

[HOME](#) [DEMJANJUK](#)

---

# BLURB BIOGRAPHY OF JOHN DEMJANJUK, SO FAR

by Lubomyr Prytulak

First posted on [xoxol.org](#) 01-Feb-2010, last revised 08-Feb-2010, 12:53am PST

---

If some future historian gazing back at our times were to sum up John Demjanjuk in a single sentence, say covering his life up to the beginning of the Munich trial, what might that sentence be?



John Demjanjuk photo on the Trawniki ID Card

## IVAN THE TERRIBLE — NOW

### Blurb biography of John Demjanjuk, version one

From what the mainstream channels of information have been saying, that blurb biography of John Demjanjuk might run something like this:

*John Demjanjuk was convicted by an Israeli court of having been the notorious Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, and was sentenced to death, but was saved from hanging by the discovery that it had been another Ukrainian Ivan — Ivan Marchenko — who had really been Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka.*

The above synopsis has been broadcast for more than two decades, and continues to be broadcast with mounting frequency today, through information conduits around the globe from ABC (American Broadcasting Corporation), AFP (Agence France-Presse), AL JAZEERA, and AP (Associated Press) to the WALL STREET JOURNAL, WASHINGTON EXAMINER, WASHINGTON POST, and WIKIPEDIA, as is illustrated at [ivan-now-quotes.html](http://ivan-now-quotes.html).

The evidence for the above widely-repeated Ivan-the-Terrible story is laid out in the 1988 Israeli verdict convicting John Demjanjuk of having been Ivan the Terrible, based on the testimony of six Treblinka survivors: Pinchas Epstein, Eliyahu Rosenberg, Yechiel Reichman, Avraham Goldfarb, Avraham Lindwasser, and Gustav Boreks. The following excerpt from the testimony of Pinchas Epstein is typical:

Ivan would come out of this room [the gas chamber] and would rain murderous blows on us with the pipe. Sometimes, he would come with a dagger, sometimes with a bayonet, and he would crack skulls, he would cut off ears, he would brutalize the prisoners, it is absolutely unbelievable, unbelievable, and he would stand next to the corpses and gaze upon them. I want to say, honorable court, that it was horrible to look at the corpses when they took them out of the cabins [gas chambers]. People with crushed faces, people with stab wounds, pregnant women with stab wounds in their bellies, women with the fetus hanging half out, young girls with stab wounds on their breasts, with eyes gouged out. I find it difficult to portray this scene ... how those victims looked. [...] Ivan was someone whom I find difficult to compare with anything, not even with an animal, because I know that an animal, if sated, does not attack... Ivan was insatiable, he would look for prey all day long, every minute, so that I can't even compare him with an animal, he was never satisfied.

---

The Israeli court's summary of Ivan the Terrible can be read at [verdict-israel](http://verdict-israel).  
 Square-bracketed dots above indicate elipsis by Lubomyr Prytulak; unbracketed ellipsis dots were in the original verdict.

"Notorious" is the qualifier most often attached to Ivan the Terrible, and it will prove instructive to review the reasons why Ivan the Terrible is rightly considered to be notorious. In the first place, Ivan the Terrible's deeds were *unparalleled*. No one else's savagery compared with his. No one else's brutality deserved to be mentioned in the same breath. No eyewitness in the Israeli trial ever recollected any other Watchman guard or SS German as being almost as cruel as Ivan the Terrible, or as striving to emulate Ivan the Terrible, or as joining in Ivan the Terrible's orgy of maiming and slaughter. In addition, Ivan the Terrible's deeds were *incessant* — his sadism being insatiable, it found expression from morning to night, day after day. Also, Ivan the Terrible's deeds were *prolonged* — he did not perform them within a day or within a week or even within a month, but over the course of eleven months. Furthermore, Ivan the Terrible's deeds were *public* — he did not perform them in a dungeon or in a secret torture chamber but out in the open in front of everybody. Lacking the slightest measure of self-consciousness or inhibition, let alone shame or remorse, he cared not in the least how many witnesses stood gaping in horror at what he was doing. And on top of all that, the viewing distance was often small, so confined was the space at Treblinka, as we are reminded by Pinchas Epstein: "He was always near me, a few meters away. This happened. This was such a restricted place, every hour, every second of each day."

Ivan the Terrible was notorious, then, because he committed extraordinarily brutal and sadistic crimes ceaselessly over the course of almost a year and in front of an aghast audience. It follows, therefore, that everyone at Treblinka knew this Ivan the Terrible, everyone at Treblinka feared him, everyone at Treblinka talked about him. The images most strongly burned into the minds of the prisoners were images of Ivan the Terrible. The memories that most plagued survivors for the rest of their lives were memories of Ivan the Terrible. In the words of the Jerusalem court, "He was their nightmare." To speak of Treblinka is to speak, first and foremost, of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka.

With such views as these, the Israeli court is in enthusiastic agreement:

No, one cannot forget the scenes of horror, the atmosphere of terror, everything that took place in the extermination camp. It is impossible to forget Ivan the Terrible and his atrocities.

After hearing the witnesses, and on the basis of our independent impression of their appearance before us, it is clear to us that the history of the Treblinka extermination camp, everything that befell them from the time that their persecution and that of their families commenced, and all the scenes of horror that they witnessed, are all like a fire imprisoned in their bones and that they are deeply ingrained in their memories. The witnesses constantly relive these experiences. These, it is true to say, they will never forget.

---

Verdict in State of Israel v Ivan (John) Demjanjuk, Date of Issue edition, 18 Apr 1988, p. 201.

And so to learn more about Ivan the Terrible, we expect to have to do no more than read any description of Treblinka to discover the words of the six above Israeli witnesses being confirmed and detailed and expanded. And we might further expect that accounts recorded at the time that the events took place, or shortly afterward, might be more accurate than accounts being offered for the first time fifty or sixty years later.

And so for corroboration and elaboration of the things that we hear being said about Ivan the Terrible NOW, let us therefore turn to examine what was being said THEN, with the expectation, or at least while entertaining the hypothesis, that the farther back our THEN reaches towards the events in question, the more accurate will be our view.

## IVAN THE TERRIBLE — THEN

Six early descriptions of Treblinka that are widely available each comes with its own unique set of recommendations.

### @ 1943 Jacob Apenszlak: The Black Book of Polish Jewry (BBPJ)

The BBPJ statement on Treblinka comes powerfully endorsed — the book's list of sponsors includes one first lady, one Nobel Laureate whose name has become synonymous with genius, three U.S. Congressmen, one U.S. Senator, one mayor of New York City, one U.S. Cabinet member, and other notables. On top of such illustrious sponsors, the BBPJ also lists fifteen members of the Publication Committee, five of whom are accorded the title "Dr," and gives special acknowledgement to Abraham Goldberg, former chairman of the Administrative Council of the American Federation for Polish Jews. The number and prestige of the BBPJ's patrons and sponsors, together with its publication being contemporaneous with the events described, leads us to expect an account of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka that is outstandingly accurate.

### @ 1944 Vasily Grossman: The Hell Called Treblinka

Upon reaching Treblinka, the Red Army located 40 camp survivors, some still hiding in nearby forests, all of whom Vasily Grossman was able to interview on the spot, along with local Polish peasants. His resulting essay, The Hell Called

Treblinka, is considered one of the most important in Holocaust literature. If anybody is able to paint a vivid picture of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, it is Vasily Grossman:

Everything written below has been compiled from the accounts of living witnesses, from the testimony of people who worked in Treblinka from the first day of the camp's existence until 02 August 1943 when the doomed prisoners rose up, burned the camp to the ground, and fled into the woods, according to the testimony of an apprehended Watchman which confirmed every word, and often supplemented, the narratives of the witnesses. These people I met with personally, spoke with at length and in detail, and now have their written depositions lying before me on the table. And all these numerous testimonies flowing from various sources, converge and corroborate each other in every particular, from their description of the habits of the kommandant's dog Bari to their account of the technology of the murder of the victims and of the automation of the machinery of death.

---

Vasily Grossman, *The Hell Called Treblinka*, 1944, Paragraph 22.

### @ 1945 Samuel Rajzman: American House Committee on Foreign Affairs

Samuel Rajzman's 1945 statement before the American House Committee on Foreign Affairs seems to have laid the foundation for his becoming a prosecutorial prize witness, as evidenced by his being called in February 1946 as the sole witness on Treblinka at the 1945-1946 Nuremberg Trials, and after that as one of the prime witnesses in the Dusseldorf Trials, and in 1978 as a prosecution witness against Fedor Fedorenko in Fort Lauderdale. His being called upon to share his experiences so often and over such a span of years suggests that the authorities staging such proceedings considered that what he had to say was particularly worth hearing.

### @ 1945-1946 Nuremberg Trials

The 1945-1946 Nuremberg Trials included a review of the Jewish Holocaust, and in 1946 heard testimony on Treblinka from the same Samuel Rajzman who appeared before the American House Committee on Foreign Affairs the previous year.

### @ 1948 Marian Muszkat: Polish Charges Against German War Criminals

The *Polish Charges Against German War Criminals*, whose chapter on Treblinka is of interest here, was submitted to the United Nations War Crimes Commission by Marian Muszkat, among whose qualifications was his having headed the Polish delegation at the Nuremberg Trials, and was introduced by Henryk Świątkowski, at the time Poland's Minister of Justice, and earlier the head of the Polish team participating in the investigation of the murder of Polish officers at Katyn.

### @ 1961 Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem

The Eichmann trial reviewed the Jewish Holocaust in considerable detail, with four witnesses shining the spotlight on Treblinka, one of whom — Ya'akov Wiernik — had constructed a model of Treblinka to assist the court, a photograph of which model was used in the 1987-1988 Jerusalem trial of John Demjanjuk. One benefit of a time lapse approaching two decades between the Treblinka crimes in question and the Eichmann-trial testimony is that ample opportunity has been afforded for previously-overlooked persons and events to be incorporated into the historical record.

## WHAT THE SIX AUTHORITATIVE SOURCES TELL US

We proceed by conducting searches within our six sources for information relevant to Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka.



## Ivan Demjanjuk

In the six sources listed above, then, how many times did Treblinka witnesses cite the name Ivan Demjanjuk? The answer is zero. The name Ivan Demjanjuk was never mentioned by anyone, nor any name resembling Ivan Demjanjuk.

## Ivan Marchenko

It can be argued that it has now been conceded that Ivan Demjanjuk was never at Treblinka, conceded because it was discovered that it was Ivan Marchenko who really was Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. Therefore, it is the name Ivan Marchenko that we should be looking for. So, then, how many times was Ivan Marchenko mentioned in the six above sources? Here too, the answer proves to be zero. Ivan Marchenko was never mentioned, nor any name resembling Ivan Marchenko.

## Ivan the Terrible

A response to the two above disappointments might be to hypothesize that all Treblinka survivors had been satisfied to refer to the monster of Treblinka as Ivan the Terrible (or Ivan Grozny, or Grozni, as that nickname is rendered in Russian), but that they somehow never took the trouble to learn his real name. What should be searched for instead, it could be proposed, is how many times Ivan the Terrible is referred to in the six authoritative sources. And what we discover is that this count too comes up with a zero. No witnesses in any of our six authoritative sources recollected any Ivan the Terrible or any Ivan Grozny.

## Any Ukrainian monster

In response to the three above setbacks, it is possible to speculate that a Ukrainian monster of Treblinka did exist, but that the name Ivan the Terrible is an embellishment added some thirty-five years later. That is, one may conjecture that images of a genuine monster of Treblinka had indeed been seared into the survivors' memories and so that the monster himself was remembered, but the monster's nickname had not been seared into memory, and so the nickname was misremembered. Let's have the list of all Ukrainian monsters that have been described in the six authoritative accounts above, no matter what their names or nicknames. But again, the count comes up with exactly zero. Not a single one of the six authoritative accounts above describes any Ukrainian monster. There are insatiable killers and sadistic torturers galore, and their deeds are recounted and their names are recited — but they are all German, every last one of them, as can be confirmed by consulting the six authoritative sources which can be accessed by clicking the red ampersands above.

## Ukrainians generally

As there admittedly were Ukrainians among the perimeter guards (along with Ukrainian-domiciled Volksdeutsche and Russians and Estonians and Latvians and Lithuanians and others) then it is to be expected that Ukrainians would have received some mention in the six accounts, and they did, as detailed below, but surprisingly rarely, and with a culpability that is dwarfed by German culpability.

- @ 1943 *Jacob Apenszlak: The Black Book of Polish Jewry (BBPJ)* Ukrainians are mentioned four times merely to assert that they form a majority among the *Lagerschutz* (Camp Guards), and a fifth time in the sentence "The Ukrainian guards, witnesses of the mass murders, are allowed to keep the money stolen from the victims." Leaving aside questions of peripheral relevance which this sentence raises, and sticking to only the question of Ivan the Terrible, it is to be noted that Ukrainian guards are said to have witnessed murders, but are not said to have committed them, and in fact are never portrayed as making any direct contact with prisoners, which is compatible with the interpretation that they served as perimeter guards, and which is decidedly incompatible with there ever having been any Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka.
- @ 1944 *Vasily Grossman: The Hell Called Treblinka*. The words Ukraine or Ukrainian never appear in connection with camp personnel. Grossman does use "Ukraine" exactly once in the context "taken to Ukraine to work in agriculture" (paragraph 14), and he uses "Ukrainian" exactly once within a list of artifacts found in Treblinka soil, among these being fragments of "Ukrainian embroidery" (paragraph 130).

- @ 1945 *Samuel Rajzman: American House Committee on Foreign Affairs.* The words Ukraine or Ukrainian never appear in Rajzman's testimony before the American House Committee on Foreign Affairs.
- @ 1945-1946 *Nuremberg Trials.* The words Ukraine or Ukrainian never appear in Rajzman's testimony at Nuremberg.
- @ 1948 *Marian Muszkat: Polish Charges Against German War Criminals.* Ukrainians are mentioned thirteen times, in eight of which instances they are depicted as acting in unison with Germans but with no information provided as to their respective numbers in such joint actions, or as to the relative contributions of each nationality to the activity described, and in one case Ukrainians are similarly lumped together with Germans and Lithuanians. In the remaining four mentions, Ukrainians are blamed alone. Relevant here is that no Ukrainian monster is discovered in Treblinka, and in fact Muszkat singles out no Ukrainian individual for particular blame or even for bare mention, and so the hypothesis of Ivan the Terrible continues devoid of corroboration.
- @ 1961 *Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem.* Of the four witnesses testifying on Treblinka at the Eichmann trial, two made no mention of Ukrainians (Ya'akov Wiernik and Avraham Lindwasser), and two did mention Ukrainians (Kalman Teigman ten times and Eliyahu Rosenberg seven). Teigman and Rosenberg do depict Ukrainian guards as collectively joining the German SS in beating and robbing prisoners, in shoving them into gas chambers, and on one occasion in shooting them, which would be relevant if we were evaluating collective Ukrainian culpability, but which is irrelevant for our purposes, as we are looking for a notorious monster, and none can be discerned in such descriptions of group activity. What is relevant for our purposes is that three Ukrainians are identified by name, something that has never happened before within the six above sources, one by Teigman and the other two by Rosenberg, and these three Ukrainians need to be examined to see whether any of them matches the description of Ivan the Terrible.

To begin, Kalman Teigman dedicates a single sentence to a Ukrainian going by the unslavic name of Rogozo. Teigman's statement concerns the prisoner Chorazycki who has swallowed poison in order to avoid being forced to disclose information to the SS about an imminent prisoner uprising, and who now lies either unconscious or dead, and whom the SS attempts to revive so that it can extract his information: "The faithful assistant of Kurt Franz, a Ukrainian Zugwachmann Rogozo, pulled out Chorazycki's tongue with some sharp instrument or hook, I don't remember exactly. Kurt Franz poured water into his mouth from a bucket, after which he jumped on him with his boots, in order to flush out his stomach." And that first sentence is the sum total of the information that Teigman provides on Rogozo, the second sentence having been included by way of explanatory background. Although at first glance Rogozo's pulling out of the tongue might seem sadistic, a more careful reading suggests that the tongue is being pulled out only enough to allow water to be poured into the mouth and down into the digestive tract, and that Rogozo's action must be understood as not an expression of sadism or of torture — it is a step (however ill-advised it may be judged by modern first-aid practitioners) in an attempt to save the life of an unconscious individual, which is why Rogozo was not mentioned in our search above for Ukrainian monsters. The scene, furthermore, lacks credibility, as Rogozo did not need "a sharp instrument or hook" to keep the tongue from blocking the back of the mouth (he could have used his finger), and lacks credibility as well because pouring water into the mouth of a supine individual may be more likely to fill his lungs with water than his digestive track where the poison is, and because jumping up and down on someone's chest with one's boots must strike anyone as doing more harm than good. In any case, Rogozo — the first Ukrainian that we have seen identified by name anywhere in our six sources — fails to match Ivan the Terrible not only by bearing the wrong name but more importantly by failing to exhibit the insatiable sadism which is Ivan the Terrible's hallmark.

And in the Eichmann trial the other two named Ukrainians were Ivan and Nikolai, as testified by Eliyahu Rosenberg:

A. [...] The people walked past in silence. That was at the beginning, in summer 1942. They did not know where they were going. When they entered the gas chambers, two Ukrainians stood next to the entrance — one was Ivan and

the other was Nikolai. They introduced the gas.

---

p. 1213

Q. And who introduced the gas — only the two Ukrainians?

A. Yes, Ivan and Nikolai.

Q. Always?

A. Yes, always.

---

p. 1215

However, Rosenberg's Ivan is not Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka either, as Rosenberg's Ivan

1. lacks the full title of Ivan the Terrible,
2. is unmentioned in any other of our six sources, and unmentioned even by any of the other three witnesses testifying alongside Rosenberg at the Eichmann trial, so that Rosenberg's Ivan cannot be said to be notorious,
3. does not carry a pipe and a saber, or any other weapon with which he could inflict personal injury,
4. does not push victims into the death chamber,
5. does not exhibit the maniacal and insatiable sadism of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka which manifests itself in such incessant acts as the bashing in of skulls and the slicing off of women's breasts and of men's ears, which failure to exhibit, incidentally, is the reason that Rosenberg's Ivan did not budge our earlier count of Ukrainian monsters above zero,
6. receives at the Eichmann trial not a word more than the above-quoted attention which is far skimpier than he would have received if he really had been the greatest hands-on killer of the Jewish Holocaust.

Rosenberg, then, falls far short of describing any Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka that matches today's descriptions, and it will not hurt to emphasize that even if Rosenberg had described exactly the same Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka that is widely believed today, that Ivan's existence would still be disconfirmed by Rosenberg's three fellow-witnesses at the Eichmann trial failing to remember such an Ivan, and by all five of our remaining authoritative sources failing to remember him. The prerequisite of notoriety cannot be waived.

And if Rosenberg's Ivan fails to tip the balance in favor of the existence of Ivan the Terrible, then Rosenberg's Nikolai must as well, as Nikolai's resemblance is even weaker, matching Ivan the Terrible not even on first name.

## Any other Ivan

Returning finally to our counts, we might ask how many times Ivan is mentioned in the six above authoritative sources — not Ivan the Terrible, just plain Ivan — and here the count returns a value of exactly one, and that one is the Ivan mentioned by Eliyahu Rosenberg at the Eichmann trial that we noted immediately above.

## Creating a composite image

It is to be expected that the creators of today's mythical Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka had some acquaintance with early sources such as the six above, and borrowed details from them here and there to paste into a composite which they offered to the world under the name Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. Might we, then, be able to discover within the six above sources anything by way of scattered fragments that may have been incorporated into today's story of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka? Indeed we can, beginning with Eliyahu Rosenberg's Ivan at the Eichmann trial that we saw just above, whose absence of insatiable sadism can be made up by borrowing from Muszkat's two Germans who cut off breasts:

7. **Leon FINKELSZTEJN:** "Bilitz Alfred and Gens Adolf stood at the entrance to the gas chambers and cut women's breasts off



with long knives..."

The same is repeated by Hejnoch Brener and Blacharski Zygmunt who also saw Bilitz cutting women's breasts off.

---

Marian Muszkat, Polish charges against German war criminals, Polish Main National Office for the Investigation of German War Crimes in Poland, 1948, p. 195, ellipses were in the original.

And our composite Ivan the Terrible is so far also lacking personal weapons of pipe and sabre, but each of these can be borrowed from two guards described by Grossman: "The tall one held in his hands a massive, meter-long gas pipe and a whip; the other was armed with a saber" (paragraph 68).

What is still needed but unavailable from our six sources is the full nickname Ivan the Terrible, and John Demjanjuk's (if that's who's being framed) physical characteristics tall, strongly-built, blond, and 23 years old where the closest any source provides is Grossman's tall, strongly-built, black-haired, and 30: "They were sadists and maniacs — one was tall, about thirty, with massive shoulders, with a dark-skinned, laughing, merrily-excited face, and black hair; the other, younger, short, with brown hair and pale-jaundiced cheeks, as if he had taken a strong dose of quinine" (paragraph 67).

## What the evidence invites us to conclude

If a notorious Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka had existed, then all early witnesses would have spoken of him. As no early witnesses spoke of him, he could not have existed. Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, then, might be called a fiction or a fable or a myth or a hoax or a publicity stunt — at least if the choice of words were left to an indulgent speaker. Recollecting that the purpose of the Ivan the Terrible story was to get John Demjanjuk hanged, a less indulgent speaker might prefer to call it a murder weapon.

## Blurb biography of John Demjanjuk, version two

In view of this overturn of the conventional understanding of John Demjanjuk, we now imagine that our future historian finds himself needing to edit the blurb biography of John Demjanjuk that he started with above as follows:

*John Demjanjuk was convicted by an Israeli court of having been an IMAGINARY Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, and was sentenced to death, but was saved from hanging by the discovery that it had been another Ukrainian Ivan — Ivan Marchenko — who had really been that IMAGINARY Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka.*

Shocking as the above statement may be — especially in a world that has been pre-warned by George Orwell, and so hopefully inoculated against Big Brother brainwashing — examination of further evidence below may force our hypothetical historian to even more disturbing revisions.

WHO KNOWS THAT IVAN THE TERRIBLE IS A HOAX?

## Historians know

Ivan the Terrible, if real, would have been guaranteed mention in Holocaust histories, and even in broader WWII histories that touch on Treblinka, by virtue of holding the Holocaust record, and possibly even the all-time world record, for number of victims mutilated and killed by his own hand. However, in the histories on my shelf, I find no credence given to the Treblinka presence of John Demjanjuk or Ivan Demjanjuk, John Marchenko or Ivan Marchenko, Ivan the Terrible or Ivan Grozny, or of any Ukrainian or anyone at all going by any name committing the crimes attributed to Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. A sampling of such books, all of which discuss Treblinka to greater or lesser extent, is listed below in order of date of publication, the horizontal line below the first five books serving to distinguish ones published before accusations against John Demjanjuk began to make the papers around 1977 from those published after. Even Simon Wiesenthal, notorious for his eagerness to lay blame at Ukrainian feet, fails to include Ivan the Terrible

among his accusations, both in a book by him (*Justice Not Vengeance*, 1989) and in a book about him (Alan Levy, *The Wiesenthal File*, 1993).

1. Reitlinger, Gerald. *The Final Solution*. Sphere Books Limited, London, 1953.
  2. Reitlinger, Gerald. *The SS: Alibi of a Nation, 1922-1945*. Da Capo Press, 1957.
  3. Shirer, William L. *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1960.
  4. Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. The Viking Press, New York, 1963.
  5. Suhl, Yuri. *They Fought Back: The Story of the Jewish Resistance in Nazi Europe*. Schocken Books, New York, 1967. Suhl quotes three independent eye-witness accounts of Treblinka, and of the 1943 inmate uprising there, written respectively by Samuel Rajzman, Stanislaw Kon, and by Yankel Wiernick. None of these three accounts lend any credence to the Ivan the Terrible myth.
- 
6. Feig, Konnilyn G. *Hitler's Death Camps*. Holmes & Meier Publishers, New York and London, 1979.
  7. Bernstein, Victor H. *The Holocaust — Final Judgment*. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis and New York, 1980.
  8. Ehrenburg, Ilya & Grossman, Vasily. (Eds.) *The Black Book: The Ruthless Murder of Jews by German-Fascist Invaders Throughout the Temporarily-Occupied Regions of The Soviet Union and in the Death Camps of Poland During the War of 1941-1945*. Holocaust Library, New York, 1981.
  9. Gilbert, Martin. *Atlas of the Holocaust*. Michael Joseph, London, 1982.
  10. Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews: Revised and Definitive Edition*. Holmes & Meier, New York and London, 1985.
  11. Gilbert, Martin. *The Holocaust: The Jewish Tragedy*. Fontana/Collins, Glasgow, 1986.
  12. Arad, Yitzhak. *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987.
  13. Segev, Tom. *Soldiers of Evil: The Commandants of the Nazi Concentration Camps*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1987.
  14. Wiesenthal, Simon. *Justice Not Vengeance*. Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1989. Simon Wiesenthal reports that Demjanjuk has been extradited to stand trial, but makes no other mention of him, a reading of which statement might lead to the inference either that Wiesenthal believes that John Demjanjuk was a collaborator, or that what he really meant to say was "alleged collaborator": "A number of proceedings against these collaborators (aimed at deporting them from the USA) are now in progress; some have been deported, while others, such as Archbishop Viorel Trifa, Fedorenko and Demjanjuk, have been extradited to stand trial" (p. 157).
  15. Yahil, Leni. *The Holocaust: The Fate of European Jewry, 1932-1945*. Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1990.
  16. Hilberg, Raul. *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933-1945*. HarperCollins, New York, 1992.
  17. Levy, Alan. *The Wiesenthal File*. Constable, London, 1993.
  18. Lipstadt, Deborah. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. Plume, New York, 1993. A single reference is made to Demjanjuk prosecutions in a footnote attacking Pat Buchanan, but in this reference Lipstadt indicates no belief in the accusations against Demjanjuk or in the existence of any Ivan the Terrible: "Buchanan's statements were made as part of his defense of John Demjanjuk, a retired Cleveland auto worker accused of being Ivan the Terrible, notorious camp guard and a mass murderer at Treblinka. It is not Buchanan's defense of Demjanjuk with which I take issue — it is his use of denial arguments to do so" (p. 6).

19. Landau, Ronnie S. *The Nazi Holocaust*. Ivan R. Dee, Chicago, 1994. Landau makes a single reference to the Demjanjuk trial: "The question of the jurisdiction of Israel to hold trials relating to crimes committed before her birth and on different soil has been raised, most recently during the trial in Jerusalem of John Demjanjuk (accused of being 'Ivan the Terrible' of Treblinka)" (p. 258). However, although admitting awareness of the proceedings against John Demjanjuk, Landau shows no sign of going along with accusations, and neither mentions Demjanjuk again in his book, nor gives him a place in his list of Principal Characters on pp. 331-335.
20. Teveth, Shabtai. *Ben-Gurion and the Holocaust*. Harcourt Brace & Company, New York, 1996.
21. Berenbaum, Michael. (Ed.) *Witness to the Holocaust*. HarperCollins, New York, 1997.
22. Beever, Antony and Luba Vinogradova. (Eds.) *Vasily Grossman: A Writer at War, A Soviet Journalist with the Red Army, 1941-1945*. Vintage Books, New York, 2005.

The first five books above, published before John Demjanjuk was accorded media prominence in 1977, resemble the six authoritative sources that we scrutinized in detail higher above — they simply contain early descriptions of Treblinka which show no awareness of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, or of people soon to be accused of being that Ivan the Terrible. The remainder of the books from sixth to twenty-second, though, are different. Their authors did not merely fail to write about Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka because no one had ever heard of any Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, they failed to write about Ivan the Terrible even though the press was reminding them of him on an almost daily basis. In view of authors six to twenty-two above being surrounded by anti-Demjanjuk chanters, their failure to join the chorus expressed their unanimous dissent. Despite the popularity of the story, the historians balked at repeating it. They refused to jeopardize their reputations as scholars by parroting a palpable fiction. By failing to echo the story of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, historical writers wished to justify libraries placing their works in the non-fiction section. Although the American Nazi-hunting Office of Special Investigations (OSI) succeeded in eliciting from a handful of witnesses fantastic stories about John Demjanjuk as Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, these stories had not been previously known to historians, and once made known, were denied entry into their writings.

## Ben Ferencz knows

And it is not just historians who know the story of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka to be false. Everybody knows it — that is, everybody who has not placed his brain under the control of his television set, as for example veteran Nazi-war-crimes prosecutor Ben Ferencz:

JOAN RINGELHEIM: [...] Ben, you decided to call no witnesses and you closed the prosecution's case in three days –

BEN FERENCZ: Yes, I didn't call any witnesses, because witnesses are not very reliable. I could have had thousands of witnesses, the DP camps were full – the displaced persons camps were full of persons who would have been willing to testify, that any one of those defendants was – that he saw them murder his mother and his father.

There was a great deal of hatred and a great deal of fear, and they would have believed it. Eli Rosenberg, I believe is here in the audience, at least he was before, he may have run away in desperation. But – oh, there he is, in the back row. He's hiding. Get close to the exit. That's a good idea Eli.

Those are the problems, that they would come in and testify, and then on cross-examination they would break down. That happened in the Demjanjuk case in Israel. I didn't need it. I had their own reports, their own documents. I broke them down on cross-examination. They denied the authenticity of the reports. But, that didn't hold out. They came in with all kinds of alibis – that's why the trial lasted much longer than three days – but I was able to break that down on cross-examinations. So, those were the remarkable features of that trial as well though: not

calling any witnesses and finishing in record time – I mean, the prosecution's case.

---

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, An Evening With Ben Ferencz in  
Conversation with Joan Ringelheim, 05 Oct 2000 [www.ushmm.org/~](http://www.ushmm.org/~)

What Ben Ferencz tells us — Ben Ferencz whose success in prosecuting Nazi war criminals is second to none — is that it is easy to find thousands of witnesses ready to testify that they saw their mothers and fathers murdered by whatever defendant is placed in front of them, and that such witnesses break down under cross-examination. The German judges in Munich know this, and the German prosecutors, and the German legislators who write the laws that the German judges and German prosecutors follow, and that is why there is no cross-examination of witnesses in Munich — because those German judges and prosecutors and legislators don't want to see one witness after another being discredited during cross-examination. Ben Ferencz's attitude of shortening the presentation of the prosecution case and refusing to rely on witnesses is sane. The Munich court's dragging the trial out indulging a series of confabulating witnesses is insane.

## Hannah Arendt knows

And who else knows that Holocaust witnesses are not to be believed? Hannah Arendt was certainly conscious of it as she watched the Eichmann trial. In the first quote below, Arendt identifies the cause of Holocaust-witness unreliability — it is that Holocaust witnesses are given immunity from cross-examination, her opening reference to Mr. Hausner being to the Attorney General of Israel, Mr Gideon Hausner, who appeared for the prosecution:

Mr. Hausner had gathered together a "tragic multitude" of sufferers, each of them eager not to miss this unique opportunity, each of them convinced of his right to his day in court. The judges might, and did, quarrel with the prosecutor about the wisdom and even the appropriateness of using the occasion for "painting general pictures," but once a witness had taken the stand, it was difficult indeed to interrupt him, to cut short such testimony, "because of the honor of the witness and because of the matters about which he speaks," as Judge Landau put it. Who were they, humanly speaking, to deny any of these people their day in court? And who would have dared, humanly speaking, to question their veracity as to detail when they "poured out their hearts as they stood in the witness box," even though what they had to tell could only "be regarded as by-products of the trial"?

---

Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*, The Viking Press, New York, 1963, p. 191.

And next Hannah Arendt comments below on the effect produced by such exemption from verification as she describes above, starting with the case of a witness who is accustomed to delivering zany monologue, but who utterly and literally collapses at the mere invitation to dialogue, with Hannah Arendt cautioning that his is an extreme case, the more typical case being a witness merely unable to distinguish fact from fantasy:

All but a mere handful of witnesses were Israeli citizens, and they had been picked from hundreds and hundreds of applicants. (Ninety of them were survivors in the strict sense of the word, they had survived the war in one form or another of Nazi captivity). How much wiser it would have been to resist these pressures altogether (it was done up to a point, for none of the potential witnesses mentioned in *Minister of Death*, written by Quentin Reynolds on the basis of material provided by two Israeli journalists, and published in 1960, was ever called to the stand) and to seek out those who had not volunteered! As though to prove the point, the prosecution called upon a writer, well known on both sides of the Atlantic under the name of K-Zetnik — a slang word for a concentration-camp inmate — as the author of several books on Auschwitz that dealt with brothels, homosexuals, and other "human interest stories." He started off, as he had done at many of his public appearances, with an explanation of his adopted name. It was not a "pen-name," he said. "I must

carry this name as long as the world will not awaken after the crucifying of the nation ... as humanity has risen after the crucifixion of one man." He continued with a little excursion into astrology: the star "influencing our fate in the same way as the star of ashes of Auschwitz is there facing our planet, radiating toward our planet." And when he had arrived at "the unnatural power above Nature" which had sustained him thus far, and now, for the first time, paused to catch his breath, even Mr. Hausner felt that something had to be done about this "testimony," and, very timidly, very politely, interrupted: "Could I perhaps put a few questions to you if you will consent?" Whereupon the presiding judge saw his chance as well: "Mr Dinoor [this unlikely name the witness had given as his real one], *please, please*, listen to Mr. Hausner and to me." In response, the disappointed witness, probably deeply wounded, fainted and answered no more questions.

This, to be sure, was an exception, but if it was an exception that proved the rule of normality, it did not prove the rule of simplicity or of ability to tell a story, let alone of the rare capacity for distinguishing between things that had happened to the storyteller more than sixteen, and sometimes twenty, years ago, and what he had read and heard and imagined in the meantime.

---

Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*, The Viking Press, New York, 1963, pp. 203-204. Material within square brackets was in the original.

## Norman Finkelstein knows

And who else knows that Holocaust witnesses are not to be trusted? Norman Finkelstein knows, and so does his mother:

As the rendering of The Holocaust assumed ever more absurd forms, my mother liked to quote (with intentional irony) Henry Ford: "History is bunk." The tales of "Holocaust survivors" — all concentration camp inmates, all heroes of the resistance — were a special source of wry amusement in my home. Long ago John Stuart Mill recognized that truths not subject to continual challenge eventually "cease to have the effect of truth by being exaggerated into falsehood."

---

Norman G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Verso, London and New York, 2000, p. 7.

To an elaboration of the principle that Holocaust survivors can't be believed precisely because they have been exempted from any process of verification, Finkelstein adds the further observation that many of these survivors can't be believed even on their claim of being survivors, and indicates further that Raul Hilberg and Deborah Lipstadt may be not entirely hostile to such a negative evaluation:

Because enduring the camps became a crown of martyrdom, many Jews who spent the war elsewhere represent themselves as camp survivors. Another strong motive behind this misrepresentation, however, was material. The postwar German government provided compensation to Jews who had been in ghettos or camps. Many Jews fabricated their pasts to meet this eligibility requirement. "If everyone who claims to be a survivor actually is one," my mother used to exclaim, "who did Hitler kill?"

Indeed, many scholars have cast doubt on the reliability of survivor testimony. "A great percentage of the mistakes I discovered in my own work," Hilberg recalls, "could be attributed to testimonies." Even within the Holocaust industry, Deborah Lipstadt, for example, wryly observes that Holocaust survivors frequently maintain they were personally examined by Josef Mengele at Auschwitz.

Apart from the frailties of memory, some Holocaust survivor testimony may be suspect for additional reasons. Because

survivors are now revered as secular saints, one doesn't dare question them. Preposterous statements pass without comment. Elie Wiesel reminisces in his acclaimed memoir that, recently liberated from Buchenwald and only eighteen years old, "I read *The Critique of Pure Reason* — don't laugh! — in Yiddish." Leaving aside Wiesel's acknowledgment that at the time "I was wholly ignorant of Yiddish grammar," *The Critique of Pure Reason* was never translated into Yiddish. Wiesel also remembers in intricate detail a "mysterious Talmudic scholar" who "mastered Hungarian in two weeks, just to surprise me." Wiesel tells a Jewish weekly that he "often gets hoarse or loses his voice" as he silently reads his books to himself "aloud, inwardly." And to a *New York Times* reporter, he recalls that he was once hit by a taxi in Times Square. "I flew an entire block. I was hit at 45<sup>th</sup> Street and Broadway, and the ambulance picked me up at 44<sup>th</sup>."

---

Norman G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Verso, London and New York, 2000, pp. 81-82.

Although in his statement below Finkelstein has in mind the Holocaust-industry shakedown of Swiss banks, his complaint of the generous space which the press allots Holocaust-related stories, however fantastic, applies also to Nazi-war-crimes stories, however fantastic, such as the story of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka:

Using the House and Senate banking committees as a springboard, the Holocaust industry orchestrated a shameless campaign of vilification. With an infinitely compliant and credulous press ready to give banner headlines to any Holocaust-related story, however preposterous, the smear campaign proved unstoppable.

---

Norman G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Verso, London and New York, 2000, p. 91.

## Boaz Evron knows

Boaz Evron not only knows that Holocaust witnesses confabulate, he views that confabulation as being of such massive proportions as to constitute the second-greatest catastrophe to befall the Jewish people during the twentieth century, an ongoing catastrophe that even today eats away at the Jewish people like a cancer:

Two terrible things happened to the Jewish people during this century: [First, t]he Holocaust and the lessons drawn from it. [Second, t]he non-historical and easily refutable commentaries on the Holocaust made either deliberately or through simple ignorance and their use for propaganda purposes among non-Jews or Jews both in Israel and the diaspora constitute a cancer for Jews and for the State of Israel.

---

Boaz Evron, *Holocaust: A Danger for the Jewish People*, published in the Hebrew journal *Yiton* 77, May-June 1980.

## Hans Peter Rullman knows

Writers focussing particularly on the John Demjanjuk persecution might bypass making statements about the general unreliability of Holocaust-survivor testimony, and emphasize a conclusion which subsumes that unreliability — that conclusion being the same one that keeps historians from believing in any Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka — the conclusion that Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka is a recent fabrication:

First of all, neither in Sobibor nor in Treblinka did there exist a guard named "Ivan the Terrible." Despite the fact that for 40 years after the war with all available witnesses having been heard, none recalled an "Ivan the Terrible." To make a long story short: The name "Ivan the Terrible" was invented by the American press after John Demjanjuk became a suspect.

---

Hans Peter Rullman, *Victim of the Holocaust*, English translation abridged and edited



from the German, Published by UNCHAIN, Newark New Jersey 1987, p. 17.

## Pat Buchanan knows

Pat Buchanan not only doubts the existence of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, he grasps how that Ivan could be a composite, just as had been demonstrated above. As Pat Buchanan relies on sources other than the six sources examined above, the two fragments which he pieces together differ from the fragments offered above:

Did "Ivan the Terrible" ever exist?

In my judgement, "Ivan the Terrible" is probably a composite of Ivan, the gas chamber operator mentioned by Wiernik, the "enormous brute," the "sadistic giant," of Jean-Francois Cohen-Steiner's "Treblinka," (1966), the huge mesomorph that Polish villagers remember — a monster of a man who wrenched and drank in their village near Treblinka, and who either died in the August uprising or perished in the Balkans with other Nazi survivors of the death camp.

The other half of the composite is, I believe, a German, a Nazi, a middle-aged veteran of Hitler's "euthanasia" program, a man Alexander Donat describes as a "hot-tempered, brutal individual and ruthless careerist," seen "running through the camps brandishing his whip and his gun, shouting and cursing," a criminal one SS historian described as a "conceited ogre." His name was Christian Wirth, but he was known to inmates by a nickname — "Christian the Terrible." Wirth was killed by partisans near Trieste on May 26, 1944.

---

Buchanan Answers Ryan, Ukrainian Weekly, 15 Feb 1987, p. 6 [ukrweekly.com/~](http://ukrweekly.com/~)

## Blurb biography of John Demjanjuk, version three

The above list of those in the know is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive. Many more than have been cited above are aware that Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka is a fantasy. Nevertheless the above list is long enough that we might at this point venture to revise our blurb biography of John Demjanjuk as follows, where "HISTORIANS" is meant to include all those who were knowledgeable about the events in question:

*John Demjanjuk was convicted by an Israeli court of having been an imaginary Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, and was sentenced to death, but was saved from hanging by the discovery that it had been another Ukrainian Ivan — Ivan Marchenko — who had really been that imaginary Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. THROUGHOUT THE PERSECUTION OF JOHN DEMJANJUK, HISTORIANS WERE AWARE THAT THE STORY OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE OF TREBLINKA WAS FICTITIOUS.*

### THE ROLE PLAYED BY UKRAINIANS IN NAZI KILLING

Two objections can be made with respect to the heavy blame that today's media places on Ukrainian participation in Nazi killing.

#### Who is Ukrainian?

The first objection is to the absence of testimony as to how witnesses were able to infer Ukrainian nationality. In the case of the three individual putative Ukrainians pointed to within our six authoritative sources above, one is called Rogozo, which is not a Ukrainian name, another is called Nikolai, which is a Russian name, the Ukrainian counterpart being Mykola, and the third is called Ivan, which is equally Russian and Ukrainian. It would seem that relying on name alone fails to identify this trio as Ukrainian. So, then, what are these witnesses who speak of Ukrainians relying on? Perhaps the witnesses have overheard the guards talking to each other, and were able to identify the language they were speaking? But then the witness's nation of origin should be queried because a German Jew, or a Hungarian

or Romanian Jew, knowing besides Yiddish perhaps only their single non-Slavic nation-of-origin language, might be unable to distinguish Ukrainian from Russian, or for that matter from Polish or Lithuanian or Latvian or Estonian. Although exactly this line of questioning seems never to have been addressed to any witness, a related question was asked of Sobibor survivor Ya'akov Biskowitz testifying at the Eichmann trial, and whose answer seemed to be the paradoxical one that he could identify Ukrainians by their being Russians:

**Judge Halevi** Who were these Ukrainians you mentioned all the time? Which Ukrainians did you refer to constantly in your evidence?

**Witness Biskowitz** These were Russian prisoners of war who went over to the German side. Of course, the Germans gave them the alternative either to be prisoners or to collaborate. They guarded the camp.

---

State of Israel, Ministry of Justice, The Trial of Adolf Eichmann, Record of Proceedings in the District Court of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 1992. The Trust for the Publication of the Proceedings of the Eichmann Trial in co-operation with the Israel State Archives and Yad Vashem — the Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority. Printed in Israel at Keter Enterprises, Jerusalem. Session No. 65, 05 June 1961, p. 1187.

What rational meaning, if any, Biskowitz intended by his answer is unclear; what is clear is that his words taken at face value are contradictory, and that clarification was called for, but instead of requesting clarification, the court's focus shifted and the question of national identification was never clarified. In view of the sloppiness of witness identification of nationality that is suggested by the considerations above, it may be wondered whether "Ivan" was sometimes not a guard's real name at all, but only a casual allusion to any Slav, just as Fritz was a casual allusion to any German, and just as continues to this day, as for example in the title of a course description at Grinnell College, "History 295: Ivan and Fritz Go to War, The Nazi-Soviet Conflict on World War II's Eastern Front" [web.grinnell.edu/~](http://web.grinnell.edu/~). Ivan, in other words, may be suspected of sometimes falling short of identifying an individual by name, but instead of serving only to identify that individual as Slavic, and which thus weakens the justification for connecting anyone who today is really named Ivan with any recollected camp guard thought also to have been named Ivan.

It may further be hypothesized from the above that Soviet prisoners tended to be called Ukrainian simply because for the most part they were captured and held on Ukrainian territory. As guards underwent training at the Trawniki camp, evidence concerning Trawniki nationalities may be predictive of camp-guard nationalities, and which may have been predominantly Volksdeutsche German:

The name lists of some of the Trawniki trainees survived. They show that the majority of the trainees were Russian ethnic Germans, so-called Volga Deutsche. Their personnel data are found in the casualties list of SS general J. Stroop who annihilated Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto.

---

Hans Peter Rullman, Victim of the Holocaust, English translation abridged and edited from the German, Published by UNCHAIN, Newark New Jersey 1987, p. 17.

Two elementary tests of witness competence in identifying nationality would have been to ask them to guess nationality from an array of names, and also to identify languages from hearing them spoken — but of course witness competence in identifying nationality has never been put to even such minimal tests as these.

## Who really provided internal policing for Nazi camps?

More importantly, it is widely recognized that policing inside Nazi camps was done by Jewish prisoners. This is evident in the earliest of our six authoritative sources above, the 1943 Black Book of Polish Jewry (BBPJ), where it is Jewish Kapos and auxiliaries who greet arrivals disembarking from trains, who address them in Yiddish, organize them, command them to undress in preparation for a bath, cut the females' hair, and sort the clothing and possessions and valuables left by the victims. And is it not eminently reasonable that the arriving prisoners would have spoken the language of their country of origin, and Yiddish as well, so that to make himself understandable to the largest number of prisoners, a guard would do

best to address them in Yiddish, which is something that a Jewish prisoner-guard would be able to manage, but not a 23-year-old Ukrainian villager.

According to the BBPJ, it is only when the victims begin to move toward the death house that Jewish Kapos and auxiliaries cede control to the German SS, who proceed to whip and club the victims along the path. And after the victims have been killed, it is Germans who oversee the Jewish dentists and body-disposers and grave-diggers. No Ukrainian is ever described as making any contact with any prisoner, alive or dead.

Were the BBPJ the only description of this kind, it would carry little weight, but in fact similar accounts are commonplace, as for example that given at Nuremberg by Georg Konrad Morgen who twice asserts that policing inside extermination camp Monowitz, which lay near the concentration camp Auschwitz, was in the hands of Jews — and where if a non-Jew had occasion to set foot, that non-Jew would be German — with perimeter security assigned to guards of several nationalities, Ukrainians in the present instance trailing the others:

I thoroughly investigated the entire stretch of territory and studied the lay-out and installation. The prisoners arrived on a side track in closed transport cars and were unloaded there by Jewish prisoners. Then they were sorted out according to their capacity for work, and here the methods of Hoess and Wirth differed. [...]

They could have been taken for large bathing establishments and that is what they told the prisoners. These crematoria were surrounded by a barbed wire fence and were guarded from the inside by the Jewish labour details which I have already mentioned. The new arrivals were led into a large dressing-room and told to take their clothing off. [...]

The camp itself was guarded on the outside by special troops of men from the Baltic, Estonians, Lithuanians, Latvians and also Ukrainians. The entire technical arrangement was almost exclusively in the hands of the prisoners who were assigned for this, and they were only supervised by an Unterführer from time to time. The actual killing was done by another Unterführer who let the gas into this room. Thus the number who knew about these things was extremely limited.

---

The Trial of German Major War Criminals, Proceedings of the International Military Tribunal Sitting at Nuremberg Germany, Taken from the Official Transcript, Published under the authority of H.M. Attorney-General by his Majesty's Stationery Office. The Hundred and Ninety-Eighth Day, Thursday, 8th August, 1946, Vol. 20, p. 391.

Describing not just a single camp, but the many camps covered in the Eichmann trial, Hannah Arendt reinforces and broadens the above impression, concluding that Jewish leadership provided indispensable cogs in the Nazi killing machine, not the least of which cogs were the terminal ones at the scene of death:

The well-known fact that the actual work of killing in the extermination centers was usually in the hands of Jewish commandos had been fairly and squarely established by witnesses for the prosecution — how they had worked in the gas chambers and the crematories, how they had pulled the gold teeth and cut the hair of the corpses, how they had dug the graves and, later, dug them up again to extinguish the traces of mass murder; how Jewish technicians had built gas chambers in Theresienstadt, where the Jewish "autonomy" had been carried so far that even the hangman was a Jew. (p. 109)

---

The matter of cooperation was twice mentioned by the judges; Judge Yitzak Raveh elicited from one of the resistance witnesses an admission that the "ghetto police" were an "instrument in the hands of murderers" and an acknowledgment of "the *Judenrat's* policy of cooperating with the Nazis"; and Judge Halevi found out from Eichmann in cross-examination that the Nazis had regarded this cooperation as "the very cornerstone" of their Jewish policy. But the question the prosecutor regularly addressed to each witness except the resistance fighters which sounded so very

natural to those who knew nothing of the factual background of the trial, the question "Why did you not rebel?," actually served as a smoke screen for the question that was not asked. And thus it came to pass that all answers to the unanswerable question Mr. Hausner put to his witnesses were considerably less than "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." True it was that the Jewish people as a whole had not been organized, that they had possessed no territory, no government, and no army, that, in the hour of their greatest need, they had no government-in-exile to represent them among the Allies (the Jewish agency for Palestine under Dr. Weizmann's presidency, was at best a miserable substitute), no caches of weapons, no youth with military training. But the whole truth was that there existed Jewish community organizations and Jewish party and welfare organizations on both the local and the international level. Wherever Jews lived, there were recognized Jewish leaders, and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish people had really been unorganized and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people. (p. 111)

---

Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*, The Viking Press, New York, 1963.

The collaboration of Jews in Holocaust killing is a part of Holocaust history which the Jewish people might be expected to deal with in some manner other than shifting the blame to the shoulders of Ukrainians.

## BYSTANDERS, COLLABORATORS, AND ACCESSORIES IN OUR MIDST

It is common in Holocaust literature to find the question being asked of how it was possible that so few rebelled against Nazi homicide. Hannah Arendt argues in words quoted below that this question is a mask to conceal the more important question of how it was possible that so many collaborated. In posing such questions, it seems to be agreed that if more had rebelled and fewer had collaborated, the magnitude of the Holocaust would have been reduced. And in pondering such questions, we all assume that we are the wiser for having studied the mistakes of the past, and that those mistakes are not being repeated in our own time, and indeed could not possibly be repeated. And surely among the greatest of all mistakes is to fail to come to the assistance of men being put to death on trumped-up charges. Surely even weak collaboration in such a crime is a crime in itself, and surely in the case where protest incurs no danger, then even passive viewing is a crime, if only a moral crime.

What are we to make, then, of all those who, like the knowledgeable above, knew that Holocaust-survivor testimony cannot be trusted, who were certain that Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka did not exist, who if they had spoken out would have exposed themselves to no harm — what are we to make of all such people who nevertheless watched John Demjanjuk being edged toward the gallows but said nothing?

Take as a single example the most respected of all Holocaust historians, Raul Hilberg. All he had to do to save John Demjanjuk from being hanged was to write a single short article announcing that Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka did not exist, but Raul Hilberg did not take this step. Had he written such an article, he would not have been shot in retaliation, and he would not have been arrested, and he would not even have lost his job, so what kept him from performing this just and humanitarian act? Raul Hilberg writes a book titled *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders*, in which he points a finger at the many bystanders who did nothing to stop the Holocaust, but what is he if not himself a bystander, what is he if not a person who can sleep soundly at night when a word from him would save a man, a man innocent of the charges brought against him, from being hanged, and that word remains unspoken? Raul Hilberg could have phoned the Demjanjuk defence and offered his services as an expert witness at the Demjanjuk trial, but he did not. Raul Hilberg could have contacted a dozen other Holocaust historians and invited them to join in denouncing the Jerusalem proceedings, but it seems he

didn't do that either. What is he, then, if not himself a bystander, a collaborator, an accessory to a crime? And what integrity can he claim for his work if he is ready to let a man be hanged rather than to allow a hairline crack to appear in that work's smooth facade?

## Blurb biography of John Demjanjuk, version four

*John Demjanjuk was convicted by an Israeli court of having been an imaginary Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka, and was sentenced to death, but was saved from hanging by the discovery that it had been another Ukrainian Ivan — Ivan Marchenko — who had really been that imaginary Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. Throughout the persecution of John Demjanjuk, historians were aware that the story of Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka was fictitious, BUT SAID NOTHING, ALLOWING THE MYTH OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE OF TREBLINKA TO PASS UNCHALLENGED, CONTENT TO LET JOHN DEMJANJUK BE HANGED FOR CRIMES THEY KNEW HE DID NOT COMMIT.*

---

[HOME](#) [DEMJANJUK](#)