



BACKGROUND

**REPORT**

---

**Pat Buchanan's Unrelenting Defense  
of John Demjanjuk**

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE  
1993

© 1993 Anti-Defamation League  
Printed in the United States of America  
All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.



Anti-Defamation League

This publication was prepared by  
The Research and Evaluation Department.

## CONTENTS

Opening Argument.....	1
The Third Strike.....	2
Fourth Time Around.....	3
Demjanjuk's Fifth.....	4
Reaching New Heights.....	5
Buchanan's Fantasies.....	7
J'accuse!.....	8
And the Beat Goes On.....	9
...And On And On.....	10

## Pat Buchanan's Unrelenting Defense of John Demjanjuk

### Opening Arguments

Since December 1, 1983, Pat Buchanan has devoted at least nine nationally syndicated columns to the defense of accused Nazi war criminal John Demjanjuk. These articles form part of a larger picture relating to World War II in which the columnist has defended other accused war criminals and Nazi collaborators; criticized the protests over the convent at Auschwitz; attacked the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Special Investigation (OSI); and even accused General Eisenhower of creating "death camps, unequalled by anything in American military history," to torture and annihilate German P.O.W.s after the Allied victory. As early as 1977 Buchanan wrote, "Though Hitler was...a man who without compunction could commit murder and genocide, he was also an individual of great courage, a soldier's soldier in the great War, a leader...who possessed oratorical powers that could awe even those who despised him. But Hitler's success was not based on his extraordinary gifts alone. His genius was an intuitive sense of the mushiness...the weakness masquerading as morality that was in the hearts of the statesmen who stood in his path."

Buchanan's persistent defense of Demjanjuk has been motivated largely by his longstanding antipathy toward the OSI. The columnist has frequently complained that the organization's pursuit of "65- and 75-year-old Central European immigrants who permitted or perpetrated atrocities in a war that ended some 40 years ago," diverts money and public attention from more contemporary evils such as communism and organized crime. In Buchanan's opinion, OSI's gravest offense, however, is its reliance on information supplied by the Soviet-era KGB. In the author's first column on Demjanjuk, December 1, 1983, he characterizes the relationship between the two agencies as a "fraternal collaboration."

Apparently because of this "collaboration," Buchanan implies that American judiciary procedures similarly come to emulate Soviet show-trials with respect to accused Nazi war criminals. For example, in the first Demjanjuk column, the author writes of another accused criminal, Frank Walus, that he was "[s]tripped of his savings and citizenship...was the target of a press witchhunt...was subjected to the almost un-American courtroom behavior of federal Judge Julius Hoffman." Buchanan offers the reader virtually none of the evidence which convinced the OSI to investigate Walus. Moreover, although Walus's case was eventually dropped by the Justice Department, the columnist writes that it was "quietly thrown out" without acknowledging that the outcome itself demonstrates the ultimate integrity of the judicial process.

In December 1983, Buchanan also wrote a second Demjanjuk column. Once more, he erroneously suggested that modern judicial standards were being suspended in the prosecution of accused Nazis. He stated, "All Demjanjuk's attorneys demand is that their client be given a civil trial in open court, to face his accusers and challenge the falsified evidence."

"Is it ignoble to say: Let's hear this guy out?"

Buchanan further suggested in this column that the prosecution of Nazi war criminals defamed Americans of Eastern European origin: "Patriotic Americans – formerly Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Poles – are being indirectly tarred today as Nazi sympathizers. Individuals are being taken into court, where horrific allegations are spread across the record, and then stripped of their citizenship – not because the allegations are proven, but simply because they 'lied' on their visa applications." Of course, lying on a visa application in itself constitutes grounds for denaturalization. Would Buchanan, who elsewhere has displayed little sympathy for the plight of immigrants, have it otherwise?

The author concludes the second Demjanjuk piece, seemingly off-subject, by asking, "What was Sen. Joseph McCarthy's offense against decency, for which he was so broadly condemned?" This effort to contrast McCarthy with Buchanan's new demon, the OSI, however, connects with other columns in which Buchanan has eulogized the Wisconsin senator extravagantly for being "instinctively right" and "fearless." Nonetheless, accusing the OSI of McCarthyism is a grotesque distortion of history. McCarthy was a shameless demagogue, willing to fabricate evidence and defame his enemies without compunction or judicial scrutiny. The OSI maintains painstaking evidentiary standards, and individuals under investigation in OSI-related cases, Demjanjuk among them, have the opportunity to respond to their accusers in a court of law. Moreover, McCarthy's campaign against communism greatly exaggerated the actual level of subversion in the government and military for explicitly political purposes; the suggestion that the OSI's interpretation of the Holocaust is likewise exaggerated, or that the agency "chooses" to investigate individuals for political reasons, is more at home in Holocaust-denying hate literature than in legitimate debate.

### **The Third Strike**

Buchanan's third Demjanjuk column, published in February 1984, further expands on the politics of distraction employed previously in this series. Thus, echoing his earlier attacks against the OSI-KGB "collaboration," the author writes, "one appreciates why those hairy-chested Nazi hunters at OSI are so timid and bashful when invited to defend, publicly, their collaboration with the KGB." He further states, "one wonder[s] whether the OSI triumph is not an official lynching, choreographed by the KGB, with the OSI as its dim-witted instrument." Buchanan also implies that President Reagan shares his views on the OSI; responding to Assistant Attorney General Stephen Trott's criticism of Buchanan's "preconceived ideological bias" against the agency, the columnist writes, "such an attitude should disqualify its bureaucrat-author [Trott] from service in the administration of a president who professes a similar 'ideological bias.'"

Buchanan next complains that KGB evidence should be disqualified sight unseen because the Soviet Union at the time was "a neo-Stalinist state that is anti-Semitic to its

core." In future columns, however, Buchanan would celebrate other KGB-supplied documents which disputed Demjanjuk's presence at Treblinka. The Soviet Union remained "neo-Stalinist" and "anti-Semitic" in Buchanan's eyes, but this evidence somehow remained untainted by these circumstances. The fact remains though, that the OSI used such Soviet-supplied evidence only out of necessity (after all, the Soviet Union did capture most of the Nazi records pertaining to Eastern Europe), not ideological affinity, and every effort was made to verify the authenticity of this data independently.

The author then repeats four arguments he had advanced in previous columns: (1) that Demjanjuk's wartime activities were first reported in "News from Ukraine," which had also accused Ivan Stebelsky, falsely, of being a war criminal; (2) that witnesses who identified Demjanjuk in Israel followed the same procedure used in the trial of Frank Walus, whose case was eventually dropped; (3) that the former paymaster at the Trawnicki SS training camp pronounced Demjanjuk's ID card to be "almost certainly a fake"; (4) that Jean-Francois Steiner, author of Treblinka, had written that Ivan the Terrible was killed in 1943, while others claimed Ivan was a Lithuanian living in Chicago. Exceeding each of these claims in sheer irrelevance, however, was the observation that the Cleveland judge who heard Demjanjuk's denaturalization case, Frank Battisti, was the "central character in a grand jury investigation of the most sweeping corruption scandal in U.S. court history."

Doubt has, of course, always existed as to whether Demjanjuk was Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. Pat Buchanan's columns, however, seek to whitewash Demjanjuk's war record entirely. Furthermore, they betray a refusal to acknowledge that the OSI is able to operate independently of the KGB, or in accordance with democratic judicial standards: in Buchanan's perspective, the courts are corrupt when they rule against Demjanjuk, the OSI's witnesses are lying or incompetent, and the witnesses for the accused – for example, the SS paymaster at Trawnicki – are the only people capable of telling the truth.

### **Fourth Time Around**

Buchanan's fourth Demjanjuk column appeared in the September 28, 1986, Washington Post. At this time, Buchanan was working as an assistant to President Reagan; the editors of the paper noted that "the views, analysis and conclusions...are his own, and not necessarily those of the administration." Perhaps because of his affiliation with the White House, however, he takes a somewhat less "prosecutorial" tone in his case against the OSI.

For the most part, this lengthy article repeats in greater detail the same four arguments – even using Stebelsky and Walus as examples again – the author had summarized in the February 1984 piece. Buchanan repackages these allegations with more emphasis on Demjanjuk's personal history; for example, he notes Demjanjuk was "a naturalized American who came to the United States in 1952 as a displaced person, a church-going family man from Cleveland and retired auto mechanic for the Ford Motor

Co." without mentioning that Demjanjuk also had a tattoo removed from his arm, which would have identified him as a member of the Nazi SS.

Buchanan also airs a lengthy explanation for the Soviet Union's "frame-up" of Demjanjuk. He suggests this scenario: "Why would the KGB go out of its way to frame an auto worker for the Ford Motor Co., who was neither an outspoken anti-communist, nor a leader in the American-Ukrainian community? Cui bono? Who benefits?..."

"This is what Demjanjuk's defenders believe to have happened: Several years after he settled in the U.S., Demjanjuk's wife went to see his mother in the Ukraine, to tell her her son was alive.... Word spread through the village: Ivan Demjanjuk survived! Which came as a shock to Soviet authorities – who had been paying a pension to the mother for her son missing in action.... The KGB came to the house, confiscated all family records and photographs – and took away her pension. Within two years, 'News from the Ukraine'...charged that John Demjanjuk, living in Cleveland, was a Nazi collaborator."

Now openly flacking for the Demjanjuk defense – which by this time included open Holocaust deniers, an issue never acknowledged by the author – Buchanan concludes the article with an analogy he would develop in subsequent columns: "In the past nine years, John Demjanjuk's life has been utterly, totally, destroyed. He has been humiliated, disgraced, vilified as virtually no other American of his time; bankrupted, imprisoned, extradited to stand trial in the same cage as Adolf Eichmann.... If John Demjanjuk is 'Ivan the Terrible' he deserves it all. If he is not, then – in this writer's judgment – John Demjanjuk may be the victim of an American Dreyfus case."

### *A Fifth for Demjanjuk*

The fifth Demjanjuk column appeared on January 18, 1989, at which time the case had been turned over to the Israeli Supreme Court. Nonetheless, the main thrust of Buchanan's piece remained his campaign against the OSI. He writes, "there is powerful evidence that the Office of Special Investigations...questioned [Treblinka survivor Richard] Glazer, in 1979. Asked to produce notes of that conversation, OSI has thus far stonewalled.

"What is going on here? Material lately extracted from OSI through the Freedom of Information Act also shows that the Soviets took testimony...from one Ignat Danilchenko, who said Demjanjuk was a member of his guard platoon at Sobibor.... Yet at Demjanjuk's trial the witnesses against him all testified he was at Treblinka.... Can a man be at two places at once?"

"According to Demjanjuk's son-in-law...OSI is also withholding from the defense 1979 statements by Kurt Franz and Franz Suchomel, both of whom served at Treblinka...both of whom are said to have stated specifically that Demjanjuk is not 'Ivan the Terrible'...."

"Surely, it is time Congress summoned the moxie to take a hard public look at OSI, and [then Attorney General Dick] Thornburgh took control of this office from people who have run it like a fiefdom for 10 years." After digressing into a defense of Arthur Rudolph, a NASA scientist whose U.S. citizenship was stripped following allegations that he used slave labor from Nazi concentration camps during World War II, Buchanan concludes the column by writing, "It's time OSI was brought out into the sunlight."

In addition to his long familiar attacks against OSI, Buchanan also allows his hostility toward Israel to seep into his defense of Demjanjuk. This dimension of his ideology surfaces when he writes, "a Phoenix lawyer, William Wolf, has unearthed what the Arizona Republic's Richard Lessner calls 'a disturbing pattern of witness intimidation, obstruction of justice and concealment of evidence,' and, perhaps, 'criminal conduct on the part of the Israeli prosecutors.'"

Buchanan's most objectionable statement, however, repeats a charge he made in the 1986 Washington Post column: "Demjanjuk may be the victim of a greater miscarriage of justice than Alfred Dreyfus." Unlike other appearances of this ridiculous analogy, here Buchanan suggests that Demjanjuk, a former SS volunteer who later concealed his Nazi past, is a greater victim than Dreyfus, an utterly innocent scapegoat and emblem of French Jewry.

### *Reaching New Heights*

Nonetheless, Buchanan's sixth column, printed on March 17, 1990, tops the list – in terms of sheer offensiveness – of Buchanan's writings on the Holocaust. Perhaps the least objectionable feature of this piece is the author's presentation of a new witness for the defense: "CBS' '60 Minutes' discovered Marianna Dudek in a village near Treblinka. Did she remember 'Ivan the Terrible?' Indeed, she did; she had slept with him for the gold Ivan had taken from the Jews...his real name was Ivan Marchenko." Thus, prostitutes now join the ranks of Nazi veterans as the only people whose memories of Treblinka Pat Buchanan believes.

Once again, the columnist also refers to testimony allegedly withheld by the OSI, given by "another guard, Danilchenko, [who] also recalled Demjanjuk at Sobibor...." Though Sobibor was also a death camp, and though SS guards there were as complicit in the crimes of the Holocaust as the guards at Treblinka, Buchanan nonetheless asserts, "the closer Demjanjuk comes to death, the more certain his innocence appears."

Much of this column disputes the evidence against Demjanjuk, and refutes the testimony of Treblinka survivors. And, in this respect, Buchanan makes one of his most astounding assertions: "Since the war, 1,600 medical papers have been written on 'The Psychological and Medical Effects of the Concentration Camps on Holocaust Survivors.'

"This so-called 'Holocaust Survivor Syndrome' involves 'group fantasies of

martyrdom and heroics.' Reportedly, half the 20,000 survivor testimonies in Yad Vashem memorial in Jerusalem are considered 'unreliable,' not to be used in trials." Significantly, out of all the "1,600" medical papers allegedly on this subject, Buchanan has not adequately cited a single one.

As appalling as these allegations are, they don't necessarily call into question the basic facts of the Nazi genocide. Buchanan's next statements, however, do: "Finally, the death engine. During the war the underground government of the Warsaw Ghetto reported to London that the Jews of Treblinka were being electrocuted and steamed to death.

"The Israeli court, however, concluded the murder weapon of 850,000 was the diesel engine from a Soviet tank which drove its exhaust into the death chamber....

"The problem is: Diesel engines do not emit enough carbon monoxide to kill anybody. In 1988, 97 kids, trapped 400 feet underground in a Washington, D.C., tunnel while two locomotives spewed diesel exhaust into the car, emerged unharmed after 45 minutes.

"Demjanjuk's weapon of mass murder cannot kill...."

Claims denying the well documented use of diesel engines in the Nazi extermination program emanate from the Holocaust-denying Institute for Historical Review (IHR) through the writings of Friedrich P. Berg, who addressed IHR's Fifth International Revisionist Conference on the topic, "Diesels, Gas Vans and Zyklon B."

Alex Heard, writing in the November 1990 issue of the now-defunct Wigwag magazine stated, "I can't say for sure that Buchanan read the [Berg] paper...but I know it was mailed to him by Jerome A. Brentar, a Cleveland business man who regularly attends IHR conferences and actively supported Demjanjuk...." Brentar told Heard, "I sent Buchanan a lot of material and I called others to send him their work...I don't recall exactly, but shortly thereafter his article came out."

At the same time, Jacob Weisberg responded to Buchanan's "revisionist" argument in the October 22, 1990, issue of The New Republic, writing "...there is no legitimate question about Jews being gassed at Treblinka. Carbon monoxide emitted by diesel engines is sufficient to asphyxiate people when they are crammed by the hundreds into thirteen-foot chambers.... Buchanan's comparison only proves that the children he describes had sufficient oxygen to survive whatever length of time they were trapped in the tunnel. Where did he get the anecdote? 'Somebody sent it to me.'"

Meanwhile, Buchanan concluded what is perhaps his most notorious column by writing, "God help us. We are the Salem judges of our own time." The individuals executed for witchcraft by the late-seventeenth century Salem tribunal were guilty of no crime, obviously, and the evidence against them was completely fabricated. Is Buchanan

making a similar claim about the Holocaust?

### *Buchanan's Fantasies*

Buchanan's seventh column appeared on September 9, 1991. In it, he writes, "I believe John Demjanjuk is coming home, a free man, that not only will his innocence be established but it will be accepted, even if grudgingly, by most honest men.... Here is why:

"On Aug. 14, Demjanjuk's lawyer...went before Israel's Supreme Court, and gave it – from the Israeli prosecutor's own files – the name and photograph of the real Ivan the Terrible.

"Whence came the new evidence? From the Soviet trial record of former Treblinka guard Feodor Fedorenko, executed in 1986." Of course, for almost a decade, the columnist had preached that the OSI has been hoodwinked by KGB-fabricated evidence implicating Demjanjuk; how is it that Buchanan is more capable of distinguishing between authentic Soviet-supplied evidence and fraudulent Soviet-supplied evidence than an agency of the U.S. Justice Department?

Regardless, Buchanan states that among these "15,000 separate Treblinka documents," the testimony of former Treblinka guards, "at Soviet war crimes tribunals in the '40s, '50s and '60s, corresponds exactly with the core story of the Jewish survivors, told decades later in Jerusalem." So much for "group fantasies of martyrdom and heroics."

The author next contends, "The Israelis 'got the wrong Ivan,' writes Peter Worthington in the Toronto Sun. Indeed, they did. The wrong man in the most awful case of mistaken identity in the 20th Century." A Nazi collaborator who murdered Jews at the Sobibor death camp, who is accused of murdering Jews at the Treblinka death camp, would hardly seem to qualify for the most awful case of mistaken identity in a century that saw the lynching of Leo Frank, among countless other wrongly accused victims.

Buchanan quotes the Toronto Sun again to further attack Israel, and demonstrate that both he and Worthington are unable or unwilling to distinguish between democratic and totalitarian governments: " 'It is appalling,' writes Mr. Worthington, 'that the Israeli prosecutor says, in effect, if he wasn't at Treblinka...he should die for other things he may have done. That's how Stalin treated the law. It is not democracy's way.'"

Buchanan concludes his column by suggesting America, in addition to Israel, had abandoned democratic judicial standards (the author, needless to say, fails to remind his readers that victims of the Holocaust suffered far greater injustices than Demjanjuk): "if a fearful America," the columnist writes, "has washed her hands of her adopted son, perhaps a free Ukraine will stand up for truth and justice." For Buchanan, justice – with respect to Demjanjuk alone – is determined not by a fair process, but by the desired outcome of total exoneration. Ironically, this noted opponent of numerically result-oriented affirmative action programs for women, African-Americans, and other

minorities, here seems to demand a kind of judicial affirmative action for Nazi war criminals!

### *J'accuse!*

The author's eighth column, dated July 7, 1993, expands on the comparison he introduced in 1986 between Demjanjuk and Alfred Dreyfus. To bolster his argument, Buchanan quotes a lengthy excerpt by the British Holocaust scholar C. C. Aronsfeld, writing in *Midstream* magazine. However, though Aronsfeld acknowledges that Dreyfus has become "the now classic victim of anti-Semitic prejudice," the passage Buchanan quotes offers no sense of the nature of French anti-Semitism in the 19th century, or the subterranean level of groundlessness of the charges against Dreyfus. Moreover, Buchanan once again fails to acknowledge the unique series of atrocities which comprise the Holocaust, or the fact that as an SS volunteer, Demjanjuk was to some, as yet undetermined, degree complicit in these crimes.

Divorced from these contexts, Demjanjuk and Dreyfus merely stand as symbols: the former for Nazi collaborators, the latter for Jews. Would Buchanan suggest that these two groups have been comparably victimized?

The columnist again echoes Aronsfeld by writing, "On display in Israel, and the United States today, is naked moral cowardice. Men are letting an old man rot, hoping he dies, to spare themselves the duty of standing up and saying, 'God help us, we made a terrible mistake. For 20 years [denaturalization proceedings against Demjanjuk began in 1977], we prosecuted, and almost put to death, an innocent man. We were wrong.'"

In addition to taunting the American and Israeli prosecutors, in effect calling them "chicken," Buchanan complains that the slow pace of the Demjanjuk trial somehow violated what he refers to as "the Western way of justice." Nonetheless, it is precisely because of modern judicial safeguards, not in spite of them, that the Israeli Supreme Court took so long to reach a verdict. The author further ridicules "the U.S. prosecutors, exposed as fools for having trusted the Soviets – who...were sitting on about 15,000 documents about Treblinka" without acknowledging that it is because of this newly available evidence that the appeals process had to run its full course.

Buchanan next mocks American journalists, charging them with moral cowardice: "Where are the thundering editorials in America's mighty free press, demanding that Demjanjuk, who lived among us 30 years, receive justice?" The author even manages to weave his frequently noted obsession with Black criminality into the screech, writing, "Were John Demjanjuk a black man, convicted falsely of raping and murdering white women – with proof of his innocence as massive as is the proof of Demjanjuk's – all America would be ablaze with indignation, rage and protest." (Significantly, in 1992, Presidential candidate Buchanan had suggested that America more naturally identifies with victimized whites than people of color; he asked, "Why are we more shocked when a dozen people are killed in Vilnius than a massacre in Burundi? Because they are white

people. That's who we are. There's where America comes from.")

Buchanan concludes the column by rhetorically transforming Demjanjuk into the Patrick Henry of the Nazi SS: "It is remarkable the length of self-deception to which [some men] will go, rather than face the truth that they were profoundly, tragically, wrong. It takes moral courage – the only thing that can save John Demjanjuk now. Give him justice, or give him death."

Victims of the Holocaust, needless to say, were only given the latter option.

### *And the Beat Goes On...*

Buchanan's most recent Demjanjuk column was published on August 4, 1993. Here the author complains that "Israel is under terrific pressure to find Demjanjuk guilty of some, any, crime, so his false accusers can wipe the egg off their faces for having declared him to be the worst Nazi war criminal of World War II. Because men cannot admit that they were party to a legal lynching, is John Demjanjuk to be hounded to death?

"How do they look at themselves in the mirror, one wonders, at the Office of Special Investigations...?"

"We now know that even as [former OSI director Allan] Ryan and crew were toasting their capture of Ivan of Treblinka, their KGB collaborators...were sitting on 15,000 documents from Treblinka, dozens of which fingered, as the real Ivan, a guard named Ivan Marchenko.... The only question that lingers is whether, in their zealotry, [OSI] became worse than crazed incompetents."

The columnist then attacks the widely recognized evidence that Demjanjuk served as a concentration camp guard at the Sobibor death camp. Among the proofs Buchanan disputes is the "[t]wo affidavits by an ex-guard at Sobibor, one 'Danielchenko'...." The reader will recall that in his January 1989 and March 1990 columns, Buchanan referred to the 1979 "Danilchenko" testimony as proof that Demjanjuk was not at Treblinka because it placed him at Sobibor. Why is it that evidence that was valid when used to demonstrate Demjanjuk's innocence suddenly becomes suspect when it points to Demjanjuk's guilt?

The answer to this question is perhaps found in the conclusion to the column, in which Buchanan appears to dispense with evidentiary standards altogether. He writes: "The day Demjanjuk's conviction was overturned, the Israeli guard who removed his handcuffs smiled hugely at him and shook his hand.... In his heart, that guard knows Demjanjuk is an innocent man. And he is. It is time to let him go." Thus, it is the Israeli prison guard's "knowledge of the heart," his gut instinct, which proves for Buchanan the innocence of Demjanjuk. For all his lofty talk about "the Western way of justice," Buchanan shows little respect for the process when it returns judgments with which he disagrees.

*...And On And On...*

On November 10, 1993, months after the Demjanjuk case had faded from the front-page headlines, Buchanan once again trotted out his favorite victim for a tenth time. In the absence of any new allegations from Demjanjuk's defense for the columnist to promote, he instead rehashes the already familiar arguments —mixed with his strangely mawkish portrayals of the Demjanjuk family —with new rhetoric further maligning the U.S. Justice Department.

Thus, for example, he refers to Demjanjuk's wife, Vera, as a "refugee of the Hitler-Stalin war," implying that World War II was merely a conflict between totalitarian regimes; as if Roosevelt, Churchill, and DeGaulle never played a role in it, and the future of American democracy itself did not depend on defeating the Axis powers. (It's worth noting in this context that the theme of Buchanan's 1992 presidential campaign, "America First," explicitly alluded to the pre-War isolationist movement of such figures as Charles Lindbergh and Father Charles Coughlin, the anti-Semitic radio priest.)

Buchanan also writes, "The Justice Department has told the World Jewish Congress that it will move again to deport Demjanjuk." Of course, since the accused war criminal's original conviction was overturned in Israel, the justice Department has publicly stated its commitment to continue investigating Demjanjuk. Buchanan mentions the World Jewish Congress, however, presumably to suggest that the decision to pursue deportation proceedings was a response to Jewish —indeed, international Jewish —pressure, rather than a response to the merits of the case itself.

Thereafter, Buchanan returns to his stock arguments, as discussed earlier in this report: Demjanjuk deserves "an American trial [as] the American Dreyfus." The affidavits of Ignat Danilchenko, which placed Demjanjuk at Sobibor, are unreliable. The "infamous ID card" is "an obvious forgery."

Buchanan warns, "...this time, hold the witnesses against [Demjanjuk] liable for perjury, if caught lying under oath." But there is no evidence —other than Buchanan's own innuendo —that the witnesses had ever deliberately lied.

Buchanan concludes his latest column by writing, grandiloquently, "Let us find out the truth about the crime of the century. Let Congress authorize a war crimes trial. The defense is ready." No doubt it is. And Buchanan is its noisiest apologist, clearly prepared to go to any lengths to deny the true nature of Demjanjuk's past.