when we published articles by Revisionists questioning the Holocaust and when we insist that Jesus Christ is the only way to heaven.

We have repeatedly emphasized in many editorials that the Bible teaches that there is no special chosen race. All those, regardless of color, race, nationality, sex, wealth, etc., who trust in the merits of Jesus Christ alone for their salvation are God's chosen people and will go to heaven. Those who tell Jews, Muslims, and any other non-Christian that they worship the true God and can get to heaven without Christ are not showing true love to the Jews and other non-Christians.

The so-called fact of the Holocaust is being used to deport innocent men in this country who served in the German army as teenagers. In some cases they have been sent back to certain death in Communist lands. The Office of Special Investigation is using the Holocaust as an excuse to force even such reputable German and anti-Communist scientists as Arthur Rudolph out of the U.S.

Israel is using the “fact” of the Holocaust as an excuse to execute such innocent men as the Ukrainian, John Demjanjuk. “The Jewish people have a long score to settle with the Ukrainian people” says Dov Ben-Meir, a deputy speaker of Israel’s Knesset. According to this top Israeli official, “Unaccounted numbers” of Ukrainians “collaborated with the Nazi regime, especially in the annihilation of hundreds of thousands of Jews.” (CNE 2504)

The “fact” of the Holocaust is being used by some to deny that Christianity is the only true religion and that Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

Israel is using the “fact” of the Holocaust as an excuse to kill Palestinians in Israel. This slaughter, together with the anti-scriptural notions of the Israel-first Millennialists, almost all of whom believe in the Holocaust, could lead to another bloody war.

The Holocaust is not some innocent hoax, like children’s fairy tales, which entertain and have no evil consequences.

The “chosen people” and “Holocaust” myths makes mission work among non-Christians far more difficult. Arabs, who are told that the Bible teaches that their land belongs to the Jews, find it more difficult to believe what the Bible says about Christ.

A Mighty Fortress Is Our God!

We have been warned, even by some theologians who recognized that the Holocaust is a hoax, to remain silent because of the danger involved. Some have told us to take out more insurance. God is still in control of this world, not some vast conspiracy, whether the Communists, Jews, international bankers, Illuminati, Trilateralists, etc.

For over 25 years *The Christian News* has been exposing a good number of hoaxes, even those held by many church members. Some have asked: Do you believe there is any absolute truth? Is there anything, in your estimation, that is not a hoax? You publish all sorts of opinions. Just where do you stand? Each week we state in our masthead: “*Christian News* is not a doctrinally neutral observer, but it is committed to the full historic Christian faith, as it is authoritatively revealed in the written Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, and correctly set forth in the confessions of the orthodox Church, to wit, the Book of Concord of 1580.”

I commend to all Revisionists and everyone else nothing more nor less than historic Christianity. God by “raising Christ

from the dead has given everyone a good reason to believe" (Acts 17:31).

In spite of the many attempts to falsify history, the Christian church has always struggled for the truth. This was true for the first Christians. It was also the basic issue of the Reformation. One of the greatest confessors of the faith in this century, Dr. Herman Sasse, who was also avidly anti-Nazi, points out in his book *Here We Stand* that the "Reformation emphasized the profound seriousness of the truth."

So, as an Evangelical Lutheran pastor, in the tradition of the early church and the Reformation, I stand before you today again to make a strong appeal in the struggle for the truth.

The subject of the Holocaust is not my primary concern in life. It is not my main message. As stated in the masthead the paper we founded and have served as editor for the past 26 years, we preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Nevertheless, Christians must not only strive to proclaim the saving Truth of the Gospel. We are obligated by this same Gospel to tell the truth in all areas of life, including events of political economics, war, and Church and secular government.

"These are the things which you should do: speak the truth to one another; judge with truth and judgement for peace in your gates." Zechariah 8:16

Notes

1. 2 Peter 1:16-21. All Bible quotations taken from *An American Translation of the Bible* by Dr. William Beck. Published by Leader Press and *The Christian News*, Box 168, New Haven, Missouri 63068, 1976.
2. John 21:24.
3. John 1:2.
4. 1 John 5:20, 21.
5. Luke 1:1-4.
6. John 14:6.
7. John 8:31, 32.
8. John 4:18.
9. Mark 5:33.
10. Ludwig A. Fritsch, *The Crime of Our Age* (Chicago: Published by the author, 5121 N. England Ave., Chicago 31, Ill., 1947, pp. 74-75.
11. Kurt Marquart, "The Fate of Christians Under Communism," in *A Christian Handbook on Vital Issues* (New Haven, Missouri: Leader Press, 1973), p. 189.
12. *The Christian News Encyclopedia* (hereafter CNE), Washington, MO: The Missourian Publisheres, 1988, pp. 2499-2520; 1077-1104; 1060-1074; 2405-2469.

13. "Was Moses The First Nazi?" *Christian Vanguard*, New Christian Church, December, 1988, 7.8. Sons of Liberty, Box 214, Metairie, Louisiana. Adolph Hitler in his *Mein Kampf* regards "racial pollution as the original sin of humanity." (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), p. 624.
14. Galatians 3:8, 9.
15. 1 Peter 2:8, 9.
16. Acts 10:35. See "Down With All Racism" by Jim Keegstra, CNE 2465. "Who Are the Chosen People? Rightly Dividing The World of Truth" by Jim Keegstra, CNE 2981.
17. CNE 2517.
18. CNE 2708, 9.
19. CNE 2688-2709; 2888-2895; 1306-1319.
20. *Augusburg Confession, Article XVII. Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 51.
21. CNE Appendix, volume II.
22. CNE 3102-3129.
23. CNE 2310-3129.
24. CNE 1920.
25. CNE 1948.
26. December 12, 1988 *Christian News*. CNE 1943.
27. CNE 1943.
28. Index of CNE, under charismatics, and also individual names.
29. Romans 1:16. 1 Thess. 2:13.
30. *Christian News*, November 14, 1988, p. 9.
31. See CNE index, under "Holocaust."
32. CNE 1090.
33. CNE 2909-2929; 2302-3603.
34. CNE 2925.
35. CNE 2925.
36. CNE 2321.
37. CNE 1099.
38. CNE 2321-2329.
39. CNE 2336.
40. CNE 2337.
41. CNE 2339.
42. CNE 2348.
43. CNE 2356.
44. CNE 2357.
45. *Christian News*, March 21, 1989.

Reviews

WHY DID THE HEAVENS NOT DARKEN? THE "FINAL SOLUTION" IN HISTORY, by Arno J. Mayer. New York: Pantheon, 1988, Hb., 492 pages, \$27.95, ISBN 0-394-57154-1.

Reviewed by Arthur R. Butz

In May of this year the general public learned, through an article by Tamar Jacoby in *Newsweek*, of the "venom of the accusations" being made over Professor Arno Mayer's new book. A few days later Jacoby's husband, Eric Breindel, made it clear in his *New York Post* column what the occasion for the venom was: "The cranks who argue that there were no gas chambers—and that the Jews who died fell victim to poor conditions in ghettos and labor camps—have found a serious scholar who at least agrees with some of what they say. Thus, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* is a dangerous and ugly book."

I had heard that Mayer listed my *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* in his bibliography, so as I sat waiting to receive a copy of the book I was hoping to see a worthy effort perceptibly influenced by my work. Now that I have read it, I see no such influence, and I am relieved. It is a bad book on several grounds, and on the allegation of mass gassings in the camps it expresses not the author's conviction but his confusion.

Arno J. Mayer is the Dayton-Stockton Professor of European History at Princeton University and has specialized in twentieth-century diplomatic history. He offers considerable personal information as presumably relevant. He was born into a Luxembourg Jewish family in 1926; his father was a Zionist. Fleeing their home in May 1940, the family managed to stay a step ahead of the invading Germans, reaching North Africa, then Lisbon, and finally the United States. His maternal grandparents, not so mobile, were sent to Theresienstadt; the grandfather died there but the grandmother survived, never having heard anything about the "killing sites."

He served in the U.S. Army in 1944-1946, in an intelligence unit that interrogated captured German generals and processed German scientists being "recruited to help America's postwar military buildup against the Soviets." In 1950 he spent the summer in Israel "on a kibbutz of the Marxist Hashomer Hatzair."

The reader of Mayer's book who has seen the reviews in advance will be puzzled as to what the fuss is about until he reaches the last chapters. Early chapters seem to place Mayer in the so-called "functionalist" (as opposed to "intentionalist") camp, which denies that extermination of the Jews took place according to a long-standing plan centrally ordered and directed, but developed on its own out of the exigencies of events and the internal logic of the Nazi system.¹ Until late in the book the reader perceives no equivocation, explicit or implicit, on the historical reality of the physical extermination of the Jews.

Mayer's purpose is to place the persecution of the Jews "in the historical context of its time" which is that of what he calls the "Thirty Years War of the twentieth century," 1914-1945. He is unusually diligent in making terminological distinctions relevant to his subject, e.g. among "Judeophobia," "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Judaism." He does not like "the religiously freighted word concept 'the Holocaust,' [the basis of an] embryonic creed . . . which . . . has taken the reflective and transparent remembrances of survivors and woven them into a collective prescriptive 'memory' unconducive to critical and contextual thinking about the Jewish calamity." He complains that "this cult of remembrance has become overly sectarian [and] has helped to disconnect the Jewish catastrophe from its secular historical setting, while placing it within the providential history of the Jewish people to be commemorated, lamented, and restrictively interpreted." In place of "Holocaust" Mayer uses "Judeocide."

This striving for precision is admirable. For purposes of this review I will use the term "Judeocide," but I will indicate below why "Holocaust" is preferred.

The field has suffered from considerable abuse of terminology. The term "Exterminationists" has been used to designate those who defend the Judeocide legend, e.g. Raul Hilberg, Yehuda Bauer, etc. I notice that Mayer uses that term in the different and, in my judgment, more correct sense of one who is involved in exterminating. Here I shall call people like Hilberg and Bauer "Holoscribes."

We who essentially deny this Judeocide have been calling ourselves "Revisionists," appropriating a word of wide application to a very narrow one (all historical writing that is worth anything is "revisionist" in some sense). For lack of a better term at hand, however, I shall use it in that sense here.

Mayer's extreme anti-German and pro-Soviet biases are rare among contemporary issues from serious publishing houses. I thought this most evident when he briefly departed from the role of historian to declare that, although the Soviets had never signed the Geneva conventions, "as a signatory, Germany was bound by them" nevertheless in its war with the Soviet Union. While this bias applies generally I shall focus here only on an instance of it that crucially concerns our subject.

Mayer makes no mention of the interwar (1918-1939) atrocities of the Bolsheviks and affiliated movements generally and of Stalin in particular. These are not irrelevant to the subject because it is clear that the German policy of disregarding the rules in the war with the Soviet Union, one consequence of which were the bloody activities of the Einsatzgruppen, was largely motivated by an assessment in which this past record weighed heavily. Indeed as the Germans swept into former Soviet controlled territory this past seemed very much alive. Mayer makes brief mention of Ukrainian massacres of Jews in the city of Lwow in early July 1941, after the Soviets withdrew and as the Germans started to arrive. The motivation for the massacres was indeed, as Mayer reports, that the Jews "were traduced for having been, and continuing to be, among the major carriers of communism and collaborators of Soviet Russia," but Mayer does not hint at the specifics. The Soviets left Lwow in such great haste that the Germans and Ukrainians were able to learn what had been going on in the NKVD prisons. The ghastly scenes they found made deep impressions on them, and are not for the delicate or fragile reader.² Since the local NKVD informer had been a Jew, the Ukrainians indulged a common human fallacy (all NKVD informers were Jews; therefore all Jews were NKVD informers) and conducted anti-Jewish pogroms. For the Germans, encountering such scenes scarcely more than a week into their invasion, it must have seemed that the Nazi anti-Bolshevik propaganda of the period before the Hitler-Stalin pact, doubtless assumed by many of them to have been the usual hyperbole of a movement given to rhetorical extravagance, had been restrained. In any case the Lwow revelations would have dispelled any German qualms about

carrying out the ruthless resolutions made before the invasion. It is interesting that the facts about the background of the Lwow massacres became available to the postwar general public only indirectly and unexpectedly as a consequence of an international brouhaha over a minister in Konrad Adenauer's government, accused of atrocities in Lwow by the Soviets, and over a Soviet agent who defected to West Germany in 1961 and confessed to carrying out two political assassinations of Ukrainian exiles in Munich.

Mayer's aim, as stated, is to place the alleged Judeocide "in the historical context of its time" and interpret it accordingly. His thesis is clear. The failure to take Moscow, and the entry of the U.S.A. into the war (even if only in an economic role), made ultimate defeat plain to Hitler in December 1941, rather than a year later after Stalingrad. Thus according to Mayer "the Nazi fundamentalists and their accomplices . . . turned to venting their rage on the Jews." At this point in the book there is no doubt in the readers' mind what this "rage" would have consisted in. It was "a decision to exterminate the Jews [although no] written document containing or reporting an explicit command to exterminate the Jews has come to light . . . the presumption must be that the order or informal injunction to mass-murder Jews was transmitted orally (probably by Hitler himself)." This idea is repeated throughout and is the ostensible thesis of the book (although we shall see that Mayer ought to have made another of his conclusions the thesis). The stalling of the invasion of the Soviet Union, implying ultimate defeat, made the Germans so angry that they took it out on the Jews, although originally there had been no intention to exterminate them. Mayer manages to make this "Judeocide" seem almost erratic; just another Hitler tantrum. There are even analogies to random massacres of Jews carried out by eleventh century crusaders.

Mayer's thesis accounts for certain peculiarities of his book. Although the Einsatzgruppen activities in the early phases of the Russian campaign certainly liquidated many Jews, Mayer claims, contradicting both the Holoscribes and the alleged written reports of the Einsatzgruppen, that their "methodical mass slaughters of Jews . . . did not start until the fall of 1941, after the Red Army had slowed the German advance [and] the eastern campaign had begun to run aground."

It is implausible that the Germans could have viewed the Einsatzgruppen as the means of "extermination" of the Jews of the Soviet Union. For one thing, a great many Jews were

evacuated by the Soviets before the Germans arrived. Numbers are of course difficult to arrive at. Mayer throws out, with no particular support, a guess of 1.5 million evacuated out of 4 million originally resident in territories occupied by the Germans and allies. Sanning³ believes that more than 80% of those Jews were evacuated. In any case, "extermination" could not under the circumstances have been achieved. For another thing, the personnel of the Einsatzgruppen numbered only 3,000 men (as Mayer notes), a force that must have been quite strained in performing only its primary security and counterinsurgency functions and could not possibly have contemplated performing "extermination" activities in such a vast theater, if the Jews were there to exterminate. Mayer pauses briefly over this point, but does not demur.

As for Soviet behavior, it is hazardous to say that they literally did not until 1943 charge the Germans with attempting to exterminate the Soviet Jews, since they charged the Germans with virtually every crime they could think of, but I think that is a fair statement.

Another peculiarity of Mayer's book is that it has more military history than any other book on this subject. The reason is Mayer's thesis, which claims that the physical extermination of the Jews was decided in "rage" over specific military reverses on the eastern front. I believe that most will agree that there is far too much military history here than is required, even for his thesis. It does not take long, e.g., to explain the military conditions of January 1942 or February 1943, as seen by the Germans.

It is strange that, in a book dedicated to placing the alleged Judeocide in "context," there is really so little historical context. What Mayer means by context are events as seen by the Nazis in terms of their own ideas. This context is primarily the military context but Mayer's conception of Nazi ideology ("an apocalyptic movement against modern times . . . an essentially syncretic ideology . . . a religion in a secular guise . . . intrinsically irrational and impulsive . . . Hitler, determined to provide the Nazi movement with a single enemy, seized upon 'the Jew' as best suited") also plays a role. The conservatives who disdained Hitler's populist movement but reconciled themselves with and served it also play an important role in Mayer's account.

In any case, Mayer's "context" is purely German. I believe the proper context of this alleged Judeocide would put in significant roles the other actors of the World War II period,

viz. the western Allies, the Soviets, the Vatican, the Red Cross, the German resistance to Hitler (to which Mayer makes only brief passing mention) and of course the Jews themselves. If Mayer had considered this context then he could have answered the unanswered question which is the title of his book. Mayer explains that the title is a quote from a Jewish chronicler of an eleventh century massacre of Jews in Mainz by transient crusaders. The contemporary interpretation of the question ("Why did the heavens not darken?") is "Why did not somebody act as though the Jews were being exterminated?" I have amplified elsewhere⁴ on this utter lack of contemporaneous evidence for Judeocide, and the total dependence of the legend on postwar declarations, made mainly in trials, and on a few apocryphal and/or ambiguous documents, also mainly produced in postwar trials. If the "Judeocide" were real, it would be the only complex of European events of its scale to transpire in recent millennia without generating contemporaneous evidence. If Mayer had considered his own question, he might have seen that the legend is funny history, something like a war between Illinois and Indiana, whose historicity is proved by later confessions of the National Guard commanders.

In Mayer's book Jewry does not appear as an international power at all. I was first jolted by this perspective when I read that in the aftermath of World War I the Jews of eastern Europe "were without a potential external protector." Continuing while wondering if the diplomatic historian knew what he was talking about at all, I was relieved to read on the next page that "Jewish notables rushed to the Paris Peace Conference to help convince the Big Four to design international instruments to require the governments of the new and newly recreated nations to respect the human rights of their large ethnic and religious minorities." In Mayer's account these Jewish notables are not presented as doing more than rushing to the Conference. In fact Woodrow Wilson's advisors included Walter Lippman, Bernard Baruch, and other leading Jews. The observer E.J. Dillon wrote of the tremendous influence that Jews from many countries exercised at the Conference in behalf of Jewish causes, in particular the status of east European Jews, and that "a considerable number of delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic."⁵

The one place where Mayer hints at an international Jewish power is in his account of the boycott of Jewish businesses

that was called by the Nazis for one day only, 1 April 1933. This was in retaliation for a campaign in the U.S. and elsewhere, via rallies and pressures on governments, then being waged by Stephen S. Wise and other Jewish leaders for an unlimited trade boycott of Germany.

It is, however, the late chapter on Auschwitz that provoked the vehemence against Mayer, e.g. Daniel J. Goldhagen's angry review in the *New Republic*. Starting early in the book Mayer states, unequivocally and repeatedly, that the Jewish calamity consisted in physical extermination at the hands of the Nazis. The Auschwitz chapter begins with the usual classification of Auschwitz as one of six "centers of mass killing." It goes on to describe the high "normal" death rate at Auschwitz due to unhealthy conditions, primarily typhus. To a great extent these conditions are depicted as somehow singularly Nazi. It would have helped the "context" a lot, especially in view of Mayer's "Thirty Years War of the twentieth century" construct, to have noted that the Germans had essentially the same typhus problems during World War I in their camps that quartered Russian POW's.

Well into his Auschwitz chapter, Mayer perks up the reader (perhaps as bored by the book as I was at this point) by conceding that:

Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable . . . there is no denying the many contradictions, ambiguities, and errors in the existing sources. These cannot be ignored, although it must be emphasized strongly that such defects are altogether insufficient to put in question the use of gas chambers in the mass murder of Jews at Auschwitz.

So, despite his explicit words, Mayer has implicitly said to the typical reader that "the use of gas chambers" is indeed a "question."

Since on the matter of the gas chambers, as on virtually all other features of the received legend, it is only necessary for one to admit the possibility of reevaluation in fundamental respects in order to become very skeptical in those respects. Mayer's critics were justified in suspecting him of being just a little bit pregnant in writing thus, but a later claim by Mayer perhaps made them view him as six months along: "from 1942 to 1945, certainly at Auschwitz, but probably overall, more Jews were killed by so-called 'natural' causes than by 'unnatural' ones" (Mayer means mainly typhus in the former category and gassing in the latter).

The "probably overall" would of course apply to the other five alleged extermination via gassing sites, which are treated in the following chapter. Again, that chapter starts with several unequivocal statements about extermination. By this time, however, the reader has been told that even when the gassings in those places are taken into account they "probably" accounted for fewer victims than natural causes, so the reader is prepared for statements to come along having the effect of nullifying or rendering enigmatic all of Mayer's previous unequivocal remarks. Indeed they come: "Because of sparse evidence, there are some uncertainties about the fiery ordeal at Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka." As for "1,274,166 Jews of the General Government . . . There is a strong presumption that most . . . were slaughtered in Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka," whose alleged gas chambers he is very vague about. On cremation he is more than vague. He does not remark on the fact that for Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka we do not have conclusive and detailed evidence of the construction of great cremation facilities, as we have for Auschwitz (of course not; those places were transit camps, not concentration camps). Rather, he mutters that the exterminated at Belzec were first burned but later dug up "for the corpses to be burned in the open." Mayer notes that the Jews in the Polish ghettos did not believe the rumors of extermination in the camps, and kept cooperating with both the war production demands and resettlement policies of the Germans.

Mayer's critics have complained that he does not document his assertions. There are no footnotes but it is too pedantic to require that all be documented. When documentary sources are well understood, there is no need to document. Most of Mayer's book is devoted to reviewing well-known events, so references and documentation are unnecessary. When there is a thesis based on a new interpretation of known sources, rather than on new sources (most Revisionist literature is necessarily of that sort), then the reasoning must be set forth, and the specific documents and records that are being reinterpreted should be specified. Mayer fails to do any of this on his most provocative points about Auschwitz, which should have formed his thesis.

This lapse is especially grave in view of Mayer's insistence early on that "historians are expected to . . . invite critics, both friendly and hostile, to verify the authenticity and reliability of their evidence as well as to debate the logic of their

constructions and the coherence of their explanations." Mayer perversely ignores his own precept in his book. Moreover, according to the *Newsweek* story, Mayer refuses to respond to his critics.

It is what Mayer does not say that is so vexing. Why is it that, despite the deficiencies in the evidence for gassings at Auschwitz, there is no question of them? That is, what is the evidence for gassings at Auschwitz? What specific faults did Mayer find in the testimonies? No hint from Mayer. If more died of natural causes than gassing, what were the numbers involved? No numbers, precise or otherwise, from Mayer, although his claim is specifically quantitative. Indeed he offers no overall numerical estimate for the number of Jews who perished in German occupied territories. This is not because the historian feels himself incompetent with numbers; the book is replete with numerical data or estimates, even where such estimates are difficult to make.

The failure to provide numbers is astonishing in that some decent idea of the numbers that perished in the concentration camps from natural causes, and in particular at Auschwitz, can be formulated. The surviving concentration camp records are held by the International Tracing Service (ITS), administered by the International Committee of the Red Cross and quartered in Arolsen, West Germany. In April 1977 the ITS published a report entitled "The Number of Victims of the National Socialist Persecution." The report says that as of the end of 1976 the ITS had 357,190 specific names of people who had died in the German camps. The report added, however, that no records were kept of the millions gassed and that even in some cases where records were kept they are missing today. For example, a "number of death cases certified" of 50,923 is given for Auschwitz, but is it stipulated that "the documentation of this camp is very incomplete." When I visited the ITS in the summer of 1977 the official I spoke to, and who gave me a copy of the ITS report, added that some analysis subsequent to the writing of the report allows us to say that there were "at least" 45,575 certified deaths at Auschwitz in 1942 and 36,960 in 1943, but the death books for 1940, 1941, 1944 and January 1945 (when Auschwitz was evacuated) are missing. The ITS has not been as free with such estimates in more recent years, but I think that Mayer could have formulated a fairly good idea of the numbers of natural deaths at Auschwitz if he had wanted to, and perhaps the ITS would have opened up for him. I feel reasonably

secure in placing the total in the range 100,000-150,000, probably closer to the former, since the camp population was small in 1940-1941 and by 1944 the Germans had made some progress against typhus. Of these victims a large number would have been Jews since Auschwitz quartered proportionately more Jews than the other German concentration camps, apart from Majdanek. The number of Jewish dead of natural causes at Auschwitz seems less than 100,000. If "certainly at Auschwitz" there were fewer gassed, Mayer must be talking about less than 50,000 gassed.

This is a unique claim. Up to now we have had on the one hand the Holoscribes, who claim victims of gassings at Auschwitz in the neighborhood of a million or even millions (since after all the purpose of the alleged gassings was mass extermination), and on the other hand the Revisionists, who claim that there were no gassings. Both sides have explanations as to why the Germans would have conducted themselves thus. Mayer gives no explanation or hint why the Germans would conduct a gassing program of the magnitude he claims and I can't imagine a motivation. I find it bewildering and appalling that a professionally trained historian could have thrown such unsupported claims out to the public and then could have so obdurately declined to defend them. As he evidently refuses to help dispel this confusion it is our task to attempt to account for it. (Since he is now presumably back from his sabbatical in France, I wonder how he will handle questions from students, if students at Princeton ask questions).

* * * * *

Mayer has troubles writing about the alleged gas chambers at Auschwitz. For example mass gassings are supposed to have started in mid-1942 when "only the two improvised gas chambers . . . were functioning," and not the carefully engineered ones said to have been integrated into the four large crematorium buildings. He does not, however, place those great gas chambers in the crematoria or anywhere else (he only says they started operating at the same time), and does not write that they operated by improvisation with the Zyklon B pesticide as did the improvised ones (the legend claims all gassings at Auschwitz used Zyklon B).

It is inviting to imagine that Mayer has balked at the ridiculous, but it is not that simple. For example, Mayer has no trouble believing that each of the 46 crematorium ovens which

functioned at the Birkenau sub-camp from 1943 had a daily capacity of about 100 bodies. One would have thought that even without any technical training, and even without consulting any of the cremation literature, Mayer would have seen the impossibility of such a figure. Instead, after adding 340 per day from the old crematorium at the main camp he makes the sort of silly calculations I made⁶ a long time ago (as an example of bad deduction) and comes up with a capacity of 1,712,160 per year. He does not say that the ovens were ever used at such a rate and, given his idea of the small numbers gassed, it is impossible to see why such capacities would have been provided (if each oven could dispose of 100 per day then two ovens would have served the whole Auschwitz complex of camps very well).

Mayer accepts the usual claim that “the SS operatives dutifully eliminated all traces of their murderous activities and instruments.” Indeed, it is true that the “traces” do not exist. Mayer continues that “care was taken to dispose of the bones and ashes of the victims.” This illustrates what happens to professors who keep their noses buried in books and documents too much, not sitting back to think just a little bit about what they are reading and writing. Does anybody imagine, for example, that we could contemplate physically exterminating the Chinese minority in the U.S. while keeping the deed secret from our immediate successors (either fellow Americans or invaders with a penchant for telling atrocity stories), by not committing the Sinocide to writing and then hiding the ashes? Mayer calls for “excavations at the killing sites and in their immediate environs.” Since there were many thousands cremated at Auschwitz then, ashes may turn up, but one must assume that the ashes of millions of victims would have turned up long ago. In any case, the Germans would never have been so foolish as to imagine they could destroy evidence of genocide on a continental scale, consuming millions of civilian victims shuttled about on long journeys over a three-year period, by hiding the ashes. It is interesting to compare this legend of concealment with the loud publicity the Germans gave to their Lidice atrocity.

* * * * *

There is another matter which did, I believe, play a role for Mayer in reaching his conclusions. He is frankly and salutarily distrustful of postwar testimonies: “Most of what is known is based on the depositions of Nazi officials and

executioners at postwar trials and on the memory of survivors and bystanders. This testimony must be screened carefully, since it can be influenced by subjective factors of great complexity." Mayer makes no mention of the "confession" of Auschwitz commandant Höss, the homologue of the confessions of the National Guard commanders of Illinois and Indiana. In fact Mayer's theory stands in stark contradiction to the Höss confession:⁷

I . . . estimate that at least 2,500,000 victims were executed and exterminated there by gassing and burning, and at least another half million succumbed to starvation and disease . . . Included among the executed and burnt were approximately 20,000 Russian prisoners of war . . . The remainder of the total number of victims included about 100,000 German Jews, and great numbers of citizens, mostly Jewish from Holland, France, Belgium, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Greece, or other countries. We executed about 400,000 Hungarian Jews alone in the summer of 1944 . . . We were required to carry out these exterminations in secrecy but of course the foul and nauseating stench from the continuous burning of bodies permeated the entire area and all of the people living in the surrounding communities knew that exterminations were going on at Auschwitz.

Mayer devotes more space to the nature of the unreliability of the testimonies of Jewish survivors, especially in his Prologue chapter. As mentioned, he is bothered by the contemporary status of the "Holocaust" as a "sectarian cult," but he does not adequately describe just how sectarian it is, although I am sure he knows. He is very emphatic on this idea of the unreliability of Jewish testimonies and the historical error of ethnocentric Jewish formulations, and I believe it is the key to his problem. The 6 million legend is Talmud "providential history" refurbished for the twentieth century. The 4 billion Jews killed by the Romans under Hadrian, the ensuing tidal wave of blood that plunged down into the sea, carrying large boulders along with it and staining the sea a distance of four miles out, the 64 million Jewish school children of Bethar who were wrapped in their scrolls and burned alive by the Romans, the bodies of the martyred Jews used to build a fence around Hadrian's huge vineyard, and the blood saved over from the tidal wave to fertilize vineyards, have become our 6 million gassed and burned, the flames reaching heaven (from modern crematorium ovens no less; how many times has Elie Wiesel evoked that image?), the

stench of cremation hanging over large parts of Poland, with the hair, ashes and fat being used for sundry purposes, many children being thrown alive into the flames without benefit of prior gassing (another Talmudic yarn Wiesel is fond of).⁸ When a man of Mayer's ethnic and educational background reads the standard "Holocaust" tales, the Talmud must drop into his lap. The need to reformulate the subject is obvious.

Mayer is intent on offering an alternative to this "sectarian . . . Holocaust" that is somehow in the context of European history. Mayer's confusion has its source in his effort to make part of European history that which is not properly part of it, and has however approached just "the providential history of the Jewish people" that he would set aside as a distorted representation of historical truth. Mayer purports to offer us a history relatively uncontaminated by unreliable testimonies, especially Jewish ones, but the reader with working knowledge of the sources sees that he is relying on the usual ones, even if only vicariously through other authors. He has, however, arbitrarily and without explanation or acknowledgment, chosen to reject only some of them, because there is in fact no "Judeocide" without the usual sources. For Mayer there is alas no escape from the sectarian "Holocaust," and confusion is inevitable. Mayer's problem is paralleled today by the problem of the many intellectuals who are fed up with Elie Wiesel but do not speak up. It is clear that Wiesel is the perfect spokesman for this "Holocaust," which is the only alleged "Judeocide" we have. That is why the right word for anybody who claims physical extermination is "the religiously freighted word . . . Holocaust."

Mayer's book is a failure, not because he has not succeeded in establishing the "context" of what happened to the Jews, but because he has gotten whatever happened to them utterly confused. He started by trying to describe the precisely framed "Judeocide" and ended with something whose incompatibility with "critical and contextual thinking" equals that of the "Holocaust," since his context is wrong, he uses the same sources, and he does not reveal a factual and logical basis for his conclusions. That reversion was inevitable, for the reasons stated.

It is true that Mayer's book has Revisionist implications. The worth of this work is only as a symptom of that which should not have been in doubt even forty years ago, namely that serious and professionally trained historians have trouble accepting the legend's evidence. However, Mayer shows the

confusion of a historian who will not draw the conclusions indicated by that apprehension, and the embarrassment he can suffer when he offers his confusion to the reading public. In terms of basic academic and scholarly criteria, this must be one of the worst history books published by a ranking academic historian in recent years.

Notes

1. The intentionalist-functionalist (or structuralist) debate was aired at a conference in Stuttgart in 1984. See e.g. W. Carr, "Nazi policy towards the Jews," in *History Today*, Nov. 1985. Also W. Stäglich, "Historians Wrangle Over the Destruction of European Jewry," this journal, Summer 1986.
2. Hermann Raschhofer, *Political Assassination*, Fritz Schlichtenmayer, Tübingen, 1964.
3. Walter N. Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, CA, 1983, pp. 103ff.
4. Arthur R. Butz, "Context and perspective in the 'Holocaust' controversy," this journal, Winter 1982. Also reproduced in Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, CA, printing of 1983 or later.
5. E.J. Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*, Harper, NY 1920, pp. 494-508.
6. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, op. cit., p. 118.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
8. The relevant Talmud passages are reproduced in an appendix of Yigael Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba*, Random House, NY and Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1971.

WHY DID THE HEAVEN'S NOT DARKEN? THE "FINAL SOLUTION" IN HISTORY, by Arno J. Mayer, New York: Pantheon, 1988, Hb., 492 pages, \$27.95, ISBN-0-394-57154-1.

Reviewed by Robert Faurisson

**In the United States a Jewish Professor
Takes the Revisionist Path**

In its May 1989 issue, *Newsweek* described (pp. 64-65) a "storm over a new book" devoted to "the extermination of the Jews" during the Second World War. The book is *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken? The "Final Solution" in History*.

Pierre Vidal-Naquet's Friend

Its author, Arno J. Mayer, was born in 1926 into a Jewish family in Luxembourg. He is a professor of European history at Princeton University. Pierre Vidal-Naquet, in his 1987 book *Les Assassins de la Mémoire* (Editions de la Découverte), called Mayer his "colleague and friend" (page 203, note 21) and mentioned his name nine times. For example, he wrote: "I owe very much to Arno J. Mayer, whom I warmly thank" (page 216, note 12). He said that he had read the manuscript of a book that Mayer was going to publish in 1988, probably bearing the title *The Final Solution in History*.

It seems that in 1982 the American professor infuriated an Israeli colleague during an international conference at the Sorbonne presided over by François Furet and Raymond Aron (29 June to 2 July). At that time Mayer undoubtedly had the courage to express some reservations about the dogma of the Holocaust and the gas chambers.

In any event, Mayer's own conference paper did not appear in the book *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif*, (Gallimard/Le Seuil, 1985, 607 pages) that was published three years later and was supposed to contain the results of that conference. We were thus kept in ignorance of Mayer's thesis from 1982 to 1988.

According to the author, he submitted the penultimate draft of his entire manuscript, except for the prologue, to three of

the leading people in the field of Jewish history: Raul Hilberg (United States), Hans Mommsen (West Germany), and Pierre Vidal-Naquet (France) (see page xiv). On the cover of Mayer's book one can read the following appreciation of the book: "The most important effort ever made by a historian to think critically about the unthinkable (Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris)."

Sources for the Gas Chambers Are Rare and Unreliable

Arno J. Mayer says that he believes there was a policy to exterminate the Jews and that the homicidal gas chambers were a reality, but at the same time he writes pages of text and makes observations with which many Revisionists would agree. Furthermore, in his bibliography he even mentions two Revisionist works: *The Lie of Ulysses* by Paul Rassinier (in the edition published by La Vieille Taupe in Paris in 1979), as well as Arthur Butz's masterly study, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*.

According to Mayer there is no trace of any plan for the extermination of the Jews and, as regards the gas chambers, he includes, in his chapter on Auschwitz, the following sentence, which is quite astonishing coming from a friend of Pierre Vidal-Naquet: "Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable" (p. 362). He adds:

Most of what is known (on this subject) is based on the depositions of Nazi officials and executioners at postwar trials and on the memory of survivors and bystanders. This testimony must be screened carefully, since it can be influenced by subjective factors of great complexity (pages 362-63).

Would it not be more correct to say that people must be suspicious of the so-called statements, confessions, and eye-witness accounts that the Exterminationists so shamelessly make use of.

Then the author adds, regarding the above-mentioned sources: "there is no denying the many contradictions, ambiguities, and errors in the existing sources" (p. 363). One would like to see Arno J. Mayer review some of these contradictions, ambiguities and errors; no doubt he is thinking about the "sources" that the same Exterminationists have used for more than forty years.

He mentions the "gassings" at Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka but those references are fleeting and are swept up in a flood of considerations foreign to the subject.

Generally speaking, throughout the book the central subject, the supposed genocide of the Jews (here called "Judeocide") and the supposed gas chambers, is buried under a mass of digressions on such things as the anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages and Hitler's campaign in Russia. This is what professors complaisantly call the study of the context; I would prefer a study of the text or, in other words, of the subject.

More Dead from Natural than Non-Natural Causes

Mayer also takes the Revisionist path when he insistently emphasizes the ravages caused in the Jewish communities of the East and in the concentration camps by typhus epidemics. People too often forget that one of the most important motives for the Germans when they created the ghettos was their fear of seeing typhus spread almost everywhere in that part of the world, which was already suffering from war. Even as he is vague on the subject of the supposed "gassings," Mayer is precise and detailed on typhus. During the period from 1942 to 1945—in other words at the very time when, according to Exterminationist historians, the fantastic "gassings" supposedly took place—he estimates (unfortunately without furnishing any figures) that more Jews were killed by so-called natural causes (starvation, disease, sickness and overwork) than by "non-natural" causes (executions of all kinds). He specifically says that this was true "certainly at Auschwitz, but probably overall" (p. 365). That remark has not gone unnoticed and it has provided fuel for a lively controversy.

Elsewhere, Mayer interprets, then eliminates one by one all the documents or arguments which up until now have been used to make people believe that the Germans practiced a policy of exterminating the Jews (the Göring-to-Heydrich letter of 31 July 1941, the Wannsee Conference transcript, the conduct of the Einsatzgruppen in Russia, Himmler's speeches at Posen in October 1943, etc.).

Things that have been presented to us as definitely established facts are often described by Mayer as being uncertain or untrustworthy. The numbers and the statistics, which have finally achieved, in a sense, an official, sacred character, are greeted by Mayer with great mistrust.

Differentiating between, on the one hand, Jewish "memory"—not to say Jewish legend or mythology—and, on the other hand, "history," Mayer deplores the existence of a cult of memory which, with the distortions that it imposes on historical reality, has become "too sectarian" (p. 16). Memory,

he thinks, tends to “rigidify” while history calls for “revision” (p. 18). Historians today have “the urgent task of thinking, critically, about the unthinkable” (p. 363).

Two Suggestions for the Future

Regarding the gas chambers at Auschwitz, Mayer writes:

The Soviet archives may well yield significant clues and evidence when they are opened. In addition, excavations at the killing sites and in their immediate environs may also bring forth new information.

I would remind the reader that those are two Revisionist ideas for which I have personally fought. Early in 1988, during the second trial of Ernst Zündel in Toronto, I was able, working through defense attorney Doug Christie, to get one of the prosecution experts, Charles Biedermann, to confirm that the Auschwitz “death registers,” left intact by the Germans, are in fact to be found, for the most part, in Moscow.

The scandal is that these registers are being kept hidden in the same way as the few volumes that remain at the Auschwitz Museum are concealed. The Americans, British, French, Germans, and Israelis cooperate in hiding these documents and even refuse to reveal how many names are contained in the several registers at the Auschwitz Museum, photocopies of which are in the possession of the International Tracing Service at Arolsen (an organ of the International Committee of the Red Cross located in West Germany, but under the strict surveillance of the Allies and of the Israelis for fear of an intrusion by Revisionist researchers). Would Mayer agree in demanding the opening of the “secret file”?

As regards excavations, here again the Revisionists have taken the initiative in spite of prohibitions against it. I refer to that in my preface to the “Leuchter Report,” named after the American engineer who studied the so-called homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau, and Majdanek (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1988, p. 376-80).

In February 1989, in Los Angeles, during the 9th International Conference of our Institute for Historical Review, Fred Leuchter asked for the creation of an international commission of inquiry into the homicidal gas chambers supposedly used by the Germans. Would Mayer break with his Exterminationist colleagues by responding to the “Leuchter Report” with something other than an

embarrassed silence or a hoax of the kind resorted to by Serge Klarsfeld and his disciples? What does Mayer think about an international commission of experts?

Progress in Ten Years

Ten years ago, Pierre Vidal-Naquet and Léon Poliakov took the initiative in drawing up a public statement directed against me which said that, because of the abundance and reliability of the evidence, "there is not, there cannot be any debate about the existence of the gas chambers" (*Le Monde*, 21 February 1979, p. 23). Among the 34 signatories of that declaration were Philippe Ariès, Fernand Braudel, Pierre Chaunu, François Furet, Jacques Le Goff and Emmanuel Leroy-Ladurie. But René Rémond refused to sign it.

We had to wait until 1988 for an established historian like Arno Mayer to say, in his chapter on Auschwitz, that sources for the study of the gas chambers, far from being *abundant* and *reliable*, as people asserted, are only *rare* and *unreliable*. This is just a single example of the significant progress that Historical Revisionism has made in the scholarly community.

The Jewish professor from Princeton is going to learn the cost of scrutinizing the taboo of the century. He has done so with the greatest caution, without being aggressive or provocative, but he has already unleashed, along with some favorable reactions in the American press, some real attacks. Daniel Jonah Goldhagen of Harvard, in an article entitled "False Witness," accuses Mayer of falsification, distortion, Revisionism, and of having "produced a mockery of memory and history" (*The New Republic*, 17 April 1989, p. 39-44).

That sounds familiar. Fortunately for Professor Mayer, he lives in the United States and not in France, like Faurisson, in Sweden, like Felderer, or in Germany, like Stäglich.¹

1. Mayer's book, more than 500 pages long, doesn't contain a single footnote. Also, many of his quotations can only be verified by personal research on the part of the reader. At the beginning of 1981, Arno J. Mayer was still so hostile towards Revisionism that he wrote:

Regrettably, Faurisson's new book [*Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*, 1980] has an unconscionable preface by Noam Chomsky that is being used to legitimate Faurisson as a bona-fide scholar of the Holocaust. As an unqualified civil libertarian Chomsky claims—disingenuously—that he has not read the book he is prefacing! (*Democracy*, April 1981, p. 68).

HITLER'S HOMETOWN: LINZ, AUSTRIA, 1908-1945 by Evan Burr Buckey. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986, xv + 288 pages, hardbound, \$27.50, ISBN 0-253-32833-0.

Reviewed by John M. Ries

Tracing the transition of Linz, Austria from a peaceful Danubian entrepot in the waning years of the Emperor Franz Josef to one of Europe's major industrial and manufacturing centers, this comprehensive account by Evan Burr Buckey is a worthy addition to the growing list of specialized studies in Central European history.

The development of Linz and the surrounding countryside of Upper Austria since the early years of this century is a sort of microcosm of the problems and solutions that have beset German-Austria. Dominated by three major political elites, the Christian Socials, the German Nationalists, and the Social Democrats, Linz became somewhat of an exception to the prevailing pattern of sociopolitical activity through the development of a "moderate political culture." This was largely the work of the provincial governor (*Landeshauptmann*) of Upper Austria from 1908 until his death in 1925, the so-called "red prelate," Johann Nepomuk Hauser. Hauser believed in democratic political rule and was instrumental in establishing the first measure toward universal manhood suffrage in Linz as early as 1908, through a phasing out of the strict property requirements for voting. His ability to convince the competing elites of the merits of compromise assured his continued popularity, enabling him to become the only provincial governor to survive the transition from imperial to republican rule in 1918-1919.

The 1920's produced the same conflicts in Linz as in the rest of Austria, with the exception that they were kept in bounds due to the moderate, democratic tradition established by Hauser and carried on by his successor, Josef Schlegel. Mr. Buckey ably describes the state of balance that existed between Social Democratic Linz, protected by its paramilitary Republican Defense Corps (*Schützbund*), and the Upper Austrian countryside, where quasi-fascist organizations, led by Prince Starhemberg's *Heimwehr*, tried to gain control. Eventually, the forces of reaction won out, as the Austrian Civil War in February 1934 put an end to parliamentary government in Linz and Upper Austria.

From the standpoint of this reviewer, and perhaps for the readers of the *Journal* as well, it seems that the author's treatment of the less familiar, and somewhat controversial, years from the Anschluss up to the end of World War Two should bear the closest scrutiny. Accordingly, it is with the period 1938-1945 that the remaining portion of this review is concerned.

Beginning with the entry of German troops into Linz itself around noon on the 12th of March, 1938, there seemed little doubt as to where the citizens of this once "rather dull and unexciting capital" of the province of Upper Austria stood with respect to the impending re-unification. Indeed, Hitler, who had grown up in Linz, was so struck by the "wild jubilation" that greeted his arrival later that evening, that he "impulsively decided to abandon an earlier plan for a 'personal union' of Austria and Germany and to incorporate his homeland into the Reich." In Linz, as elsewhere in the future *Ostmark*, "Blumen statt Bomben" ("flowers instead of bombs") was the order of the day.

Yet how do we account for such a "torrent of enthusiasm"? Certainly, as Mr. Buckey clearly documents, the National Socialist seizure of power in Linz was "the direct result of German pressure and intervention. It did not occur as a consequence of a deal with traditional elites nor in the wake of a mass upheaval." Moreover, the Catholic peasantry of the surrounding countryside would remain aloof and suspicious of the Third Reich throughout the next seven years. Whatever prompted the spontaneous display of approbation at the dissolution of the Austrian state can only be explained if we take into account the years its inhabitants had spent searching for a national identity, a quest that transcended class and party lines; a stagnating economy made worse by the recent effects of the worldwide Depression; and the prevailing belief that unification with a resurgent Germany would be a major improvement over the way things had been. In the end, therefore, it was the compelling desire for change, regardless of the consequences, that ultimately sanctioned what seemed to many on the outside as the "suicide of a state."

And the changes would, indeed, be extensive. Mr. Buckey points to the measures "relieving social distress, especially by the Strength Through Joy [Kraft durch Freude] Organization, the revitalization of the Linz economy, and above all, the elimination of local unemployment within six months of the Anschluss," as decisive factors in the establishment of a

popular consensus for the National Socialist regime. Considering the latter, in March 1938, of the some 37,120 people without jobs in Upper Austria, some 12,000 resided in Linz. Seven months later, in October, the number had dropped to 3,195 and 1,098, respectively. Within two years after the Anschluss, there would be as many as 13,900 unfilled jobs in the region.

Hitler's plans to transform his hometown into a "Second Budapest" received a great deal of personal attention, but while his patronage did not quite produce the extensive cultural changes that he had envisioned, it did contribute to the development of a major manufacturing center from the decaying remnants of a pre-industrial provincial capital. With an infusion of 60 million marks, courtesy of the director of the Four-Year Plan, a massive industrial complex arose, focusing on the appropriately named Hermann Göring Steel Works. Also, a nitrogen plant, a chemical works, and other large scale enterprises manufacturing aluminum, artificial fibers, and armaments began to spring up. The period of National Socialist rule in Linz, as "brutal and capricious" as it may have been, witnessed the creation of a modern industrial city. Outmoded structures and interest groups, recalcitrant labor unions and leftist parties—all were altered through a thorough reworking of the entire economic system. In the process, it was the Reich Germans who "played the most conspicuous role since they alone possessed the vision and the capital" to effect the desired changes.

Outside of the Hitler regime's economic program, a great deal of local support for the National Socialist government rested on its anti-Jewish and anti-clerical policies. In an earlier section of the book, Mr. Buckey describes how the German Nationalist followers of the notorious Judeophobe Georg Ritter von Schönerer gained strong support in Linz during the first decades of this century, even controlling the municipal council from 1900-1919. Anti-Semitism had also been encouraged by the Church and was perhaps reflected to a great extent in the enthusiasm demonstrated by the local peasantry in the anti-Jewish measures taken by the National Socialists following the Anschluss. Indeed, given this background, it may come as no surprise to learn that "the Nazi seizure of power in Hitler's hometown began with a pogrom." During the ensuing months, the relatively small number of Jews (there seemed to be around 1000 at the time of the Anschluss) who lived in Linz was significantly reduced, many

either volunteering or being forced to leave. The assertion that the remnant who decided to remain following the Kristallnacht (November 9-10, 1938) "perished in the 'final solution' in mid-summer 1942" is open to question from a Revisionist standpoint.

The anti-clerical policies of the National Socialist government were also supported strongly by the town population, going back to a long tradition of opposition to Church authority. Schools were closed, priests deported or imprisoned, and other restrictions were imposed, all against the sustained opposition of local Bishop Gföllner, who, according to Mr. Buckley, "may have been the only bishop in Germany and Austria to have opposed National Socialism for two decades." As it turned out, these and similar policies by the government cost the regime the allegiance and support of the region's Catholic peasantry.

The prolonged effects of the war did not seem to weaken seriously the National Socialist consensus in Linz, at least until late 1944, when the suffering due to food shortages, disease, and repeated bombing began to take its toll. Only then did the Hitler regime begin to be perceived as an alien domination. This is perhaps underscored by the resistance movements which sprang up in Linz over the preceding few years: all seemed to be mainly concerned with ending the war rather than Nazi rule. In this sense, they should more properly be called "peace movements."

I highly recommend this excellent study of an important city in recent Austrian history not only for its own sake but also as a valuable preparation for the eventual appearance of that definitive modern history of Austria which we are all anxiously awaiting.

About the Contributors

ARTHUR R. BUTZ is Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences at Northwestern University. He is the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*.

ROBERT FAURISSON is Associate Professor of French Literature at the University of Lyon-2 in France. He specializes in the appraisal and evaluation of texts and documents. A frequent contributor to *The Journal of Historical Review*, Professor Faurisson has published numerous articles and books, including *Is the Diary of Anne Frank Genuine?* and *Réponse à Pierre Vidal-Naquet*.

DAVID IRVING is the author of many books on the Second World War, including *The Destruction of Dresden*, *The Rise and Fall of the Luftwaffe*, and *Hitler's War*. His latest books are *Churchill's War* (Volume 1) and *Göring: A Biography*.

PROFESSOR ANTHONY KUBEK earned a Ph.D. in political science and history from Georgetown University. Dr. Kubek has taught at the University of Dallas, where he became senior professor and chairman of the social sciences division. He was dean of the University of Plano in Texas, and has been visiting professor at several universities in the Republic of China (Taiwan). Dr. Kubek has served as a consultant for the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, for which he edited the Morgenthau Diaries. He is the author of *How the Far East Was Lost*, *The Amerasia Papers*, *Modernizing China*, and many other books and articles.

VICTOR MARCHETTI served for fourteen years with the CIA, where he rose to be executive assistant to the deputy director. His book *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, co-authored with John Marks, was the first critical account of the agency written by an insider. When Marchetti was ordered to submit his book to the CIA censors, he became the first American to be served with an official censorship order by a court of the United States. Marchetti is also the author of *The Ropedancer*, an espionage novel, and currently edits *New American View*, a newsletter critical of Israel and the Israeli lobby in America, with Mark Lane.

THE REVEREND HERMAN OTTEN received his master's degrees in history (Washington University) and sacred theology (Concordia Seminary, St. Louis). He is pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church in New Haven, Missouri and publisher and editor of the weekly *Christian News*.

JOHN M. RIES is a graduate of Notre Dame University (B.A.) and the University of Tulsa (M.A.). He teaches Latin and history at the secondary school level.

What historians are saying about the Roques thesis . . .

. . . from now on researchers will have to take his work into account . . . —Alain Decaux, member, Académie Française

Had I been a member of the jury, I would probably have given a grade of "Very good" to Mr. Roques' thesis.

—Michel de Bouard, Institut de France

This is the exposé which shattered the myth of Pope Pius XII's complicity in the Holocaust, and struck at the very roots of the

Holocaust story's credibility by challenging the "confessions" of SS

officer Kurt Gerstein.

Author Henri Roques' doctoral thesis

made world

headlines in 1986, when for the first

time in the history of French academe


a duly awarded doctorate was

revoked by state fiat.

For the first time, the accusations of Kurt Gerstein—the enigmatic, twisted Third Reich functionary who claimed to have witnessed mass gassings of Jews

in 1942—are here subjected to thorough critical review. Roques' stunning conclusion: not only are

Gerstein's allegations of a mass extermination of Jews and a Roman



FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Catholic cover-up of the slaughter groundless, but postwar academics have deliberately manipulated and falsified key parts of Gerstein's tortured testimony.

An indispensable resource for scholar and layman alike, *The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein*

provides transcripts and translations of an unprecedented six versions of Gerstein's story, as well as photocopies of the originals; a searching examination of both the authenticity and credibility of the "confessions"; and numerous documents and records which have never before been published. Henri Roques' thesis is sure to become a classic, not only of meticulous scholarly detective work but of the liberating power of free inquiry in the time-honored Western tradition.

ISBN: 0-939484-27-7

Pb. 340 pp., Tables, Notes, Index — \$11.00

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

Send for our catalog of unusual and hard-to-find titles