of these titles, how should we catalog it? Should we restrict access to the book or pamphlet? Should we treat this material as we treat other "restricted" items, controlling, and thereby limiting, our clientele's access to it? If we decide to restrict the material, what criteria should we establish to determine who gains access? Where should such an item be classified? In anti-Semitica? In history? Should a new category be established for "pseudo-history?" And what subject headings should be assigned to books which characterize the Holocaust as a hoax? Was LC's initial decision to include these titles under the subject heading **Holocaust—Historiography** appropriate, or did it, as some have stated, lend to the works in question a patina of legitimacy? Is the replacement heading, **Holocaust, Jewish (1939–1945)—Errors, inventions, etc.**, an improvement? These difficult questions will be tackled by our final speaker, Mrs. Adaire Klein, Librarian of the Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, who will carry the discussion from the theoretical to the practical. She will outline the policies of the Wiesenthal Center in connection with this type of material and describe one library's answer to the questions raised above.

## Notes

[1]References to this literature are included in Robert Singerman's comprehensive *Antisemitic Propaganda: An Annotated Bibliography and Research Guide* (New York and London, Garland, 1982). On the Anne Frank diary, see Ditlieb Felderer, *Anne Frank's Diary—a Hoax* (Torrance, CA, Institute for Historical Review, 1979). Francis X. Clines in "Anne Frank Again Focus of Challenge," in *The New York Times* (April 21, 1987), reports on a critical edition of the diary which is being prepared, in part, to counter these outrageous allegations. The new edition, which is being translated into English, will include some previously omitted materials as well as documentation authenticating the diary.

[2]A succinct overview and critique of this genre can be found in "Lies About the Holocaust," by Lucy Dawidowicz, in *Commentary*, v. 70 (December, 1980). Other publications which address Holocaust denial literature include: Alison B. Carb and Alan M. Schwartz, *Holocaust 'Revisionism': A Denial of History: An Update* (New York: Civil Rights Division, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1986) and an earlier version by Alan Schwartz, "Holocaust 'Revisionism': A Denial of History," in *Facts*, v. 26, June 1980: 1–17; Erich Kulka, *The Holocaust Is Being Denied!* (Tel-Aviv, Committee of Auschwitz Camps Survivors in Israel, 1977); Arthur Suzman, *The Holocaust* (Johannesburg, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, 1980) and his earlier work *Six Million Did Die* (Johannesburg, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, 1978).

[3]This case was reported on extensively in the press. See, for example, "Holocaust Doubters Settle Auschwitz Survivor's Suit," by Myrna Oliver, in the *Los Angeles Times* (July 25, 1985), which includes the text of the apology.

[4]Subsequent to this panel discussion, an article by F.K. Donnelly, titled "Catalogue Wars and Classification Controversies," describing the cataloging dilemmas posed by this type of literature, appeared in the *Canadian Library Journal*, v. 43, no. 4 (August, 1986).

[5]At a meeting following the panel presentations, Rabbi Theodore Wiener of the Library of Congress' Subject Cataloging Division explained the rationale behind LC's classification policy in this matter and reported that the Library is considering establishing an additional classification number corresponding to the subject heading **Holocaust, Jewish (1939–1945)—Errors, inventions, etc.**

*Dr. Michael Grunberger is Head of the Hebraic Section of the Library of Congress.*



# The Classification of Holocaust Denial Literature by the Library of Congress

***Morton Weinfeld***
*McGill University*
*Montreal, Canada*

## Introduction

In 1985, the *Bulletin of the Canadian Association of University Teachers* published two articles, one by me and a reply by Vincent Richards, an Alberta librarian and past president of the Library Association of Alberta, on the subject of libraries and Holocaust-denial literature (see boxes). At the time, I decided not to respond to his article.

The recent discovery that a 1985 doctorate had been granted by the university of Nantes, in France, to a Holocaust denial dissertation, and the resulting furor in France, has prompted this belated reply. The stamp of higher academic sponsorship, even if awarded through misjudgment, should not be permitted to blur the distinction between fact and fantasy. As Kurt Waldheim has discovered, historical memories can be short, and selective. Scholars must work in tandem with librarians in the discovery and dissemination of the truth about our world.

## Librarians have a role In Holocaust-denial

*by Morton Weinfeld*

**Last fall, the Montreal Gazette carried a story about Alberta librarians condemning the seizure of an anti-Semitic book. *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* by A.R. Butz, published in the United States, was banned by Canada Customs and seized from the University of Calgary library by the RCMP. The book in question has a double thesis: The Holocaust did not occur; and the historic claim that it did is a deliberate hoax, fabricated by Jews.**

Let me state first that I strongly deplore both the banning of the book by Canada Customs and its seizure from the university library. It is not clear under what legal authority such steps were taken. It is doubtful if the provisions of the hate literature legislation in the Canadian criminal code (in section 281) were intended to remove all such books from university libraries. I have used selections from Hitler's *Mein Kampf* to illustrate points about anti-Semitism in my university lectures.

This does not necessarily mean that all restrictions on the dissemination of hate literature ought to be removed.

### Historical rubbish

The book in question is historical rubbish, part of the pseudo-scientific "Holocaust-denial" movement and is clearly anti-Semitic in motivation, content, and consequence. The issue of freedom of speech vs. restrictions on the dissemination of hate literature is a complex one, and will continue to be debated by civil libertarians and others.

A different issue raised by the story, as reported by The Canadian Press, is how such books ought to be classified in the libraries. There are no easy rules here, though of course one can appreciate that librarians would want no outside interference in this decision.

### By any other name?

Should a racist book that argued explicitly and incorrectly that non-whites were genetically inferior to whites be classified under genetics or under racism? Should the Butz book be classified under "history" or under "anti-Semitism?"

I checked the McGill University Library. As it happens, the Butz book is not in the collection. (No great loss, especially in this period of tight budgets.) However, two books by a leading French exponent of Holocaust-denial, Paul Rassinier, are available—one in English, one in German, catalogued in the main collection, in the section dealing with history. Curiously, others by Rassinier in French are found in the Rare Books collection.

Problems of proper classification can even affect the natural sciences. Most of us might agree that publications of the Flat Earth Society ought not to be classified under "astronomy", but under "deviant groups" of some sort. More problematic might be classification of a creationist book on evolution: under "science" or "religion?"

### Inconsistent

Indeed, as I write this I have before me the book *What is Creation Science?* written by Henry Morris and Gary Parker, also from the McGill University Library. This book is classified under religion, with studies of Genesis, rather than science, despite the authors' use of the term science in the title of their work.

Clearly, there is an inconsistency in the classificatory treatment of this book and those of Rassinier. The creationist book is written by two people with doctorates in the natural sciences, and it is written in the style of a scientific treatise. There is not one quotation from the Bible in the book. Its authors, and other scientists who share that point of view, think of themselves as legitimate scientific scholars. Yet they are not so considered by libraries.

The Rassinier work has received different treatment. Rassinier himself was a high school teacher of history and geography, though the available biography indicates no post-secondary training as a historian. His English book, *Debunking the Genocide Myth: A Study of the Nazi Concentration Camps and the Alleged Extermination of European Jewry*, contends, as its main points: 1) at most about one million European Jews perished during the Second World War; 2) these casualties were the inevitable outcomes of warfare, and not part of any organized scheme to liquidate the Jewish people; 3) there were no systematic attempts to exterminate Jews in gas chambers or the like; 4) the conventionally accepted historical record is a deliberate distortion of history, part of a Zionist conspiracy; 5) the misfortunes which befell German Jews were at any rate largely a result of their own failure to become fully loyal German citizens.

It seems to me that there is far more justification for classifying the creationist book as science than this Rassinier trash as historical scholarship, where it is now.

### Marketplace freedom

I understand that many or most library call numbers are accepted directly from the Library of Congress classifications, adopted by libraries using that cataloguing system. But I also understand that books may on occasion be classified by the receiving library; moreover, libraries may be free to disagree and modify a decision made by the Library of Congress. I would recommend such action in the case of the Rassinier book. Though it poses as scholarship, and includes footnotes and references, it would seem more in place next to works by Gobineau or Houston Chamberlain, or wherever *Mein Kampf* or the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are classified.

Certainly we are all committed to the ideal of a university as a free marketplace of ideas, especially in the library. But to push the metaphor, even a commercial marketplace is restricted—for the benefit of consumers—by regulations concerning truth and honesty in advertising, labeling, and packaging. Stores are not free to mislabel products.

*(Continued on next page)*

### Opening can of worms?

Some might ask, why make a fuss about such a book? Few people will read it, and perhaps a to-do will give it unwarranted and even dangerous publicity. Perhaps. Yet such books, unlike say, books by proponents of the flat-earth view, do pose serious dangers to the quality of social and civic life in the Canadian polity. People who believe the earth is flat are unlikely to mobilize themselves to vilify or attack other groups of citizens. The Holocaust denial movement is, alas, just the current, more sophisticated manifestation of virulent forms of anti-Semitism and racism which have long plagued western societies. It serves clearly to promote hatred of Jews, as well as to defame them. Moreover, we are not dealing with just isolated events.

### Keegstra to Richards

Anyone doubting the potentially serious consequences of this movement and its inseparability from vicious anti-Semitism ought to read the texts of students' notes from the high school classes of Jim Keegstra in Alberta, also a firm believer in Holocaust denial. (*See Canadian Jewish News*, June 14 and 21, 1984.) (On March 26, Keegstra won an appeal against the seizure by customs officers last August of a copy of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.* The section of the Customs Tariff Act which gives officials the right to ban books they consider obscene or immoral was declared unconstitutional under the new Charter, in an earlier case involving *Penthouse* magazine. Meanwhile, Keegstra goes to trial April 9 on a charge of promoting hatred against Jews.) Serious scholars and intellectuals might seem immune from the virus of Holocaust-denial writing. But what may begin in selected books and journals, and in the classrooms of Jim Keegstra, may, if given the stamp of historical revisionism—always so appealing to intellectuals—spread farther afield. Consider the remark of the president of the Alberta Library Association, Vincent Richards, quoted in the same story. If accurate, and not taken out of context, it is frightening indeed. It bears repeating:

"I read the (Butz) book in 1976 and while its scholarship is faulty and biased, it raises some very controversial questions which better scholars should tackle.

"Intellectual freedom and rigorous debate are what helps society to arrive at the probable truth about something, not secret bans."

What a statement; "Faulty scholarship and bias" is an unbelievably mild criticism to level at obscene trash such as the Butz book. Indeed, most published scientific work can be criticized by some scholars—who happen to disagree— as having some faulty scholarship and bias. The comment gives the Butz book undeserving legitimacy.

Even more troublesome is the reference to the "very controversial questions." Did the Holocaust occur? Is the whole thing a hoax? For Mr. Richards, is the evidence still not in on those questions?

He seems to have an open mind on the subject, as suggested by his use of the term "probable truth." While I happen to agree with his views opposing removal of the book from the library, I would be curious to hear him expound further on the question of the Holocaust itself, especially as he has now read this illuminating book.

Mr. Richard's statement is an excellent example of the degree to which the poison of Holocaust-denial literature can spread, whether to already receptive minds, or under the guise of a misplaced even-handedness or open-mindedness.

**CAUT Bulletin, April 1985.**
*Reprinted with permission of the Canadian Association of University Teachers.*

## Holocaust debate threatens freedom

***by Vincent Richards***

**Morton Weinfeld's article (April 1985) . . . seems to be an expansion of one written late last year in the *Montreal Gazette*, which I chose to ignore. In both cases he insinuates I hold certain views, which I don't, and maintains that some comments give the Butz book (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*) undeserved legitimacy. He invites me to expound further on the question of the Holocaust itself. The risk of defending intellectual freedom is that people think you are defending the subject of the controversy.**

In 36 years as a librarian I have seen all kinds of propaganda published, much of it wearing the cloak of academic respectability. A few such titles were included in a list of recommended books recently purchased from the federal funds provided through the Holocaust Resource Committee of the Jewish Federation of Edmonton.

### Bias is bias

On the list were biased books, purchased in the interest of intellectual freedom, which probably defame Pius XII and the Catholic Church as well as numerous western leaders during the 1930s and 1940s. I find such books offensive, as I do Butz's. However, I believe it is necessary to have them in any large library, along with books which combat their ideas.

Recently an art exhibition of paintings was staged in Edmonton, highlighting the horrors of the Holocaust. Some of the paintings carried specifically anti-Christian caricatures. These things both surprise me and upset me.

### Polemics vs. goodwill

First of all because a large number of my relatives died in the last war trying to end the ravages of Nazism, while Gandhi was counselling the Jews to passively resist Hitler. Secondly I think the Jewish community could be better served by some of its less-thoughtful polemicists. They tend to reduce the issue solely to whether one denies the Holocaust ever happened or not.

They do not seem to realize that it is possible for intelligent people of goodwill to agree totally that the Holocaust happened and that six million Jews were killed, but hold various opinions about other aspects of this horror.

### Controversy's roots

What the real controversy is about are the degrees of culpability amongst various groups, including some Jews, acquiescing or not adequately preventing Hitler's moves against the Jews and other groups; to what extent the Jewish community was singled out compared to other groups of Hitler's victims; the impression given that Jews were unique victims, which offends the relatives of six million Poles, Slavs, gypsies, Catholics, the physical and mentally handicapped and other ethnic, religious and minority groups exterminated by the Nazis; and the degree to which the terrifying events which happened to the Jews are used for Zionist propaganda purposes—a thesis firmly held by our Arab readers.

### Current holocaust?

No doubt there are other issues. Besides all these gutwrenching and agonizing questions there is the eternal question of why? Jewish philosophers and theologians, as well as Christian ones and others, agonize over this.

Others argue that it is part of late nineteenth and twentieth century materialistic madness, which now works itself out in another holocaust of 1.6 million unborn babies aborted in the U.S. annually and 60,000 each year in Canada. Some see relationships with what went on in Hitler's Germany, others don't.

### Other holocausts

Was there only one holocaust, or is there some relationship to holocausts in Uganda, Cambodia, Vietnam, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ukraine, and other genocides? Shouldn't our voices be raised in concern over all this madness as well?

Perhaps no minority group has a monopoly on being victimized. All these are very controversial questions. It just won't do to brush them aside as some form of anti-Semitism. Some members of the Jewish community argue strongly among themselves about such issues without such facile name-calling.

### To light a candle

Libraries have miles and miles of books, which if laid end to end would point in all directions. Many books contain ideas diametrically opposed to each other and were written with the best will in the world by their authors who sincerely believed in the truth of their work. Many of the older works, once respectable in their day, now only evoke laughter.

That's why librarians are so leery of those who know the full truth about anything at a given time, who try to choke off debate about controversial issues; those who too easily label people they perceive as opponents, and those who wish to label books (or their catalogue cards) to show their approval or disapproval of the contents.

Librarians across the land look forward to a good, scholarly, well written book (or perhaps a pamphlet will do) which effectively demolishes ideas like Butz's. In the meantime most of us prefer not to rely solely on the Ottawa thought police.

Come off it Mort.

**CAUT Bulletin, June 1985.**
*(Reprinted with permission).*

## Response to Richards' Article

In his article in the *CAUT* [Canadian Association of University Teachers] *Bulletin* (June 1985), Alberta librarian Vincent Richards makes a dual argument. The first is a general civil libertarian and relativistic argument that libraries must accommodate all points of view, including those which may be distasteful, since "the full truth about anything" may be unknown, or subject to change over time. The second is an argument specific to the Holocaust, in which he outlines some of his personal views about the "real controversy" surrounding the Holocaust. These may constitute his response to my invitation that he "expound further" on his views regarding the occurrence of the Holocaust as they have been influenced by books like that of Arthur Butz's *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, which, Richards claimed, "raises some very controversial questions" deserving further study.

Both of these issues are too important to personalize, and if I refer to Richards' article in the following, it is only for convenience. I do not know Richards, and I do not suggest in any way that he holds views which are anti-Semitic in motivation, or that he denies the historicity of the Holocaust. But his first argument is simplistic, and his second reveals an ignorance and insensitivity which plays right into the hands of the Holocaust deniers.

### Selection or Censorship?

Richards misunderstands the role of libraries as arbiters in the marketplace of ideas. There are no absolute freedoms, and all modern marketplaces now have rules and regulations to protect buyers and sellers from dishonest or misleading practices. Libraries, as adjuncts to scholarship, are inevitably involved in making judgments about different sorts of books, in at least two ways: first, in deciding whether to obtain a given volume, and second, in classifying the book.

Consider the following example. Most libraries do *not* have an extensive collection of (or any) hard-core pornographic books, even if reserved for readers 18 or over. Why not? One suspects that given constraints of money and space, priorities have been established. Somewhere within the library system, some people have made the judgment that this smut is not serious literature and ought to have little or no claim on the resources and space of the library. On the other hand, some sexually explicit fiction should be found in good libraries (e.g., works of D.H. Lawrence or Henry Miller, even *Pornoy's Complaint* or *Fear of Flying*). In differentiating between hard-core smut and serious fiction, librarians (certainly university librarians) usually rely on the consensus of literary experts regarding the

merits of various works. This might constitute in Richards' terms "bias."

### Differentiation through Classification

Library classifications invariably differentiate bodies of knowledge. Such differentiations need not constitute a hierarchical ranking, but they do signal to the library user that the various subgroups are seen as distinct by the practitioners in the field, for whatever reason.

Consider classifications for the science of psychology, which is placed in BF in the Library of Congress Classification scheme. Up until the BF 850's, we find what we might call mainstream scientific psychology. After that number and up to the BF 1700's, one can find class numbers for various approaches to the study of the human mind or personality, including graphology, phrenology, palmistry, extra-sensory perception, studies of the occult and other parapsychological or paranormal phenomena, astrology, and related matters. Clearly some value judgments are being expressed here, even if one assumes no rank ordering was intended in terms of valid science.

To take another example, books dealing with alchemy are classified by LC in science, but again are specifically demarcated by the class numbers QD 25-27. Scientific chemistry, as we know it, begins at QD 30.

Works such as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, or Henry Ford's sponsored writings from his newspaper, *The Dearborn Independent-The Internationalist Jews*, are classified in the McGill University Library at DS 145, which comprises examples and studies of anti-Semitism. Their classification here—and not in social thought or general history—provides a useful signal to the reader.

My argument that library classification of Holocaust denial literature should differentiate it from serious and/or mainstream historical scholarship seems to me to be consistent with library classification practice in other fields.

Many of Richards' amplifications of the libertarian or relativistic view (e.g., who is to say what is absolute truth?) are beside the point. The fact that opinions and versions of truth change over time does not mean that at any one point in time, there exists no consensus among scholars about the value of various works, and it is this which is reflected in the classification schemes of libraries. If opinions change in the future, and, for example, hard-core smut is seen as having literary value greater than that of the works of Shakespeare or Bellow, then library acquisitions may change to reflect that fact.

Richards expresses his opposition to "those who wish to label books (or their catalog cards) to show their approval or disapproval of their contents." He does not recognize that this is precisely what libraries do. It is libraries—or the Library of Congress, in most cases—which provide those categories or labels, whether we are talking of Holocaust denial books cataloged as history, creation science as theology, or flat-earth books as anything but astronomy.

### Issues in Holocaust Literature

The specific point which Richards makes is that Holocaust denial books, such as that of Arthur Butz (whose argument is captured concisely in his title: *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*), do indeed raise important issues. In a few brief paragraphs, Richards outlines his understanding of what are the controversial issues relating to the Holocaust. These include: the argument against the uniqueness of the Holocaust; the imputed focus on Jewish victims to the exclusion of all others; pondering the degree of Jewish acquiescence with Nazis; and Zionist utilization of the Holocaust for propaganda purposes.

Now it so happens that some of these issues are of interest to historians of the Holocaust. But the list is incomplete; there are many more dominant areas of inquiry. These include the study of: active collaboration by non-German states, active and passive Nazi officials, and the few but significant "righteous Gentiles" who risked their lives to save Jews. Richards' views—if genocidal exterminations are frequent, if Jews were only one group among many equally victimized by the Nazis, and some may even have collaborated, then why the fuss about the Jews?—constitute not Holocaust denial, but Holocaust denigration. This is Holocaust denial by the back door: perhaps six million were killed, but so what?

The elements of a dark conspiracy seem to lurk in the points which Richard raises: Jews among others, acquiescing in their own destruction; Zionists making propagandistic hay out of the event; "the impression given" (by whom?) that Jews were the sole victims; the focus on the Holocaust which prevents the voicing of concern regarding contemporary "holocausts" in Cambodia, Ethiopia, etc.

The fact is that absolutely nothing prevents descendants of other groups victimized by the Nazis from researching and writing about atrocities, erecting monuments to their victims, and attempting to prosecute guilty parties or to secure redress. There is also nothing that prevents citizens of whatever background from organizing to either ameliorate or commemorate tragedies past and present. And many groups (Armenians, Ukrainians, and Japanese, among others) have done precisely that. And certainly anti-abortionists (another issue cited by Richards) are not hesitant about mobilizing to protest against their perceived "holocausts."

For Richards, the Holocaust remains one of those issues in which nearly every work published is "biased." Just as Holocaust-denial books have their "bias," so too did some of the books on a list prepared by the Holocaust Resource Committee of Edmonton, according to Richards. Regrettably, he did not specify exactly which books on that list were, to use his terms, "biased," "offensive," "defamatory," and "propagandistic."

Richards suffers from a lack of appreciation of exactly what did happen to European Jewry during the dark years of World War Two. He is also guilty of the common tendency to misuse and overuse the terms "holocaust" and "genocide," to cover all manners of tragedy, warfare, starvation, and brutality. If everything is genocide, then nothing is genocide.

Richards also reveals an appalling ignorance of the state of historical scholarship on the Holocaust in his last paragraph. He writes that "librarians across the land look forward to a good scholarly book which effectively demolishes ideas like Butz's." This is a mind-boggling statement. Libraries in North America, especially campus libraries, are *full* of books which do precisely that. I am sure that there are historians in Alberta universities who can help him locate them. Certainly, the Canadian Historical Association has no problem with the state of historical scholarship on the question, as it felt compelled to denounce Holocaust denial literature in a resolution passed in Spring 1986. French historians had made an even stronger statement six years earlier. Nobody has to wait for yet another book in order to demolish "ideas" like those of Butz, just as no one must wait for another book to demolish the idea that the earth is flat.

### Conclusions

In summary, citizens have a right to read Holocaust denial books, and libraries have a right to acquire them. Jim Keegstra, a former Alberta high school teacher, found such books, including specifically the one by Arthur Butz, helpful in preparing his social studies lectures. Who knows how many others may benefit from them?

But people should be under no illusions regarding the origins and motives of the Holocaust denial movement. It is comprised

*(Continued on p. 55, column 1)*

# The Handling of Holocaust Denial Literature in a Special Library

***Adaire Klein***
*Simon Wiesenthal Center*
*Los Angeles, CA*

### Introduction

It is a pleasure to share this podium with such an illustrious panel. We have had an introduction to what constitutes Holocaust Denial literature. As librarians, we must now come to grips with the question, what do we do with it. As the only librarian on the panel, I shall address this issue on the basis of my personal experience in our library.

Since its inception in 1977, the Wiesenthal Center Library has had to cope with Holocaust Denial, Antisemitica, and other similar genres of literature. On my first day of work, I was handed two cartons of books and told to make a library. As I perused the fifty books given to me, I suddenly realized that it was not going to be a simple task. There was *The War Against the Jews, 1933–1945* by Lucy Dawidowicz (NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), and a number of other basic Holocaust texts; however, there was also a copy of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* by Arthur Butz (Torrance, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1976).

From that day on, we daily wrestle with the questions: How do we handle it? What do we do with it? What are our obligations to the public?

The focus of my remarks is on the literature which revises and denies the Holocaust; however, PLO propaganda materials, "Zionism is Racism," and Antisemitica are only a few of the additional subject areas which would need similar decisions, and we have applied some of the same parameters discussed below to our holdings on these topics.

Also, *denial* of the Holocaust is not the only Holocaust material treated this way. It may surprise you to learn that there is Holocaust pornography—anti-Nazi and extensively illustrated. We handle these materials in a similar way. Perhaps you will find other areas where these ideas can be applied.

My remarks shall be as specific and as practical as possible. Throughout every decision, there is a primary concern for the public we serve.

### Assumptions

In order to best understand the topic given to us, we must consider what is probably the most important word in the title of today's session. The title reads: "Controversial materials in a Jewish library." It is the adjective "Jewish," in this case, which sets important guidelines for us. It is the word "Jewish" which entitles us to a bias—a bias which constitutes a commitment to the institution we represent.

In the Wiesenthal Center, we accept as a premise that the Holocaust did take place. As do the courts, we firmly believe that the Holocaust is an historical fact. This does not mean, however, that we would attempt to prevent the deniers of the Holocaust from publishing their materials. That certainly is not our intent. On the other hand, we do not have to buy their materials. We do not have to buy anything that contradicts the mandate of our institutions, and we certainly have no obligation to publicize it.

### Legitimization

In this regard, I was dismayed to see that the Jewish Public Library of Montreal published a Holocaust bibliography (1979) which included *The Drama of European Jews* by Paul Rassinier (1975), listed under the history and background of the Holocaust (Item #16). I find it difficult to understand why one would list Rassinier's book together with those of Lucy Dawidowicz, Martin Gilbert, Yisrael Gutman, and other recognized Holocaust historians.

If we are producing a bibliography, or a section of a bibliography, dedicated to Holocaust Revisionism, there is obviously room for the Rassinier book; however, we must not legitimize such books and materials by including them in a Holocaust bibliography that does not distinguish fact from fiction.

Giving all sides of an issue is also not a consideration here. We have absolutely no obligation to give a platform to Holocaust Revisionism. The Holocaust is an accepted historical fact, and we need not concern ourselves with citing the sources of the Holocaust deniers.

Already heard here today is a plea to librarians from the academic community to classify these materials and to provide subject cataloging for them which honestly identifies them for what they are. In public institutions, as well, there have been recent efforts to distinguish between authentic Holocaust historiography and Holocaust Revisionism and denial; e.g., The Library of Congress has now drawn that distinction with the designation of the subject heading HOLOCAUST, JEWISH, 1939–1945—ERRORS, INVENTIONS, ETC. (This is discussed further below.)

### Acquisition of the Materials

It is essential when dealing with controversial matters to know the other side's views. Knowing the enemy and/or the opposing view is crucial to one's understanding of the subject. In fact, it frequently strengthens

---

*(Continued from p. 54)*

### Weinfeld

of crackpot pseudo-scholars drawn primarily, but not exclusively, from the libertarian right wing. Most of its organizational activity and publishing is sponsored by the Liberty Lobby, which is (among other things) perhaps the best organized and financed anti-Semitic organization in the United States. It is Butz and his gang that are controversial—not the foolish and malicious views they propound, which have *no* constituency among serious historical scholars.

Libraries must not shrink from reflecting this fact in their classifications of such material.

---

*Dr. Morton Weinfeld is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Dept. of Sociology at McGill University in Montreal, Canada.*