

New Holocaust Story

Harold Weisberg

a story from its Geneva correspondent that the Washington Post buried on page 29 of its February 17 editions is relevant to the years of controversy in these pages and it reminds me of my own writing before I enlisted in the army in World War II. ~~It is a new Holocaust story.~~

It also reminds me that the Department of Justice <sup>then</sup> asked me violate a law it was charged with enforcing and that thus I became what was known as an "unregistered foreign agent" - for British intelligence.

The Post's story is headed - and it is an enormous understatement - "Study Says Red Cross Did Too Little to Help Jews in WWII."

This study of its own records was <sup>commissioned</sup> authorized by the International Committee of the Red Cross. It opened its files to the eminent Swiss historian it selected to study its record - but its record only as reflected in its own files <sup>limited</sup> and to what <sup>it</sup> was recorded and preserved <sup>MS</sup> which is very far from a complete record.

The main conclusion is that the lack of succor for millions of Jews constituted the "the worst defeat in the history of <sup>the</sup> ~~its~~ (the ICRC) history of its humanitarian mission." <sup>at beginning in 1935/1939 I</sup> ~~had~~ published a series of definitive exposes of Nazi cartels and how they impaired the Allies preparation for defense against Hitler and the war effort. In this original work, investigative reporting, I developed information our Government and Britain's did not have. I took it to our Department of Justice and gave it to the late Joe Borkin, economist and lawyer, and it is he who asked me to become a British agent.

I did, by taking information to <sup>w</sup> two agents in economic warfare <sup>They had a</sup> ~~in a private house~~ not far from the embassy. I met with them on a number of occasions, all in violation of the law but important in the defense of the world against Hitler.

Contrary to the <sup>statement</sup> ~~suggestion~~ in this ~~ICRC~~ ICRC study, some of the limitations of which I note above, information on the Holocaust was "clear" in 1942. I knew about it and wanted to write about it. Through my British contacts I met "The Man Known As Intrepid," the <sup>title</sup> ~~title~~ of a book about him, the chief of British espionage in the United States. His name was Stephenson. He put me in contact with U.S. representatives of the European anti-Hitler underground. They were as open with me <sup>as</sup> ~~and~~ he had been and they informed me,

particularly the Poles, about <sup>Hitler's</sup> wholesale slaughter of Jews.

I was not able to place this article with any major publication so I gave it to a small Jewish magazine. The story included pictures of underground anti-Hitler papers with accounts of what we now know as the Holocaust.

Because I enlisted in the army in ~~1942~~ 1942 (and wound up in our own new intelligence agency, the Office of Strategic Services) it is obvious that Hitler's murderous record was "clear" in 1942.

It is commendable, I believe, for the ICRC to have taken this too-long delayed look at itself and its contribution to the ~~slaughter~~ <sup>of 6,000,000 Jews</sup> of millions of innocents, but whether or no understated as the study relates to the Red Cross, it is enormously understated as it relates to all the major anti-Hitler governments. Like the Red Cross, all of them, ~~particular~~ <sup>our</sup> including our own government under FDR, could have saved a <sup>large</sup> enormous percentage of those who ultimately died in Hitler's death camps and refused to <sup>OK</sup> ~~Each~~ <sup>They</sup> see some selfish interest as more important than ~~common decency~~ <sup>humanitarianism</sup>, than decent ~~concern~~ <sup>concern</sup> for the respect of mankind, than preventing unspeakable tortures and millions of agonizing murders, as more important than saving those very many lives that could have been saved ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> those Jews not yet under Hitler's domination.

Some of these were outside of the territory Hitler controlled, <sup>completely</sup> like France, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal. <sup>Vichy</sup> At least a half-million could have been <sup>rescued</sup> saved from Hungary when it was merely a Hitler vassal. (The courageous Swedes did make valiant efforts.)

The Vatican <sup>too</sup> also refused to help. Later it helped important Nazis escape retribution.

In Vichy <sup>France</sup> Germany alone thousands of Jewish ~~and~~ children had been collected <sup>at least</sup> and were ready to leave but they were not permitted to.

A major factor in this was Klaus Barbie, defended in these pages by Roy Meachum; if Barbie didn't murder a hundred thousand  <sup>Jews</sup> or more personally he wasn't all that important.

"The biggest surprise" to the ICRC committeeman who pushed the investigation, was that ~~the~~ "the ICRC could have saved more Jewish lives in the later years of the war in countries such as Hungary and Romania, allied with Germany but not so oppressively controlled ~~and~~ and occupied."

From this we are to believe that ~~most of the~~ <sup>allied</sup> anti-Hitler governments and many individuals, including even writers, knew what the ICRC did not know.

Another surprise to him is that "the Swiss government played a significant role in persuading the (ICRC) not to issue a moral appeal against Nazi death camps in 1942."

This is the same year for which the reports says the Red Cross ~~records~~ "information is not totally clear."

For all ~~nations and their~~ governments the alleged reason for preserving guilty silence and doing nothing is fear of Hitler, ~~of what Hitler might do.~~ They all feared something more than the inevitable consequences for which they all share responsibility, the most terrible slaughter <sup>- of Jews -</sup> at least since Christianity dominated the world. ~~the slaughter of millions of whom 6,000,000 were Jews.~~

Not long ago readers of these papers were told in a lecture to the Israeli government and Jews in general that they should learn the lesson of ~~the~~ history. In reply I wrote that they had and their policies and actions came from their personal experiences and knowledge of history, ancient and recent. ~~That they had learned what those who pontificate against them have not learned and were not about to forget it.~~

For all its omissions and inconsistencies and much to its credit the ICRC did commission the study that, <sup>although</sup> ~~it~~ limited to those of its own records <sup>that</sup> still exist, <sup>amounts to</sup> has the effect of its ~~acknowledgement~~ <sup>acknowledgement</sup> of its failings and guilt.

I do not expect this belated honesty, this <sup>overdue</sup> admission of guilt by those <sup>to be duplicated</sup> by those many governments <sup>including our own and Britain's, which many of the</sup> who could have saved millions <sup>who were</sup> who murdered, <sup>didn't</sup> and refused to do ~~even~~ <sup>even</sup> the thousands of children gathered and waiting in vain at French ports.

Those who could have been saved and weren't were Jews. I doubt they would not have been saved had they not been Jews.

What is different about this current report is that it was about the ICRC and was commissioned by the ICRC. Since World War II there have been many <sup>detailed and responsible</sup> scholarly studies, all readily available <sup>They are</sup> and ignored by most people, who are not interested, with much ~~more information and detail than is indicated in this published account of the ICRC study.~~ History's lesson has long been available to those who care about it.

And to those who misrepresented it.