

# Coup d'Etat

The Bizarre Inside Story  
of How an Intelligence Operative  
Tied to the CIA and Israel's Mossad  
Orchestrated the Take-Over of  
the Institute for Historical Review  
And Set in Motion the Ultimate  
Destruction of Liberty Lobby

How the IHR now operates as a classic  
Soviet-style "trust" name-gathering  
operation—a "controlled opposition"

Ignore the  
chapter "headers."  
They come from another  
template that has  
nothing to do with this.

---

Mike

**Coup d'etat:  
The Illegal Seizure of the  
Institute for Historical Review  
And the Opening Guns of  
the Campaign to Destroy Liberty Lobby**

On October 15, 1993 a shocking and quite violent row erupted at the longtime headquarters, in Costa Mesa, California, of the Institute for Historical Review, a historical revisionist research institute originally established by Willis Carto and his wife Elisabeth in 1978.

The events that took place that day set in motion, over the next decade that followed, a chain of circumstances that left the IHR virtually moribund and in 2001 brought about the total destruction of Liberty Lobby, the Washington, D.C.-based populist institution (first founded by the same aforementioned Willis Carto in 1955).

A detailed examination of the personalities and events involved in this sordid affair demonstrates—beyond any question—that the IHR affair and the subsequent evisceration of Liberty Lobby, longtime publisher of the once-vibrant national weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, were the consequences of a long-planned and carefully calculated conspiracy by Judas Goats acting on behalf of *The Enemy Within*.

First of all, in exploring this amazing story, it is important to delineate the differences between the IHR and Liberty Lobby, which had always been entirely separate institutions, despite the fact that both had been founded by Carto.

Liberty Lobby was founded by Carto in 1955 as a grass-roots citizens' lobby. Its continuing purpose had been to not only provide patriots an action-oriented lobbying organization on Capitol Hill in Washington but also a source of infor-

mation and a clearing house for grass-roots patriotic efforts around the country, both complementing and uniting their efforts.

Ultimately, Liberty Lobby's weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, established in 1975, reached a paid circulation of some 391,000 readers, making it—by far—the largest independent national news publication of its kind, with an outreach considerably more substantial than any other nationalist journal, and rivaling even many well-established “mainstream” publications. In truth, *The Spotlight's* actual weekly readership, in terms of its “pass on” rate, certainly exceeded one million. As such, *The Spotlight* and Liberty Lobby were providing a serious challenge to the power elite in America and around the globe.

The IHR, along with the Noontide Press, operated under the auspices of a non-profit corporation, the Legion for the Survival of Freedom (LSF), first established by the late Jason Matthews and a group of patriots in 1952. By 1966, however, the LSF was going into bankruptcy, unable to continue publishing the popular *American Mercury* magazine, one of its various educational projects.

At that time—at the request of Mrs. LaVonne D. Furr and retired General Edwin Walker, who had assumed control of the *Mercury* after Matthews' death—Carto (already the founder and treasurer of Liberty Lobby) personally assumed the debts of the LSF (amounting to some \$20,000) and took actual control and management of the corporation and made possible continued publication of the *Mercury* for another decade. Carto also merged the independent Noontide Press into the LSF and brought his *Washington Observer* newsletter under the LSF's umbrella.

It was not until 1979 that Carto established the IHR as an LSF subdivision. Contrary to what the conspirators who subsequently seized control of the IHR subsequently claimed—the LSF's mission was never solely limited to the

IHR's historical research. Instead, the IHR was only a subdivision of the multi-faceted LSF.

Although the work of the IHR was best known for its ground-breaking historical research into the facts about the events of World War II known as "the Holocaust," the truth is that the IHR's mission to promote what is generally referred to as "Revisionist" history encompassed far more than the study of "the Holocaust."

And so it was that from 1980 until 1993, under Willis Carto's management and leadership, the IHR had a virtually unbroken track record of continually publishing not only its *Journal of Historical Review*, issued no less than 46 times from the spring of 1980 through the winter issue of 1992-1993) and then five volumes, in a magazine format, published in 1993, as well as the monthly IHR Newsletter.

The only break in that otherwise continuing record came in the summer of 1984, at which time the IHR office (then in Torrance, California) was firebombed out of existence on the night of July 4, an act that was very clearly a professional operation that insiders in the U.S. law enforcement community quietly admitted had been the work of Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad. Although the entire book inventory of the IHR—worth over a million dollars—had been destroyed and the IHR had suffered a severe setback, Carto went to work and raised the money so that the IHR could be revived and publication of its *Journal* put back on schedule within a relatively short time.

During that same time frame that Carto was working to build the IHR, the institute was hit with a lawsuit by self-described "Holocaust survivor" Mel Mermelstein who also brought in Liberty Lobby as a co-defendant, simply on the basis that Liberty Lobby and the IHR were both under the direction of Carto, despite the fact—as already noted—that the two were entirely separate institutions.

Although Carto made the business decision to settle

with Mermelstein in the first suit, rather than taking the case to a costly court trial that could have potentially resulted in an even more devastating loss that could have bankrupted both the IHR and Liberty Lobby, Mermelstein came back again and filed yet another lawsuit against both institutions that dragged on and on at great cost to both entities. Had it not been for Carto arranging for attorneys and raising funds to fight Mermelstein, the battle would have been lost.

In the end, however, thanks to the skillful work of attorney Mark Lane, working in conjunction with another attorney, William S. Hulsy, Mermelstein's case fell apart and in September of 1991, Mermelstein threw in the towel, even before the case went to trial. It was a bitter loss for those who wanted to see the destruction of the IHR and Liberty Lobby—but a great victory for those who value historical truth.

(For an entire account of the decade-long Mermelstein lawsuits, see Michael Collins Piper's 1994 work, *Best Witness: The Mel Mermelstein Affair and the Triumph of Historical Revisionism*, which features an introduction by Mark Lane and an afterword by Willis Carto.)

In any case, there is no question that by 1993—with the collapse of the Mermelstein lawsuit, both the IHR and Liberty Lobby were thriving. In fact, in 1993 the IHR had been the primary focus of no less than four major anti-Revisionist works widely touted by the elite media around the globe. Very clearly, the IHR had more than survived. The IHR, indeed, had made revisionism a powerful force that now could no longer be ignored. Revisionism had to be reckoned with.

Although he was the founder of the IHR, Willis Carto seldom—if ever—interfered with the day-to-day operations of the IHR. He felt generally confident in the overall ability of the IHR staff to attend to the duties of the institute and allowed it to function unimpeded. He served as an unpaid

advisor, coming in periodically to oversee fund-raising efforts and editorial decision making.

In the two years following the IHR's Mermelstein lawsuit victory, however, there had been an undercurrent of problems at the IHR but none were—or so it seemed—dangerous to the future of the revisionist movement.

Although an able writer, researcher and translator, Ted O'Keefe, editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*, had been unable to meet deadlines and, as a consequence, had been required to surrender his post as editor of the *Journal* to Mark Weber who was hired by the IHR in January of 1991. O'Keefe, however, remained an employee and very popular within the Revisionist community.

Weber, however, proved like O'Keefe to be less than professional, despite his writing and research talents. He was extremely stubborn and impossible to work with. Ultimately, Carto, as founder of the IHR, determined in consultation with the board of directors of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, that the *Journal* would be much better served with another editor. Weber realized that he was to be replaced and, as a consequence, was ripe to be manipulated by those with other agendas.

In the meantime, another IHR staffer had been hired by Tom Marcellus, one Greg Raven, a self-described "libertarian-revisionist" who was unknown in revisionist circles but who was touted by the then-trusted Marcellus.

There was another problem. Ted O'Keefe had failed to write the book on the Mermelstein case that he had agreed to write. He had spent a year and one-half working on the book and not a single publishable page had materialized. As a consequence, Willis Carto asked Michael Collins Piper, to come to California to write it.

The first draft of what proved to be a 235-page book was finished in one month and plans were set in motion for the IHR to publish it immediately. It was ultimately pub-

lished, in the spring of 1994, as previously mentioned, under the title Best Witness.

The entire time that Piper was working on a friendly day-to-day basis with the IHR staffers, they were—behind the scenes—engaged in their conspiracy to seize the IHR. For four months the paid staffers—on company time, no less—had been engaged in a covert conspiracy they intended to result in an act of outright piracy.

Now, at this juncture, it is important to note that there was another parallel and related development. It was in the wake of the Mermelstein defeat that the ADL itself became involved in its now-infamous spy scandal in San Francisco that was described in detail earlier in the pages of this book.

The ADL was under heavy fire, but, at the same time, it was still using its considerable resources to interfere with the work of the IHR.

A San Francisco Bay area attorney named Andrew Allen was busy ingratiating himself with the IHR's staff members under the guise of being a "revisionist" and cleverly and insidiously exploiting the dissatisfaction on the part of Mark Weber and Ted O'Keefe, in particular.

Allen claimed to have a longstanding interest in the IHR's historical research, but for nearly ten years Allen had been actively engaged in efforts to undermine the IHR's work. After IHR staff member David McCalden was fired from the IHR in 1981, Allen began financing McCalden's activities that were largely focused on undermining the IHR.

During the same period McCalden was also collaborating closely with another San Francisco "revisionist," Roy Bullock who was, of course, later exposed as an ADL spy. So it happened that under the tutelage of Allen and Bullock, McCalden launched a well-financed propaganda campaign against the IHR.

In fact, according to information released publicly on November 7, 1984 by respected veteran revisionist histori-

an H. Keith Thompson, whose bona fides are undoubted, McCalden was indeed being fed intelligence that originated from a CIA middleman whom Thompson subsequently identified as one Elliot Carter.

Because of Allen's activities, IHR founder Carto had actually barred Allen from attending IHR conferences.

Despite Allen's record, IHR staffers Mark Weber and Ted O'Keefe began collaborating closely with Allen during the spring and throughout the summer of 1993.

And as we shall see in the pages that follow, there is much more to the story of Andrew Allen which indicates the source of his motivation to destroy the IHR.

At the same time Weber and O'Keefe were trafficking with Allen, Weber, and particularly O'Keefe, were in regular contact with the IHR's former attorney, William Hulsy, who was angry that IHR founder Carto had dismissed Hulsy as an attorney for the IHR, thereby ending a lucrative relationship in which Hulsy had been paid over \$100,000 for his work in defending the IHR.

Hulsy's strange and apparent about-face, it seems, may not have been so totally unexpected. It had been foreshadowed by a bizarre comment that Hulsy made on September 19, 1991 during the triumphant IHR-Liberty Lobby victory party in Hulsy's hotel suite in Los Angeles following the collapse of the Mermelstein case in the courtroom of Judge Stephen Lachs.

The assembled guests toasted the victory and praised Hulsy and Liberty Lobby attorney Mark Lane for their outstanding work. Stepping forward Mark Lane praised Hulsy. However, Hulsy, glass in hand, lurched forward with a thoroughly inappropriate (and rather bizarre and surprising) comment: "I'm so tired of hearing about how great Mark Lane is. How great a case Mark Lane presented. What about Bill Hulsy?"

There was a stunned silence. Several of those on hand



chuckled nervously as Hulsy leered ominously at the small gathering. Sensing that there might be trouble afoot Mark Lane and his wife Trish quietly excused themselves. It was a strange moment, but it did indeed perhaps signal that something was amiss.

As such, in the months that followed, during which time Hulsy's relationship with the IHR had been severed by Carto, Hulsy—using his own privileged information gleaned from his former client, Willis Carto, about the LFS/IHR structure and its assets—Hulsy began conspiring with O'Keefe and Weber who were, at the same time, being prodded by Andrew Allen who later publicly boasted that he “started” the IHR coup.

Hulsy and Allen were telling Weber and O'Keefe that they were the “real” IHR and that it was time that they take action to take control of the IHR and remove Willis Carto from his well-known and indisputed position as the leader of the Revisionist institute.

And it should be added—and not just parenthetically—that even at the same time Weber and O'Keefe had fallen under the spell of Allen, in particular, that the two other key IHR staffers, Tom Marcellus and Greg Raven, were involved in intrigues against the IHR on their own, following a mysterious agenda that was almost certainly beyond the understanding of O'Keefe (and perhaps even Weber himself).

In any case, there was thus set in motion the events that led not only to the illegally-orchestrated takeover of the IHR's legitimate board of directors but, in the end, the ultimate destruction of Liberty Lobby. And here's what happened . . .

While in Washington on October 4, 1993 Willis Carto received a faxed letter containing a highly unexpected and shocking message signed by IHR director Tom Marcellus, IHR Journal Editor Mark Weber, and assistant editors Ted O'Keefe and Greg Raven. The paid employees whom he had

hired told Carto that he was no longer welcome at IHR headquarters. Nor was his wife, Elisabeth, who regularly did volunteer work for the IHR .

(Marcellus had first sent the letter on October 1, but Carto had not received it. Marcellus then called Carto on October 4 and, upon finding out that the letter had not been received, Marcellus then faxed it to Carto. As we shall see in subsequent pages, the fact that the letter was first sent on October 1 is highly significant indeed.)

In any case, upon reviewing the fax, Carto launched his own investigation and subsequently learned that Lewis and LaVonne Furr—a husband and wife, the senior members of the board of directors of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom (the IHR's parent corporation)—had resigned. Carto learned that over a period of several months—unknown to Carto—Marcellus, assisted by Weber, O'Keefe and their attorney, William Hulsy, had been putting immense pressure upon Mrs. and Mrs. Furr, threatening them with legal prosecution if they, the Furrs, did not join Marcellus and company in their coup d'etat. Frightened by the threats, the Furrs resigned, although they later repudiated their resignations as coerced under duress.

(The term coup d'etat was first used to describe the IHR affair by none other than the attorney, William Hulsy, who was involved with Marcellus and company in the long-term planning that led to the coup. Hulsy used this term in a conversation with attorney, Mark Lane, who continued to represent Liberty Lobby.)

Upon the resignation of Mr. and Mrs. Furr, Marcellus and Weber instructed Kerr that it was his responsibility to call a new board meeting and appoint new board members. Marcellus and Weber had falsely told Kerr that he (Kerr) was the only remaining director, although Weber knew very well that there were two others still on the board, including Sam Dickson, a highly regarded Georgia attorney.

Unaware of the impropriety of this action, having been misled by Marcellus and Weber, Kerr complied and unwittingly “appointed” three new board members, fully in contradiction of the by-laws of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom. The new board members were Friedrich (Fritz) Berg, John Curry and Andrew Allen. It was this new—and thoroughly bogus—board that announced that Elisabeth and Willis Carto were now *persona non grata* at the IHR and in the ranks of the revisionist movement.

As soon as he received the letter of October 4, Carto developed plans to regain control before too much damage could be done. The conspirators wanted him to hand over all of the corporate documents for the Legion and he agreed to a meeting in Hulsy’s office for October 15, shortly after he returned to California.

Meanwhile, the conspirators had neglected to pay the rent on the two buildings the IHR occupied. Additionally, they had secretly changed the locks although the express permission of the owners was required. Thus, acting as agents for the two landlords, the Cartos and three friends were let into the buildings by a loyal employee, Jean Scott, a soft-spoken Englishwoman known by many telephone callers as “the voice of the IHR.”

After the Cartos and their friends had re-secured the building, Carto sent a conciliatory fax to Hulsy’s office, advising the attorney and his collaborators that Carto was now in control of the IHR office and that the resignations of the staffers would be accepted without publicity.

The reaction of Hulsy and company was worthy of a gang of thugs. Arriving at the IHR office, they stormed the main entrance. Unfortunately, the lock on the main door was not strong enough and it snapped.

Hulsy, Marcellus, Weber, O’Keefe and Raven—wielding a loaded gun—forced their way into the building and began to violently to eject the Cartos and their friends. They fought

back, so much so that both Elisabeth and Willis Carto were battered and bloodied.

Co-conspirator Raven (standing side by side with the attorney) aimed his loaded semi-automatic pistol at Elisabeth Carto's face, screaming at her to get out. Never one to mince words, Mrs. Carto responded, "You'll first have to shoot me, you coward." Fortunately, Raven did not fire.

Ultimately, Elisabeth—a slender, attractive blonde—was hurled out of the building, landing in a heap on the sidewalk. Willis positioned himself between the door and the frame, with the heavy steel and glass door being pulled shut against him. Attorney Hulsy (who weighs in at perhaps 75 pounds more than Carto) and Marcellus were pummeling Carto, trying to dislodge him.

"It was getting somewhat uncomfortable and so I let go," Carto later remarked, somewhat wryly. Willis Carto was now in the street and had been removed from the headquarters of the institute he had worked so hard to establish.

In the meantime, Hulsy's female companion, who was waiting outside, summoned the police who arrived shortly. Upon the arrival of the authorities, the competing parties began explaining their versions of what had happened.

Willis advised the police that Raven had drawn a weapon. Although the gun was now nowhere in sight, the police searched the building and discovered the pistol hidden in Raven's desk, where it had just been secreted by Marcellus and Raven. The gun was loaded. "It had one in the chamber," commented one police officer as the weapon was confiscated as evidence. Raven was immediately arrested, handcuffed, and taken away in a police car.

(Elisabeth and Willis Carto were—needless to say—astounded at the events that had unfolded. However, several days earlier she may have had a warning of what was about to unfold. After she had contacted Tom Marcellus, upon learning of the faxed message to Willis in Washington,

she had an unsettling experience.

(Addressing Marcellus, with whom she had maintained what she perceived to be a cordial relationship over the past fourteen years, she said, "Tom, I thought we were friends." Marcellus snorted, "We were never friends.")

At this point attorney Hulsy and his remaining co-conspirators began swearing out arrest warrants against the Cartos. The police officers asked if the Cartos wished to swear out arrest warrants. Attempting to settle the matter then and there, hoping that it would go no further, Carto advised the police that if Hulsy and his clients would abandon their arrest warrants that he would do likewise.

Hulsy refused. "Only if Carto turns over all the assets and complete control of the Legion," he yelled. Carto was not about to concede that this group of pirates were in the right and refused to submit to this obvious extortion.

As a consequence, several arrests were made, including both of the Cartos who were handcuffed, taken to police headquarters, and placed in cells under \$50,000 bail each and held for eight hours.

Fortunately, Carto was ultimately able to make contact with his long-time friend, Jim Townsend, publisher of the populist monthly, *The National Educator*, who arranged for the Cartos' release on their own recognizance at about midnight. No charges were ever filed. Hulsy's colleagues Weber and O'Keefe were arrested as well. Weber had grabbed Elisabeth Carto by the neck and had struck her about the face and the head.

In the meantime, as the dust settled, Elisabeth and Willis Carto sought legal counsel to determine the appropriate course of action. In the affidavits filed during the course of the litigation, IHR Director Tom Marcellus hit hard at existing projects of the IHR, using language which might lead some to suspect that perhaps Marcellus had a decidedly non-revisionist agenda.

Marcellus also discontinued the ambitious project of publishing a history of World War II by Gen. Leon Degrelle, the French-speaking Belgian who was one of the most decorated combat officers on the Russian front, with personal experiences and acquaintances of wartime leaders of the Axis powers right up to Hitler, himself. Degrelle's classic work, *Campaign in Russia*, previously published by the IHR, had proven to be the institute's most popular work. The first volume of his projected series, *Hitler Born at Versailles* was enormously popular and thousands of readers looked forward to the rest of the series.

Moreover, the royalties for the books had been paid to Degrelle by a friend of the IHR. All that remained was the editing and translating (to be sure a formidable task) and the printing.

Marcellus shocked many revisionists when he alleged that Degrelle was guilty of "plagiarism" and attacked Degrelle's work as being "flagrantly pro-Hitler." Marcellus and his colleagues also made derogatory remarks, in sworn statements, about Degrelle's advancing years.

In addition, Marcellus also trashed an anthology of wartime submarine commanders' recollections that would be published in conjunction with the Sharkhunters organization, consisting of submariners of all nations involved in World War II, as well as a very unique book, translated from the German by Carl Hottetlet, the *Lehrplan*, a study of the material taught to German youth during World War II.

Marcellus also trashed the reprinting of a World War II book by a rabid Zionist, Theodore Kaufman, who argued that the entire German nation should be exterminated.

Another victim of the IHR conspirators was kindly and likeable Dr. Robert H. Countess, a gentlemanly scholar and a dedicated proponent of the revisionist cause who had become much-liked and respected by his revisionist colleagues worldwide.

Willis Carto had retained Countess to write a thoroughly researched and professional history of the Jewish experience in Europe with a particular focus on the oft-mentioned (but seldom examined) repeated expulsions of the Jewish people from the nations of Europe. Inasmuch as this phenomenon is repeatedly cited by Establishment historians writing of “the Holocaust,” Countess had agreed with Carto that it was a subject worthy of scholarly research.

However, following the IHR coup, Marcellus advised Countess that his contract with the IHR was “in review” So it was that Countess’ work also was sabotaged on the basis that this was not a project worthy of IHR consideration.

Weber and company, frankly, created quite a furor within revisionist ranks by lending their support to a variety of sworn declarations entered into the court record by their attorney. These declarations, among other things, accused Willis Carto of “Nazi” and “racist” sympathies, and a determination to publish “pro-Hitler” works under the egis of the IHR and to make the IHR’s journal into a “racist” and “Nazi” magazine. These terms of opprobrium would be no surprise coming directly from the Anti-Defamation League. For these allegations to come from Weber and company, however, began to raise serious questions as to what the real agenda of the “new” IHR was truly all about.

However, there were other signs that there was more at work the IHR takeover. In the earliest days of the IHR debacle, Liberty Lobby obtained hard evidence that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith was in possession of the mailing list of the Noontide Press, the IHR’s book publishing affiliate. What was so significant about this was that the evidence suggested that the Noontide list was turned over to the ADL even before the in-house IHR coup which took place on October 5, 1993. This suggests that a staffer at the IHR was, in fact, collaborating with the ADL in the period leading up to the coup.

Here are the facts: A long-time Spotlight reader from New Jersey was surprised to receive a letter from the San Francisco Police Department advising him that his name was among those on the so-called "right" file maintained by Tom Gerard, a veteran San Francisco police officer who was under investigation for the theft of police intelligence files that he (Gerard) then turned over to long-time ADL undercover operative Roy Bullock.

(The "right" file contained the names of (and, in some cases, personal information about) individuals involved in populist and nationalist groups. Both Gerard and Bullock maintained such files in their personal computers. The same information was also channeled to the ADL and then, presumably, on to the ADL's contacts in Israel's secret intelligence service, the Mossad.)

When The Spotlight reader made a formal request to the San Francisco authorities for the information contained about him in the illicit files, he received a photographic copy of the file in question. (The photographic copy is reproduced here, with the individual's name blacked out to protect his identity.) Although the file listing contained only the individual's name and address, beside the legend "organization" appears the designation "Noontide Press."

The individual advised The Spotlight that he had absolutely never attended any function sponsored either by the IHR or the Noontide Press. He had, however, ordered books from Noontide—prior to the IHR coup. And this fact is significant. That this individual's name is now in the ADL files means one thing: the ADL had gained access to the Noontide Press mailing list—even before the IHR coup. This conclusion is indisputable, considering the facts.

The ADL could only have obtained the Noontide Press mailing list from someone working within the IHR headquarters office in Costa Mesa or from someone who obtained the list from an IHR employee.



However, the guilty party (or parties) obviously had no idea that evidence of the purloined list would end up in the hands of the San Francisco authorities. Otherwise the theft of the list would have remained a secret known only to the ADL and its collaborator (or collaborators) inside the IHR or those working closely with insiders at the IHR.

Whether the list was passed on to the ADL by the late David McCalden—who was known to be working with ADL spy Roy Bullock—or whether it came from one of the “loyal” IHR employees who later staged the coup against Willis Carto will probably never be known. But this shocking revelation was but another fact which confirms the long-standing conclusion by loyal revisionists that the IHR coup de etat was an ADL project of long-standing, aided and abetted from within the IHR itself.

Although Willis and Elisabeth Carto (with the assistance of the legitimate members of the IHR board of directors) brought legal action in an effort to regain control of the IHR, during the last week of December 1993 a California state superior court judge, Robert Polis, dismissed their action, despite all of the evidence of coercion and threats—really extortion—by Allen, Weber, Marcellus and company.

Needless to say, the ruling by Judge Polis came as no surprise to anyone who was fully aware that the American court system is not only corrupt but heavily dominated by jurists who recognize that the power of Zionism is paramount. There are few judges, let it be said, who would have dared to restore the IHR to its rightful management.

But all of this was just the beginning of a series of events that would drag on for many years—some of the more sordid details of which are yet to come in these pages.

However, at this juncture, it is appropriate to take a closer look at the aforementioned Andrew Allen who bragged that he had “started” the events that led to the illicit takeover of the IHR. An examination of Andrew Allen demon-

strates clearly where his real interests lie.

## **Chapter Two**

### **The Man Behind the Mask: Andrew Allen— The Man Who “Started” the IHR Affair**

A shadowy multi-millionaire real estate developer based in San Francisco admitted being the prime mover behind the shocking coup d’etat at the Institute for Historical Review. Who is this enigmatic individual named Andrew Allen?

According to former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky, a general rule of thumb is that “If someone looks like he’s Mossad—he isn’t.” Andrew Allen most definitely does not look like he’s Mossad. Quite the contrary! A self-described

“liberal Republican,” Allen is not only an attorney, but he’s also the well-heeled beneficiary of several old-line family trusts and the proprietor of a lucrative real estate management concern in upscale Marin County, California. That’s his public profile. But there’s much more to Allen if you look behind the scenes . . .

In fact, Andrew Allen is a long-time covert operative with service in the Middle East (in Afghanistan) and at least tactical deployment in the Far East (in Burma). Yet, despite the vast and striking geographic, ethnic and historical contrasts between these far-flung regions where Allen’s been engaged, there is one notable, inter-related geopolitical similarity: Israel’s Mossad has been deeply involved (both alone and working with the CIA) advancing Israel’s interests in both domains.

During the course of subsequent litigation following the October 15, 1993 coup at the IHR headquarters in California—litigation which ultimately embroiled Liberty Lobby, resulting in its final destruction—details began to emerge about Allen which pointed directly to his status as a high-level Judas Goat, one of the true Enemies Within.

In a sworn deposition on Oct. 7, 1994 conducted in San Francisco by Randall Waier, Liberty Lobby’s co-counsel, Allen revealed that he is “on the board of directors of a 501(c)(3) [tax-exempt] group called the Burma Foundation” the purpose of which he said is “to provide relief to Burmese refugees and promote democracy in Burma.”

Documents filed by Allen himself with the Internal Revenue Service indicated further that Allen was not only a member, but also the founder and secretary of the Burma Foundation’s board of directors.

In yet a subsequent deposition, Allen revealed that his ties to the so-called “Free Burma” movement went the whole way to the top. Allen admitted that when the Burmese rebel opposition leader (whom Allen described as the “democrat-

ically-elected” prime minister) came to the United States, “he stayed with me.” According to Allen, “He was visiting the United States to go and speak at the United Nations and on his way there he had stopped in the Bay area.”

When asked how the Burmese radical leader just happened to stop off at Allen’s house, of all the locations in the hotel-rich tourist town of San Francisco, Allen said, “Somebody called me and said ‘Could he stay with you along with the finance minister?’ so they did.”

Who was it who called Allen and arranged for the foreign dignitaries to stay at the Allen home? Allen chirped, “I can’t remember.” When asked why the supposedly forgotten individual or agency called on Allen for his services, the covert operative responded sarcastically, “They knew I had a house with an extra room or two.”

When asked if he was surprised that he had such high-level international dignitaries staying at his home, Allen commented, “No, I was honored,” and then added that the Burmese finance minister “was later killed.”

So clearly, Andrew Allen and his Burma Foundation had some high-level connections indeed. But those connections go beyond the CIA. The whole Burma affair ties directly into Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad.

Allen’s foundation bears the precise profile of the myriad proprietaries—or “front groups” in common parlance—that have been established by both the CIA and the Mossad, both jointly and individually, for a wide variety of intelligence operations.

The Washington Times reported that “the National Endowment for Democracy and the New York-based Soros Foundation” are major financial backers of “the pro-democracy movement” (which obviously includes Allen’s foundation) that was targeting Burma (now called “Myanmar” by the nationalist regime currently in power).

What is the National Endowment for Democracy

(NED)? And what is the Soros Foundation? The Soros Foundation is the creation of controversial international financier George Soros, one of the world's richest men, a Hungarian-born Zionist whose growing role in worldwide intrigue in recent years has yet to be fully explored.

Suffice it to say, however, the fact that Soros—along with Andrew Allen—has an interest in the affairs of Burma is not so surprising, as we shall see.

However, the story of the NED is much more public. A U.S. taxpayer-funded globalist operation ostensibly committed to advancing Andrew Allen-style “pro-democracy” movements, the NED has—from its inception—been tied closely with Israel’s Mossad and its auxiliary, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith. Carl Gershman, founding executive director of the NED, had served on the national staff of the ADL, but had also been associated with the CIA-financed International Rescue Committee founded by Leo Cherne, a prominent veteran of the Zionist lobby.

Gershman is a frequent contributor to *Commentary* which is published by the New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee. *Commentary*, in fact, was one of the first national media outlets to publish a blistering attack on the Institute for Historical Review when the California-based institute was still in its infancy.

What then, accounts for the NED’s—and Andrew Allen’s—interest in Burma? Although far-off Burma in Southeast Asia is of little interest to most Americans, the country and its region of the world have long been of special concern to Israel’s Mossad.

According to Israeli historian Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, writing in *The Israeli Connection: Who Israel Arms and Why*, the development of diplomatic relations between Israel and Burma in the early 1950s “was a major diplomatic success . . . [that was] Israel’s first breakthrough in relations with the Third World . . . [and] . . . was for Israel a dream come true in

that it had managed to reach beyond the Arab encirclement and gain acceptance in an important part of the Third World.”

However, according to Beit-Hallahmi, Burma’s “visionary prime minister who favored contacts with Israel was overthrown in 1962 by a military coup . . . and for all practical purposes, Israel’s relations with Burma came to an end.”

The new military regime then began “cutting off most outside contacts and adhering to a strict nonalignment policy . . . [and] . . . although Israel still maintains an embassy in Rangoon, the relations between the two countries are formal and limited.”

The *New Republic*, published by Zionist zealot Martin Peretz (whose magazine unwaveringly boosts the Israeli propaganda line) took the Burmese government to task for “generally taking nonaligned Third Worldism to paranoid extremes”—that is, rejecting outside interference from international banking houses, the financial manipulations of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the intrigues of the Mossad and its CIA allies.

Illustrating the vast international nature of the NED apparatus, it might also be noted that the NED had a hand in the overthrow of Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos. NED funded a so-called “independent” poll-watcher group, Namfrel, which made unsubstantiated claims (loudly trumpeted by the international media) that Marcos “stole” the 1985 presidential election.

To return to the issue of Andrew Allen’s involvement in the affairs of distant Burma: Based upon what we have seen about the NED—and Allen’s Burma Foundation, which operates as an adjunct of the NED’s multi-layered “pro-democracy” operations worldwide—the government of Israel and its Mossad have a distinct interest in Burma. This explains Allen’s own peculiar concern with Burma and, at the same time, points toward where Allen’s real interests lie.

There is, however, another major reason why the Mossad and its allies in the CIA have a special interest in Burma. That is the fact, as reported in *The Washington Post* quoting the 1994 State Department Report on International Narcotics Control: "Burma is the world's largest source of illicit opium and heroin."

The role of both the CIA and the Mossad in the international drug smuggling racket out of Southeast Asia is known, in part because of revelations arising out of the Iran-Contra affair, coupled with recurring revelations of Israeli involvement with Latin American drug lords. However, as far back as 1972 Professor Alfred McCoy of the University of Wisconsin at Madison outlined his findings about CIA involvement in the drug trade in his ground-breaking work: *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.

What's more, as those versed in the history of organized crime are aware, it was the Meyer Lansky crime syndicate—long tied closely to the Mossad—that was the prime architect of the worldwide drug-smuggling network, working in conjunction with the CIA, an alliance that grew and prospered during the Vietnam War, in particular.

The prime sources of the Burmese heroin exports are the Shan United Army—led by the infamous drug lord Khun Sa—and the United Wa State Army. These drug suppliers operate independently and (like Allen) in opposition to the Burmese government—known as the State Law and Order Restoration Council—that came to power in 1988.

However, self-styled "pro-democracy" forces such as Allen's Burma Foundation, in league with the ADL's Carl Gershman and his National Endowment for Democracy and the foundation of billionaire George Soros are working to topple this government.

(That the Soros Foundation is also actively financing efforts in the United States to legalize the use of heroin is probably not coincidental either, inasmuch as the legaliza-

tion of such drugs would spell immense legitimate profits for Soros and his associates in the international financial community—and in the CIA and the Mossad.)

Allen's Burma connection is only one facet of his Mossad ties. His other Israeli connection is even more profound: Allen has been physically operating in the Middle East itself alongside Mossad agents for at least a decade.

When Allen was asked in a sworn deposition on October 7, 1994 by Liberty Lobby attorney Randall Waier "how much professional time as a lawyer do you reckon you have given to the noble causes you've been involved in, say in the last ten years . . . ?" Allen's response was revealing. Allen bragged (under oath): "I want to—my biggest assumption of noble causes was running—I shouldn't say running. That's maybe inappropriate—taking supplies to the Mujahideen rebels in Afghanistan, so in the last ten years probably that was my overriding use of my time." (Emphasis added.)

In other words, Allen was physically involved in running "supplies" to the Mujahideen. Not only was Allen's supply line, according to Covert Action Information Bulletin (September 1987) "the second largest covert operation" in the CIA's history, but it was also, according to former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky (writing in *The Other Side of Deception*) under the direct supervision of the Mossad.

According to Ostrovsky: "It was a complex pipeline," he notes, "since a large portion of the Mujahideen's weapons were American-made and were supplied to the Muslim Brotherhood directly from Israel, using as carriers the Bedouin nomads who roamed the demilitarized zones in the Sinai."

In fact, the Mossad has been a prime mover in so-called "pro-democracy" movements (a la Allen's Burma Foundation and his Afghan rebel activities) across the globe. According



to Nicaraguan Contra leader Adolfo Calero, a number of “foundations were set for an international network [of U.S.-based anti-Communist guerrilla forces] with Israeli advisors.” (Quoted in *Dangerous Liaison: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship* by James and Leslie Cockburn).

According to the Cockburns, “That global approach was . . . designed as a vehicle to arm ‘freedom fighters’ on three continents with the help of Israel, the White House, and the CIA. The beneficiaries were outlined to CIA Director Casey in one memo as guerrillas in ‘Nicaragua, Angola, Afghanistan, and Cambodia . . .’ (Emphasis added.)

(Interestingly, here, as in Burma, there is yet again another “drug connection.” According to an Associated Press report of December 16, 1983, David Melocik, a Drug Enforcement Administration spokesman, said that “the [Mujahideen] make their money off the sale of opium. There’s no doubt about it . . . the rebels keep their cause going through the sale of opium.” So much then for Allen’s associates in both regions.)

In a subsequent legal deposition, Allen admitted under oath to another Liberty Lobby attorney, Howard Singleton, that his Afghan activities were related to a group known as the Committee for a Free Aghanistan (CFA).

The list of Allen’s CFA colleagues reads like a roster of the elite American intelligence Establishment—a glittering list of luminaries all of whom, quite notably, have long-standing close ties to the Israel lobby in official Washington.

The list of CFA’s Council of Advisors included General John Singlaub, former U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency head General Daniel Graham, former Reagan-Bush administration National Security Advisor Richard V. Allen, Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.), and Paul Simon (D-Ill.) and Reps. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), Gerald Solomon (R-N.Y.), Mickey Edwards (R.-Okla.)

and Charles Wilson (D-Texas).

Other members of its advisory council included Washington Times editor Arnaud DeBorchgrave, a relative-by-marriage to the Rothschild international banking family. Fundraisers for the CFA included Israel's devoted cheerleader, evangelist Pat Robertson, never known as a disciple of revisionism, and former U.S. Attorney General Eliot Richardson.

Although these "big names" lent their prestige to CFA's activities, Allen himself was "on the ground" actually engaged in the international "running" of supplies in the Mossad sphere of influence.

The activities of Allen and his fellow "runners" in fact, appear to have been under the direct jurisdiction of George Bush when the latter was serving as Ronald Reagan's vice president, which is quite fitting in that Allen is himself a self-described "liberal Republican"—a description often applied to Bush, a former CIA director

As facts that have been released in the wake of the Iran-contra affair indicate, during the Reagan administration, Bush was the actual head of many of the covert operations that were carried out by then-National Security Council staffer, Lt. Col. Oliver North. The Afghan intrigue was all part-and-parcel of North's international network of which the Iran-contra mess was only a fraction.

Some of the publicly-known funding and support for the Afghan activities of Allen and his associates at CFA came from such well-connected Establishment outfits as the Heritage Foundation and from a group known as Accuracy in Media, which was headed by former Federal Reserve official Reed Irvine (who bragged publicly of his friendship with former CIA director William Casey). CFA was also engaged in raising funds for Radio Free Kabul, International Medical Aid, and Doctors Without Borders.

(In fact, the whole Afghan arms-relief-and-supply net-

work of which Allen was a player has repeated links to the Mossad and its own wide-ranging network within the global intelligence community. For example, the Afghanistan Relief Committee was an outlet of the International Rescue Committee (an operation by long-time Zionist operative Leo Cherne) and the National Endowment for Democracy, headed by long-time Anti-Defamation League figure Carl Gershman.)

Afgh

When in the course of questioning in yet another deposition, the subject matter returned again to Allen's Afghan intrigue, Allen squirmed visibly when asked to explain how he ever became involved in "running" supplies to Afghanistan. Finally, after a pause, Allen replied, "I got involved because a friend of mine was in the Peace Corps in Afghanistan and had brought some children back to a hospital for medical treatment."

As Allen's voice broke and as he appeared to hold back tears Allen added that his "friend" had died. Yet, when asked to name this "friend" over whom he had become so emotional, Allen said, "I can't remember."

Allen admitted the Afghan operation was financed by the Committee for a Free Afghanistan but he claimed little or no knowledge or precisely who the officers of the CFA happened to be, even though, of course, he ventured out on a potentially dangerous mission to a far-off part of the world during war-time.

In response to one inquiry, Allen denied knowing Elliott Carter. The late Mr. Carter was the CIA "handler" who provided Allen's close associate, the late David McCalden, with CIA and other intelligence files on leaders in the revisionist movement.

Much of the CIA data was actually generated in the first place by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith which often functions as a "fact-finding" adjunct for both the CIA and the Mossad. Elliott Carter was the CIA's funnel to

McCalden—a cold, hard fact that Allen’s defenders are hard-pressed to deny.

With Allen’s support and financial backing McCalden published the CIA data in an effort to smear revisionists and cause dissension between them. This went on for some years until McCalden’s death from AIDS.

When asked point blank if he worked for either the CIA or the Mossad, Israel’s intelligence service, Allen responded (as if surprised and wounded by the inquiries): “Are you serious in asking these questions?” and then proceeded to deny affiliation with either.

However, Allen did acknowledge his role in two distinct international operations (previously referenced) that numerous sources have pinpointed as being in the sphere of joint CIA-Mossad influence: namely, 1) the campaign to dislodge the current military regime ruling Myanmar (formerly Burma); and 2) the international supply line to the Mujahideen rebels in Afghanistan.

Utilizing his considerable personal wealth and his training as an attorney, not to mention his high-level contacts in the intelligence community, Allen functioned as an agent-in-place making the plot to destroy the IHR (and ultimately Liberty Lobby) come to fruition. Taking all of this together, can there thus be any doubt that Andrew Allen, posing as a “loyal Revisionist” was in fact leading Mark Weber and Ted O’Keefe, to the slaughter?

But then again, Is it possible that Weber—enigmatic individual that he is—was really a saboteur all along? In what follows we will digress—quite necessarily—in order to review some little known facts about Weber that raise real questions as to whether Weber can rightly be counted as the “loyal Revisionist” that he claims to be.

### **Chapter Three**

**“If it looks like a duck and  
quacks like a duck . . .”**

**The Strange Sojourn  
of Mark Weber and Jared Taylor  
In the Midst of CIA and Mossad Intrigue  
in Darkest Africa**

What are the odds of not just one—but two—key figures in the debacle at the Institute for Historical Review and the subsequent campaign to destroy Liberty Lobby both

having been active in two very different little-known and far off Third World countries which have both been described as key “jewels” in Israel’s foreign policy crown?

The answer to that question helps identify the behind-the-scenes forces that manipulated the on-site operatives who were behind the illicit seizure and neutralizing of the Institute for Historical Review.

In the previous chapter we reviewed the intriguing international connections of San Francisco millionaire, Andrew Allen, who bragged of having “started” the IHR affair. However, it turns out that Allen’s primary lieutenant in the illicit take-over of the IHR, Mark Weber, himself had an unusual sojourn in yet another Third World country—Ghana in West Africa—where Israel’s Mossad once ruled the roost until a nationalist regime in that country came to power and ended relations with Israel.

Weber was in Ghana in the early 1970s, ostensibly serving as a U.S. government paid teacher of English—or so he says. The U.S. government probably did have Weber on its payroll, but considering Weber’s skills in German linguistics it seems rather unusual that he ventured all the way to the wilds of darkest Africa simply to teach English to colored folks for whom, in his written and spoken words, he has never demonstrated any particular regard.

Yet Weber indeed did journey to Ghana to shoulder the proverbial “white man’s burden.”

Or was he really on some sort of intelligence mission for the Mossad’s friends in the CIA and posturing publicly as a school teacher? It wouldn’t be the first time that the CIA (or the Mossad) used a bright young “intellectual” for its dirty work. And what is particularly intriguing is that it just so happens that Weber’s Ghanaian safari took place during a critical time when Israeli intelligence needed “inside” information in Ghana.

Israeli historian Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi has written that

“if Burma was the great Israeli success story in Asia, Ghana was the equivalent in Africa.”

Do you see the connection?

Burma-Andrew Allen/Ghana-Mark Weber.

When Israel’s “success story” in Asia went bad, Andrew Allen stepped in and has been helping try to resolve things ever since. And just at the time that Israel’s equivalent success in Africa was going bad, a young “schoolmarm” named Mark Weber popped up on the scene.

In fact, according to Beit-Hallahmi, Israel’s once vibrant outpost in Ghana “turned out to be a stepping stone to the rest of Black Africa.” Beit Hallahmi points out that the Mossad was riding high in Ghana for years:

The first Israeli ambassador in Africa was Ehud Avriel, stationed in Ghana in 1957, and widely believed to be a Mossad operative. Avriel was active in recruiting individuals for “special missions” all over Africa.

Cooperation with Ghana took many forms, marked by mutual enthusiasm and openness. There were commercial ventures, the best-known of which was the Black Star shipping company.

Hundreds of Ghanaian trainees went to Israel, and hundreds of Israeli experts came to Ghana. There was also military and intelligence cooperation: Ghana’s air force was supplied with reconditioned military aircraft and training and intelligence training was given by the Mossad.

Israel was described as “Ghana’s closest friend in the early years.” Nevertheless, Kwame Nkrumah always demonstrated some reservations about Israel. He started moving closer to Egypt, which he visited several times, while refusing to visit Israel.

While Israel established close ties with Ghana as early as 1957, and with the Ghanaian leadership even before formal independence in 1956, the special relationship between the two countries was over by 1967. Formal relations ended on October 28, 1973.

Significantly, Mark Weber's Ghanaian venture took place in the early 1970's, during this same time frame when Israel's ties with Ghana were dissolving. Beit-Hallahmi (writing in 1987) added further:

Elements in the Ghanaian secret service are said to have kept contacts with the Mossad even while their countries did not have diplomatic relations, but relations with Ghana [have] worsened since the coup led by Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings.

The Ghanaian government accused Israel of being involved in a planned coup attempt, together with the CIA and Liberia. Relations with the United States have deteriorated since then, with mutual accusations of spying, and an exchange of accused spies between the United States and Ghana in 1985.

So the Israeli (and CIA) interest in Ghana was quite intense and Mark Weber was in the midst of it all. And, if that isn't enough, note this: when Weber eventually made his way to Washington, D.C., he just happened to turn up as a night clerk in a Washington hotel which—by “coincidence” also just happened to be the very hotel where top African diplomats, military men and intelligence officials stayed whilst visiting the American capital.

Out of all of the hotels in Washington—and there are many—Mark Weber somehow ended up working in the one hotel known for its “African connection,” a hotel where a night clerk could certainly provide a lot of vital intelligence for superiors in the CIA or the Mossad or both.



However, Mark Weber's African connection gets even murkier. According to Weber's former wife, Priscilla, Weber does have one guru, and he's a pretty famous fellow at that: well-known Yale-educated American "racialist," author and lecturer, Samuel Jared Taylor—or "Jared" Taylor for short. It turns out that Weber and Taylor "just happened" to meet for the first time while both were running about in a CIA- and Mossad-infested region of Africa back in the 1970s.

The fact is that there are some very real questions about the strange circumstances in which Weber and Taylor claim to have met.

The "official" story told by both Weber and Taylor is that Taylor was wandering about the Sahara desert, in Mrs. Weber's words, "trying to find himself," while Weber was on his way to teach English (on the U.S. government payroll) to Black Africans in Ghana.

Mysteriously—or so the story goes—Weber encountered a stranger in the Sahara Desert who offered to sell him what appeared to be stolen travelers' checks belonging to one "Samuel Jared Taylor." Tower of integrity that he is, Weber refused to buy them. Then—just by coincidence—several days later, after traveling through the desert, according to the story, Weber actually met this same Samuel Jared Taylor in person in some little desert town. Surprise! Surprise! Then, lo and behold, during the short week they spent together, Taylor supposedly saved Weber's life by nursing him through a case of influenza.

Suspicious people surmise that this frankly unlikely scenario—which sounds like something out of a third-rate Hollywood spy movie—is perhaps a "cover story" concocted by two intelligence operatives whose meeting was part of an assignment and not just some accidental meeting in the far-off African desert. And considering the fact that Taylor—as noted—is a Yale graduate is interesting indeed since, as most informed folks know, Yale has long been a

recruiting ground for the CIA.

So, all told, there is good reason to believe that Weber's "teaching" venture in Ghana was a bit more than that. Although Mrs. Weber has described her husband's Ghanaian enterprise as her husband's "draft dodging," (which it probably was), at the same time, the same thing has been said about Bill Clinton's adventures in London and Moscow, during which time, it's now quite clear, Clinton was working as a CIA asset inside the anti-war movement. Lots of smart young scholars opted to work "undercover" for the government rather than go on the frontlines. It may well have been that Weber was one of them.

Of all places for Weber to locate in Africa, Ghana is an intriguing choice. The U.S. government probably did have Weber on its payroll but as a "schoolmarm"? Not likely. And then add the enigmatic Taylor to the Weber scenario and it becomes a very intriguing mix indeed.

And the fact that Taylor has remained one of Weber's closest advisors—including during the period when Weber was involved in the campaign to seize control of the IHR (which Taylor heartily endorsed), it is worth taking a look at Taylor himself, since Taylor, in many respects, has all the earmarks of a Judas Goat working for The Enemy Within.

After forging his link with Weber in far-off Africa, Taylor went on to an illustrious career in international banking (always a hotspot for CIA types) out of the Far East, and later returned to the United States where he began writing.

Taylor's book, *Paved With Good Intentions*, touting the theory that blacks are inferior to whites, was published by a New York publishing house best known for promoting a series of peculiar works that insist the CIA had no part in the JFK assassination. Perhaps not surprisingly, Taylor's own book was favorably mentioned in *Commentary* (journal of the New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee), edited for many years by CIA-connected "neo-conservative"

Norman Podhoretz And the fact that a book with a slant critics have said is “racist” would get a boost from the likes of Podhoretz and Commentary is interesting in and of itself.

That Taylor should get a friendly nod from Podhoretz and company is not really so extraordinary. The truth is that Mark Weber’s guru is just as enigmatic a character as Weber himself. Although even the Anti-Defamation League has criticized Taylor for some of his views, and Taylor, in turn, has sent gentle barbs in the ADL’s direction for chiding him on certain aspects of the race question, Taylor still stands foresquare with the ADL against anyone who dares criticize Israel. And that’s precisely what makes Taylor so valuable to the Zionist lobby in America.

Widely promoted as one of the “intellectuals” of the American “racialist” movement, Taylor has insinuated himself into a leadership position in the Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC) and from that post he has emerged as a hard-line critic of those who take positions in opposition to Zionism and Israel.

In some respects, this recalls the old days of COINTEL-PRO when—as Dr. Edward Fields has reported—the FBI told its infiltrators in the Ku Klux Klan that they were free to publicly make anti-black remarks in public speeches and in their publications, but, at all costs, to avoid criticizing Jews or Israel.

And the truth is that many of Jared Taylor’s critics have noted that he tends to surround himself with a variety of Jewish intellectuals who have been waggishly (if insensitively) dubbed as “Jared’s Jews.” Taylor has particularly close ties with one Rabbi Meyer Schiller, a hard-line Zionist based in New York, who has publicly bragged that his friendship with Taylor has helped diminish anti-Zionism within the ranks of Americans who are among Taylor’s followers. (An interesting point indeed.)

In addition, Taylor plays a valuable role on behalf of

Zionist interests by stoking up opposition to Arab and Muslim immigration into America, further adding fuel to the ever-building fire in America (against Arabs and Muslims) that has helped strengthen the Zionist cause in the United States. And all of this comes at a time that, quite conversely, the record shows that Taylor has worked to scrub anti-Zionist attitudes out of the American circles in which he operates.

For example, when prominent Louisiana maverick political figure David Duke and the aforementioned Dr. Edward Fields, editor of *The Truth At Last* newspaper—both of whom have been known for their outspoken opposition to Zionism—spoke at a forum attended by CofCC supporters in the Washington, DC area, Taylor boycotted the meeting (doing so quite vocally) and told others not to attend. At that gathering, several audience members took the floor to denounce Taylor, pointing out that Taylor's position was counterproductive to the expressed goals of the CofCC.

Similarly, on December 12, 1998 Taylor boycotted another meeting of the National Capital Region branch of the CofCC precisely because the featured speaker was this author, Michael Collins Piper, discussing his JFK assassination study, *Final Judgment*, which focuses on the role of Israel's Mossad in the murder of President Kennedy. Taylor instructed his disciples not to attend this meeting.

Noting Taylor's conduct, critics have pointed out that the woman who became Taylor's wife, Evelyn Rich, actively worked to sabotage David Duke's 1990 campaign for the U.S. Senate. Miss Rich released an audio tape to the national media that she had secretly recorded of Duke's private conversation with a supporter. The tape (taken entirely out of context) was used to "prove" that Duke was a "Nazi."

And what's particularly intriguing is that Mark Weber's guru, Taylor, does seem to have some sort of friendly behind-the-scenes entente cordiale with the Anti-Defamation

League, the Mossad's valued American intelligence and propaganda arm.

According to no less than Theodore O'Keefe, Mark Weber's associate at the IHR, Taylor's lady friend and wife-to-be, Miss Rich actually received a phone call at the home she shared with Taylor from none other than Irwin Suall, the now-deceased longtime chief of the ADL's infamous "fact finding division." According to O'Keefe (who was visiting Taylor's home), Taylor himself answered the phone, handed the phone to Miss Rich saying, "It's Irwin Suall," after which Miss Rich conversed with the ADL spymaster.

There is a great irony here. Although the ADL claims it opposes "racism," the fact is that Taylor's views on issues such as affirmative action and race quotas are quite similar to those of the ADL and its allies at the American Jewish Committee whose magazine *Commentary*, as we noted earlier, published a friendly review of Taylor's book in February 1993. So perhaps the ADL-Taylor link is not really so surprising.

One Taylor critic is Dr. Robert L. Brock, a longtime black nationalist who has been a no-holds-barred critic of the Israeli lobby. Brock has fairly well summarized the strange world of Jared Taylor:

Mr. Taylor talks a lot about how black folks commit crime and how we're not as smart as whites but Mr. Taylor never mentions Zionist power in America. He never mentions the role the Zionists have played

in manipulating Black Americans and the civil rights movement. Until people start looking at the big picture there's no way we're going to solve the race problem in America.

So it is that the tactics of Jared Taylor causes fissures in the nationalist movement and there's nothing more than the ADL loves than that. All of these details, taken together, suggest there is much more to Jared Taylor than meets the eye. And the fact that he has been the guru of Mark Weber does indeed say a lot.

So having taken a look at the intrigues of Andrew Allen and Mark Weber, let us now return to the circumstances surrounding the evisceration of the IHR and the tragic events that followed.

## **Chapter Four**

### **The So-Called "Missing" Millions: An Underlying Secret Agenda**

### **Behind the IHR Affair**

It was after the successful—though thoroughly illicit—takeover of the Institute for Historical Review by Andrew Allen and the disloyal staff members that there emerged what appeared to be a long-kept-secret motivation on the part of the group of pirates who had established themselves as the “new” IHR.

It turned out that Allen and his subordinates believed that Willis Carto (and Liberty Lobby) were sitting on a veritable “goldmine” that Allen and company claimed was actually an asset of the IHR. In published letters and press releases—and later in a lawsuit filed by the “new” IHR against Liberty Lobby (and Willis and Elisabeth Carto) at Allen’s direction, Allen and the conspirators claimed that Willis Carto had embezzled untold millions of dollars that supposedly belonged to the IHR.

In fact—as we shall see—the funds allegedly “embezzled” by Carto were funds left to Carto’s care—for disposition as he personally deemed best—by the late Jean Edison Farrel, a grand-neice of the late American populist inventor, Thomas Alva Edison.

Miss Farrel, along with other members of her family—including the late Governor Charles Edison of New Jersey (son of the inventor)—were long-time supporters of Liberty Lobby, dating back as early as the founding of the institution by Willis Carto in 1955. (Governor Edison himself was one of the founding Liberty Lobby Board of Policy members, even prior to the time that board membership was opened to all Americans of legal age who swore their loyalty to the U.S. Constitution.)

Through their association with Liberty Lobby, the Edison family members became friends with Willis Carto and his wife, Elisabeth, and followed the work of Liberty

Lobby with interest.

Shortly before her death, Miss Farrel (then living in Switzerland) approached Carto and indicated her interest in bequeathing her assets to his care. At that time Miss Farrel made the proper arrangements to ensure that the overwhelming bulk of her financial assets would pass to Carto's control upon her demise.

Upon Miss Farrel's death in the fall of 1985, however, there was an unexpected development. In addition to the arrangements that she had made regarding the disposition of her assets to Mr. Carto, Miss Farrel had also executed a handwritten will bequeathing her personal effects at her home in Switzerland (as well as the meager contents of a single safe deposit box in Switzerland) to a neighbor who had promised, in return, to expedite the transfer of Miss Farrell's financial assets to Carto.

However, the neighbor in question promptly hired a lawyer and laid claim to the entirety of the Farrel estate, including the funds bequeathed to Carto's care, using the handwritten will as the basis for the claim. (Interestingly—and unknown to Miss Farrel at the time of her death—the deceitful neighbor was a committed Zionist, holding views totally contrary to those of the Edison family.)

The death of Miss Farrel came as a genuine shock to Willis Carto, who had been in regular contact with her, and it happened to come at a time when Carto had been out of touch with her for a month.

And to this day Carto believes that her death was, to put it lightly, mysterious. And unbeknownst to Carto, who didn't find out about Miss Farrel's death until one month after her demise, the "friendly" neighbor was already working to grab control of Miss Farrel's assets.

Needless to say, an ensuing and highly expensive international legal battle erupted and—not surprisingly under the circumstances—the neighbor received critical backing



in her effort from the ADL and other high-level forces in the international Zionist community that wanted to prevent Carto from gaining control of the estate.

From a friendly source in the State Department, Carto learned that during two trips that he made to Switzerland to handle the affair, he was under close surveillance by operatives of Israel's Mossad.

At the time of Miss Farrel's death, red lights—and sirens too—went off in the offices of the ADL and in the offices of its foreign principal, the Israeli Mossad. They promptly provided tactical, financial and intelligence support to those who were involved in the effort to thwart Mr. Carto from gaining access to the Farrel estate.

Neither the IHR nor the LSF had the financial resources available to wage the litigation necessary to ensure Mr. Carto's rightful claim on the Farrel legacy. The courtroom contest dragged on for fully five years. Yet, Carto arranged for the financing that made the effort possible. He secured a number of substantial loans, including in at least one instance signing a note putting himself personally responsible for repayment—whether he secured the Farrel money or not.

(As Carto himself put it, bluntly: "Neither Tom Marcellus, nor Mark Weber nor Ted O'Keefe—and certainly not Greg Raven—had anything whatsoever to do with raising a single penny toward securing the Farrel legacy. Not a one of them ever lifted a hand. All they did was benefit from it.")

All told, Mr. Carto had to secure the services of some ten different attorneys, in the United States and Switzerland and in a number of other foreign countries where Miss Farrel's assets were located. (Hardly a penny—if any—of the resources came from the IHR or the LSF itself. Much of the money was lent to the effort by Liberty Lobby.)

Now bear in mind something else. Miss Farell's death in 1985 came not long after the devastating destruction of the

IHR offices on July 4, 1984. At the time of Miss Farrel's death, there was virtually nothing left of the IHR. Its office had been totally destroyed; its book inventory lost forever and, perhaps most importantly, there was not enough money coming in to pay the IHR's outstanding debts.

At this point, frankly, Carto wasn't even certain that the IHR would be able to survive. However, thanks to the dedicated support of revisionists around the country and around the world, actually, Carto was able to get the IHR back on its feet and operating—much, of course, to the dismay of the ADL. And all of this was taking place during the same time period that Carto was working to secure the Farrel estate.

Finally, with Carto acting for himself and as an agent for the LSE, a settlement was reached in July of 1990. Although—unfortunately—fully 55% of the Farrel estate finally went to the ADL-sponsored neighbor (despite her faulty and suspicious claim), the balance of 45% was entrusted to Mr. Carto.

In the end, the share secured by Mr. Carto was approximately \$7.2 million—far less than the \$40 million that the lying propagandists at the ADL told the worldwide media was the amount that Mr. Carto received and much farther less than the \$80 million that Mark Weber once claimed that Carto had received.

However, much of the share procured by Carto was extinguished by taxes, legal and accounting fees and other expenses, including a substantial fee paid to highly regarded Swiss Revisionist leader Francois Genoud, later denounced by Weber as a "Nazi." So the "big money" about which Weber dreamed was just simply not there.

And in light of the claims by Mark Weber and Andrew Allen regarding Willis Carto's disposition of the Farrel funds, this very important point must be made: At the time of the settlement of the estate, both the IHR and Liberty Lobby

were together facing the potentially-devastating ADL-backed \$11 million nuisance suit filed against them by Holocaust survivor Mel Mermelstein, the second such suit by Mermelstein during a ten-year period. The ADL widely publicized the fact that a substantial fortune had been entrusted to Carto's care and Mermelstein's lawyers bragged publicly—and actually told the court—that they intended to grab control of the Farrel legacy.

In an effort to protect Liberty Lobby and the IHR from Mermelstein and his ADL backers and at the advice of attorneys (including then-IHR attorney William Hulsy), Carto structured the LSF assets and the funds received from the Farrell estate in such a way as to make them legally judgment proof. This included setting up an independent corporation to manage the funds received from the Farrel estate.

In fact, Carto actually transferred \$750,000 from the corporation managing the Farrel estate funds to the IHR. These funds made it possible for the IHR to rebuild its book inventory (lost in the 1984 fire) and to continue publishing its monthly journal. Carto also paid bonuses to IHR employees Tom Marcellus, Mark Weber and Ted O'Keefe directly from the Farrel estate funds.

Now this is additionally important to note: although Mark Weber has claimed that the Farrel legacy was intended exclusively for the work of the IHR, never once in any of the legal papers involved in setting up the arrangements for Mr. Carto to take control of her assets did Miss Farrell ever specifically mention the IHR. Again, this fact is totally contrary to what Weber and his cohorts alleged.

Miss Farrell's primary interest was not even historical revisionism. Her major interest was the tax protest movement. She was a tax protestor. That's precisely why she had left the United States and taken up residence in Switzerland. Miss Farrel supported Liberty Lobby and The Spotlight for their fight for Constitutional taxation more so than she was

ever interested in historical revisionism.

What's more—and this point cannot be overemphasized—Miss Farrel strongly believed that radio was an important aspect of publicizing the point of view that she believed in and in keeping with that theme, Willis Carto had used some \$2.5 million of the Farrel funds to assume management of an existing satellite radio network and then began expanding into the field of AM and FM radio, to the point that the emerging Sun Radio Network had some 200 affiliates across the United States. Led by its flagship forum, Radio Free America, hosted by Tom Valentine, the network not only publicized the work of Liberty Lobby and the IHR but also a wide variety of independent populist and nationalist groups and individuals engaged in a wide variety of endeavors.

The network—funded by the Farrel legacy—provided a national (even international) radio outreach for the Revisionist work of the IHR and on more than one occasion, IHR representatives had been featured on the network, not to mention other Revisionist giants such as British historian David Irving, among many other “stars” in a movement that otherwise received very little access to radio.

And let it be added, for the record, that neither Willis nor Elisabeth Carto, as individuals, received a single penny from the Farrel estate, except for reimbursement of personal expenses they incurred in procuring the estate. And the only funds that Liberty Lobby actually received were actually and immediately transferred to the Sun Radio Network for its operations. Every penny received by Liberty Lobby from the Farrel legacy was accounted for. No funds disappeared. None were embezzled. The financial record of all transactions was complete—despite the lies told repeatedly by Weber and Andrew Allen and others who were brought unwittingly into their web of deceit and destruction.

In fact, what monies that had been procured from the

Farrel estate by Willis Carto had already largely been expended, not only paid to the IHR as noted, but also to the Sun Radio Network. Yet, Weber and company professed to believe that there were hidden millions under Carto's control.

All of this having been said, it is probably worth noting, in this context, that Weber told at least one person (and probably more) that once he and the IHR finally grabbed control of what they (wrongly) believed to be those "hidden millions" he (Weber) was going to use those funds to buy up ownership of the key independent populist and nationalist newspapers and organizations all across America.

In other words, Weber wanted to literally gain control—ownership—of the entire nationalist movement in the United States.

A grandiose dream—indeed.

However, the thought that the entire nationalist movement could be dominated by one person or institution (particularly a suspected Judas Goat) is a chilling one, to say the very least.

The very fact that a wide variety of independent political organizations are constantly at work has always strengthened the populist and nationalist movement, rather than weakening it. That's why, for example, that —over the years—Liberty Lobby, long the unquestioned leading force in the American nationalist movement, had always strongly encouraged (and even helped finance) the launching of several well-known patriotic organizations and publications that were then—and remained—entirely independent of Liberty Lobby.

When a wide variety of independent organizations are at work, this naturally forces the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, for example, to divide its resources fighting on a wide variety of fronts.

So one can only imagine what could happen if a small

clique of Judas Goats—The Enemy Within were to buy out and shut down or otherwise “redirect” America’s major independent populist organizations in one fell swoop. This would consolidate the assets and outreach of these independent organizations into the clutches of the Judas Goats and destroy the last remnants of the independent populist movement in America.

And if Mark Weber had somehow gained control of the tens of millions of dollars of which he dreamed, that would have been precisely his ultimate goal. Weber and his associates (known and unknown) would have been “in control.” And that was the ultimate aim in the take-over of the IHR and the subsequent campaign to destroy Liberty Lobby that emerged.

As it was, as Weber and his cohorts began to realize that grabbing the Farrel money was not going to be as cut-and-dried as they had hoped—after all, Willis Carto was fighting back and going public with all of the details of the sordid affair—they began finding other ways to finance their war of attrition.

First of all, Weber and his crew began selling off the IHR book inventory (built up with the funds from the Farrel legacy) at fire sale prices in order to keep paying their own salaries, even as they were alleging that Carto had never made any of the Farrel estate available to the IHR.

In fact, if Carto hadn’t made the Farrel money available to the IHR, Weber wouldn’t even have had the books that he was selling in order to pay his salary, since—following the ouster of Willis Carto from the IHR—the activities of the IHR had come to a virtual standstill.

And although several IHR journals were published under the “leadership” of Mark Weber, that, too, soon came to a halt.

There is one final irony in all of this that should be noted. This is a point that demonstrates beyond any ques-

tion the totally malicious and venal nature behind the lawsuit against Liberty Lobby that came in the wake of the takeover of the IHR. And this is a point that is hardly known even by many of those people who followed the IHR affair as it unfolded. The point is this:

The money received from the Farrel funds that Willis Carto provided to Liberty Lobby, which were, in turn, used to subsidize the establishment of the Sun Radio Network were not grants. Instead the funds were loans. All of these loans were earmarked to be repaid by Liberty Lobby to the corporate body set up by Willis Carto to administer the Farrel funds.

In addition, the fact remains that the money loaned to Liberty Lobby had not even come due at the time the IHR was wrested from Willis Carto's control. Thus, the amount transferred to the Sun Radio Network through Liberty Lobby constituted un-repaid loans that were not even yet due.

Had the IHR continued to exist as it had prior to the takeover and had Liberty Lobby been able to continue functioning—not hampered by the lawsuits initiated by Weber and his “handler,” Andrew Allen—these funds would ultimately have been repaid by Liberty Lobby over a period of years.

As a result, there would have once again been several million dollars, including interest, sitting in the Swiss account managing the Farrel money, funds which Willis Carto would have certainly made available to the IHR as needed. So there was no “embezzlement” whatsoever and Weber and Allen knew that full well.

Yet, despite all that had happened since the IHR takeover, or rather, precisely because of the IHR takeover, the IHR was now moribund, hardly more than a corporate shell that served one purpose and one purpose alone: as the framework upon which Andrew Allen and Weber were able

to perpetuate their lawsuit which was designed, ultimately, to destroy Liberty Lobby. Without the IHR continuing to exist on paper, there would be no way the lawsuit could continue.

And although the IHR was producing nothing, and there were internal conflicts developing that led, ultimately, to the dismissal even of Ted O'Keefe from the staff, and then the resignation of Greg Raven, Mark Weber continued to promote the myth that the IHR actually existed when, in fact, it was only a sorry shadow—a vacant shell—of its former vibrant self.

Yet, the lawsuit against Liberty Lobby continued. And then, on April 6, 1995, as Weber and his co-conspirators began to grow desperate they tried out an entirely new scheme in order to grab what they wrongly believed to be hidden millions. Under the direction of Andrew Allen, Weber and his colleague, Tom Marcellus, showed up at the Costa Mesa, California Police Department and swore out an arrest warrant claiming that Willis Carto and one of his associates (who had helped procure the Farrel funds) had "embezzled" the money.

Until now it had only been a civil matter. The arrest warrant, however, made it a criminal matter. And what happened as a consequence of the lies told by Weber and Marcellus is a story in and of itself.

Let us proceed . . .

## Chapter Four



---

**An Ugly Turn in the IHR Affair:  
The SWAT Team Raid on Liberty Lobby—  
The ADL's Behind-the-Scenes Role**

At 7:00 am on the morning of March 22, 1995 some 25 gun-waving members of a SWAT team raided the West Coast office of Liberty Lobby and The Spotlight, located in the Escondido, California home of Liberty Lobby's founder and treasurer, Willis A. Carto. Included among the group were agents of not only the FBI, but also the IRS, the BATF and (of all things), the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The taxpayer-financed terrorists were ostensibly executing a search warrant looking for "evidence" that Carto had made off with unspecified valuables and other assets that were the subject of the legal dispute between Carto and the disloyal staffers at the Institute for Historical Review (IHR).

That search warrant had been executed based on the complaint filed with the Costa Mesa, California Police Department by Mark Weber and Tom Marcellus who made the preposterous allegations against Carto that they themselves knew were not true. Their intent was to use the police powers of the government to do what they had not been able to do through a relentless and ongoing series of harassing lawsuits against Carto and Liberty Lobby and the legitimate directors of the IHR's board of directors.

In Costa Mesa, they found a most willing patsy, investigator Larry Rooker, a friend of attorney William S. Hulsey, who had greatly profited financially from the litigation surrounding the IHR. It was Rooker who organized the joint task force to attack the Carto home.

Although Carto was not home at the time of the raid, his wife Elisabeth and two young visiting family members were present. Mrs. Carto, alerted to the danger by the barking of

the family's pet dog, Charlie, encountered the marauders outside the front door, as they converged upon the house after having broken down the gate leading on to the property.

As a helicopter whirred about overhead and as at least one sniper positioned himself nearby with his rifle trained on Mrs. Carto, the gun-wielding officers (some carrying assault weapons and wearing ski masks) violently seized Mrs. Carto, placed her in handcuffs and then sprayed her dog in the face with an immobilizing chemical, leaving the hapless puppy howling in pain and unable to protect his mistress.

They then forced their way into the house. Alerted to the events by the ensuing noise, Mrs. Carto's attractive young niece came to the front door in her nightgown where she was accosted by the police officers who pointed weapons in her face, shouting "Put your hands in the air" and demanding, "Are you carrying a gun?" In the meantime the girl's cousin was being roused from his sleep, dragged from his bed in handcuffs, and isolated from the rest of the family members. He was held in handcuffs for twenty minutes before being released. The young man, a recent law school graduate in Germany had come to California for a three-week rest before beginning his new job.

Although the marauders subsequently took the handcuffs off Mrs. Carto, she and the two young people were held incommunicado as the police officers ransacked the house from top to bottom for five hours.

At one point Mrs. Carto overheard officers pondering the possibility of bringing in bulldozers for the purpose of excavating on the property, for the purpose of uncovering "stolen goods" that they suggested might be buried.

It was not until the police left—five hours after the assault commenced—that Mrs. Carto was able to put through a call to her husband and to attorney Mark Lane,

both of whom were in Washington, D.C. at the time of the assault

The marauders took with them fourteen boxes of documents, Mr. Carto's personal gun collection, and Mrs. Carto's computer. Despite the energetic efforts of Hulsy's friend and his team, no "evidence" turned up of any "stolen goods," however—the alleged purpose of the raid.

It was only after the raid itself that attorneys for the Cartos uncovered solid evidence that a longtime asset of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith had played a key role in orchestrating the raid. Although this came as no real surprise, the fact that an ADL asset was indeed instrumental in the violent attack on the Carto home pointed further toward the motivations behind the original seizure of the Institute for Historical Review and the subsequent lawsuit against the Cartos and Liberty Lobby by the new, illegal controllers of the IHR.

It turned out that San Diego County Deputy Sheriff Tim Carroll was a prime mover behind the SWAT-team raid on the Carto home which was located in San Diego County, outside the jurisdiction of the Costa Mesa (Orange County) Police Department which officially directed the raid itself.

Costa Mesa Police Department investigator Larry Rooker declared in his sworn affidavit—asking for a search warrant for the raid on the Carto home—that on "3-10-95" (four days after his conference with CIA and Mossad asset Andrew Allen's collaborators, Weber and Marcellus) that he (Rooker) then spoke with Tim Carroll. Rooker stated that Carroll said he was "familiar" with Liberty Lobby founder Willis Carto, according to Rooker, "because of official contacts and information he [Carroll] has obtained during the past several years."

What Rooker's affidavit did not say was that not only did Carroll's name surface in 1993 as the San Diego Sheriff's Office liaison with the ADL, but that Carroll is also a self-

admitted long-time collaborator with the ADL's now-infamous San Francisco-based spy operative, Roy Edward Bullock.

As already noted, on June 30, 1986 Bullock was first exposed by Liberty Lobby's newspaper, *The Spotlight*, as a deep-cover operative for the ADL, although Bullock then denied the allegation. For several years before and after the *Spotlight* expose Bullock was in regular, sustained contact with one David McCalden, assisting McCalden's campaign to undermine the IHR.

Since the early 1980s McCalden had also been actively collaborating with Andrew Allen who finally admitted under oath that he helped finance McCalden. Not until 1993, however, did Allen surface as the self-described mastermind who "started" the in-house coup d'état that left the IHR in disarray. (McCalden himself had died of AIDS several years earlier, evidently infected by his Jewish mistress.)

After the ADL spy scandal erupted in San Francisco, Bullock proudly admitted his work for the ADL, but only after he had been exposed in a criminal investigation of the ADL by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) which had unearthed the illegal theft of police intelligence files by one of its own officers, Tom Gerard, who was, in turn, providing the files to Bullock and the ADL—and thence, obviously, to the Mossad.

What's more, as we have seen, evidence in the case also linked the sale of police intelligence files to agents of the South African government. It was this, as we shall see, that aroused the additional interest of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

Here is where San Diego County Deputy Sheriff Tim Carroll comes in: When the SFPD launched its inquiry into the ADL's illicit spying operations in late 1992, the chief SFPD investigator, Ron Roth, relied extensively upon admissions by Carroll as the basis for filing for a search warrant for

the ADL's offices not only in San Francisco, but also in Los Angeles, where evidence indicated that some of the stolen files were being held.

Roth's affidavit, asking for a search warrant, detailed his interview with Carroll and a transcript of that interview was part of official records on the ADL spy case released by the SFPD to the public at the time the investigation was underway.

In short, Carroll's admissions—under questioning by the SFPD—were a key element in the earliest stages of the inquiry into the ADL's nefarious illicit spying operations. Carroll answered the SFPD's questions not because he wanted to, but because he had to.

As the ADL's man inside the San Diego County Sheriff's Office Carroll was as much a part of the ADL's law enforcement-linked spy apparatus as his associates Bullock and Gerard were in San Francisco.

Here are just a few highlights from the police interrogation of Carroll that illustrate the close working relationship between Carroll (now a central player in the ADL-orchestrated attack on Liberty Lobby) and both the ADL and its "number one investigator," Roy Bullock:

- When Investigator Roth asked the San Diego ADL collaborator how long he had known Bullock, Carroll responded: "Probably goes back five or six years. I do a lot of work with the ADL in San Diego and that's how I met [Bullock] and, uh, I have met him at various conferences," including two, he noted, where Bullock was a "guest speaker."

- Carroll also admitted under questioning that he traveled to Israel in the last part of May 1991 on what he described as "an ADL sponsored law enforcement trip," which included some eleven American law enforcement people—including the SFPD's Gerard.

(Carroll's so-called "law enforcement trip" was nothing less than an all-expenses paid Mediterranean vacation, com-

pliments of the ADL—a lucrative “gratuity” indeed. Many police officers, in other circumstances, have lost their jobs and gone to jail for accepting far less valuable gifts and favors from those suspected of criminal activities.)

- Accompanying the ADL’s police informants on the trip, Carroll admitted, was Mira Lansky Boland of the ADL’s Washington office who, in his words, “coordinated everything with the ADL people in Jerusalem.” Since that time, Carroll said, he had “talked to her off and on . . . She may want to know stuff, I may want to know.”

- Carroll also admitted that he knew (from Bullock himself) that his ADL contact had received classified intelligence information from the San Francisco Police Department files. (This suggests that Carroll himself may have been criminally liable for having failed to report a crime: i.e. Bullock’s receipt of stolen confidential SFPD files.)

- Of his relationship with Bullock, Carroll also confessed that “we’ve done joint ventures together,” although he did not specify what those “joint ventures” were.

That a long-time ADL collaborator (Carroll) who played a key part in the attack on Liberty Lobby was a material witness in the ADL affair is significant, particularly in light of the revelation that the previously-mentioned declassified SFPD documents revealed that Liberty Lobby had actually played a major role in unmasking the illegal espionage and dirty tricks network of Carroll’s financial benefactors at the ADL.

As we saw earlier in these pages, in discussing the ADL spy scandal, ADL spy Bullock told the FBI when he was interrogated that it was Liberty Lobby that first exposed him (Bullock) as an ADL operative. Not only Bullock but other sources close to the investigation acknowledge that it was Liberty Lobby’s expose of Bullock’s ADL affiliation in the June 30, 1986 issue of *The Spotlight* that set in motion the

process which led to the investigation of the ADL's criminal activities.

So it was that the ADL's campaign against Liberty Lobby backfired, leading to the events that ensnared the ADL in a crisis that should have sent top ADL officials—and its police department collaborators, including perhaps Tim Carroll—to jail.

In light of all of this, it is clear that Tim Carroll had at least two motivations in assisting his ADL associates in launching the SWAT-team raid on the Carto home and Liberty Lobby office in the wake of Andrew Allen's instigation of the IHR debacle that led to the raid:

1) Carroll's own career was on the line as a result of his involvement in the ADL's illicit police department-linked spying operations after he had unwittingly become ensnared as a key witness in the investigation. This alone would give Carroll reason to want to "strike back" at Carto and Liberty Lobby.

2) Because Carroll had been forced by the San Francisco police to reveal his knowledge of the ADL's illegal operations, he essentially "owed one" to the ADL for having exposed the ADL to possible criminal indictment arising from the embarrassing scandal that was highly costly to the ADL's public reputation.

This, however, is not the end of Carroll's peculiar involvement in the world of intrigue involving the ADL and its foreign principal, the Mossad.

In fact, shortly after the SWAT-team raid on Liberty Lobby, Carroll suddenly "retired," only to mysteriously return to active duty a few weeks later as a "special investigator" into the murder of one Ian Stuart Spiro, a San Diego County man whose strange death (along with his family) on November 7, 1992 still remained officially "unsolved."

If Carroll was serious about solving the Spiro case he could have referred to former Mossad officer Victor

Ostrovsky's *The Other Side of Deception*. According to Ostrovsky, Spiro had worked with the Mossad for many years. The Mossad had given Spiro several million dollars to pay to a third party. However when the deal fell through, Spiro kept the money. Then, when a Mossad team came to Spiro's house to reclaim the money, the Mossad murdered his wife and children. Spiro was forced to reveal the location of the money and was then fed poison to make it appear as if he had committed suicide after killing his family.

That Carroll returned to duty as the official "investigator" into Spiro's death suggested that Carroll's real job was to whitewash the Mossad's murder of the Spiro family. The sheriff of San Diego County, who appointed Carroll to this new assignment, was William Kolender, a dedicated Zionist and himself probably a "sayan"—that is, in Mossad terminology, a Jewish "helper," not a Mossad operative.

In March 1995—just at the time of the raid on Liberty Lobby—the San Diego ADL office donated a computer system to Kolender's office to assist him and Carroll in keeping track of "hate crimes" in their jurisdiction.

Ultimately, it should be mentioned—and to no one's surprise—ADL asset Tim Carroll's team concluded that the Spiro case was no more mysterious than it had ever been—a simple "murder-suicide." No Mossad involvement. No CIA intrigue. Just an everyday crime.

In the end, despite the "big show" at the Carto home and the office of Liberty Lobby, and despite claims by Weber and Allen and others that an indictment of Willis Carto was imminent as a result of "evidence" uncovered in the raid, no indictment came. No charges were filed. And, in fact, the Cartos ultimately filed suit against the guilty parties within the police department who had orchestrated the improper raid on their home and, in an out-of-court settlement, received a small sum in compensation for their troubles.

But there was more to be told . . .



## Chapter Five

### What the Unlikely Duo of L. Ron Hubbard and Willis A. Carto Have in Common: the Scientology Connection to the IHR Affair

The takeover of the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) was bizarre from the start. However, in the wake of the controversy surrounding the evisceration of the IHR, new evidence emerged pointing further toward yet another strange behind-the-scenes force that played a major part in the destruction of the IHR and the campaign to destroy Liberty Lobby: a secret alliance between the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Church of Scientology, whose longtime devotee, Tom Marcellus, was—along with Mark Weber—a key player in the illicit seizure of the IHR.

It turned out that Los Angeles attorney, Lawrence Heller, who served as chief counsel for Holocaust survivor Mel Mermelstein's ADL-backed lawsuit against the IHR and Liberty Lobby, was more than just another high-priced lawyer. In fact, Heller was—and is—actually one of the secret behind-the-scenes controllers of the Church of Scientology for what can best be described as “forces unknown.” Here's the whole bizarre story.

On September 19, 1991 Heller and his client, Mermelstein, suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of Liberty Lobby's attorney, Mark Lane, who put Mermelstein's ten-year long legal assault on Liberty Lobby and the IHR to rest. Mermelstein and Heller gave it up, knowing that their case was going nowhere. This happened just one day after Heller and publicly threatened Lane with violence for having skillfully dismantled their client's case in a Los Angeles courtroom.

Although at that time Liberty Lobby knew that Mermelstein was being backed by the ADL, it wasn't until some years later, well after the 1993 coup that led to the destruction of the IHR, that Liberty Lobby learned of Heller's association with the Church of Scientology.

Liberty Lobby discovered (in 1996) that some six years earlier (just prior to taking on Mermelstein's case) Heller had unsuccessfully represented the Church of Scientology in a high-profile case in which the church had been sued by a group of dissident former members who won a major judgment against Scientology.

This was deemed significant since Liberty Lobby had already determined that there had been a secret pact between the ADL and the Church of Scientology to destroy the IHR from within: Specifically, that the ADL used its considerable clout in official Washington to arrange for the IRS to grant a highly lucrative tax exemption to Scientology—something that Scientology (under its founder, L. Ron Hubbard) had been unsuccessfully seeking for years.

Thus, by no coincidence, on October 1, 1993—the very day that the IRS granted the much-wanted tax exemption to Scientology, Scientologist ToMarcellus (until then, the trusted longtime office manager of the IHR) sent the letter to Willis Carto advising the IHR founder that his (Carto's) relationship with the IHR had been “terminated” and demanding that Carto turn over all of the assets and records of the IHR's parent company, the LSF, to Marcellus and his co-conspirators, Mark Weber, Ted O'Keefe and Greg Raven who was widely believed to be a Scientologist as well.

It just so happens that the initial arrangements between Scientology and the IRS were set in motion within one month after Scientology lawyer Lawrence Heller had suffered his defeat in the Mermelstein case.

In fact, the IRS Commissioner who laid the groundwork for the tax exemption was Fred Goldberg, a law partner of

Kenneth Bialkin, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League in the firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom, long known as the ADL's primary legal arm.

During the Mermelstein case neither of the two IHR staff members at the time who were open Scientologists (Tom Marcellus and office clerk Michelle Matteau) ever mentioned Heller's connection to their church, which, of course, would have been an obvious red flag to Willis Carto and others that there was much more to the Mermelstein case than was apparent.

From the start, Marcellus, who maintained many Scientology connections in the Los Angeles area and who was especially active in the church, could not have failed to know precisely who Heller was, particularly because Heller had represented Scientology in a particularly high-profile case of recent date.

However, on March 4, 1996, when Liberty Lobby's newspaper, *The Spotlight*, first published the details regarding Heller's ties to Scientology, Marcellus and Mark Weber and others who had staged the coup at the IHR tried to ridicule the idea that there was any Scientology connection to the affair. In addition, the Church of Scientology went public and began publishing attacks on Liberty Lobby and Willis Carto and making threats of libel suits.

But what Liberty Lobby had learned was that: Not only had Heller been associated with the Church of Scientology since at least 1982—some nine full years prior to his role in Mermelstein's ADL-backed assault on the IHR, but, in fact, the ubiquitous Mr. Heller was part of a small clique that secretly took control of the Church of Scientology upon the disappearance (and presumed death) of L. Ron Hubbard and which now controls the lucrative rights to Hubbard's writings—a point that is not otherwise known to most grassroots Hubbard loyalists.

What makes this all the more bizarre is that neither

Heller, nor all but one of his associates in the ruling clique, are apparently even followers of the teachings of L. Ron Hubbard who was still highly regarded by church members who had no idea that a “new” leadership was in control within Scientology.

Based upon evidence that was being circulated by Hubbard loyalists (who reject the “new” secret Scientology leadership), here’s what happened.

In May of 1981—shortly after Hubbard disappeared—Heller’s then-law partner, Sherman Lenske popped up and claimed to be Hubbard’s personal attorney.

Less than two months later, Hubbard’s wife, Mary Sue, was overthrown from her position as controller, where she held control over the corporate structure of Scientology, as well as over the copyrights of her husband’s voluminous writings and various trademarks relating to church affairs.

In the months that followed the entire corporate empire of Scientology was restructured. The most significant of the changes took place on May 28, 1983 when Lenske and his inner circle (including Heller) set up the Church of Spiritual Technology (CST) which ultimately came into ownership of every intellectual property that L. Ron Hubbard and Mary Sue Hubbard had ever owned or controlled.

(In 1992 a U.S. Court of Claims ruling, Sherman Lensky was named as one of the “special directors” of the CST, along with his brother Stephen, who, along with Heller, was his law partner, and Heller himself.)

It is also interesting to note that one of Lenske’s other partners in founding CST was one Meade Emory, who served as an attorney for the Joint Committee on Taxation for Congress from 1970 to 1972 and then, from 1975 to 1977, served as assistant to the commissioner of the IRS.

It was during the period that Emory served at the IRS that an IRS employee named Gerald Wolfe was stealing IRS

documents and passing them on to Scientology's Guardian Office that was under the control of Mrs. Mary Sue Hubbard.

Then, several years later, when the theft of the documents was unveiled, it played a major part in the overthrow of Mrs. Hubbard (who was prosecuted and held responsible) and led to the ultimate power grab by Emory, Lenske, Heller and the others in the CST inner circle.

In short, what happened was this: when the flamboyant and all-powerful Scientology leader L. Ron Hubbard disappeared—the Lenske-Heller group moved in and grabbed control of the very foundation of the Scientology movement: the lucrative publishing rights to the prolific Hubbard's writings that are sold (at fantastically high prices) to devoted Scientology students worldwide.

And what should be noted is that many Hubbard loyalists (who have since left Scientology) claim that the new controllers of the Hubbard literary legacy have actually altered Hubbard's writings, although for what end we can only speculate.

Ironically, it appears that upon Hubbard's death (and his wife's subsequent overthrow following a tenacious Justice Department prosecution), the Church of Scientology itself fell victim to a coup d'état orchestrated by outside forces with an interest in gaining control of Scientology, its vast wealth and its wide-ranging global power network.

Then, as is now clear, Scientologists (including Tom Marcellus) were manipulated by their new controllers (including Heller) into playing a part in the subsequent coup at the IHR.

Former high-ranking American diplomat Stephen Koczak (who had been stationed in Israel) privately told *The Spotlight* in 1994 that, according to his sources, Scientology had been taken over by Israel's Mossad, in conjunction with elements of the CIA. So it does appear that Heller and his group were those involved in the takeover.

And bear in mind that Scientology (which is “mind control” in its classic form) would be of special interest to both the CIA and the Mossad.

Although the CIA’s infamous mind-control experiments have been widely publicized, what is largely suppressed is that they were conducted under the supervision of James J. Angleton, the Israeli loyalist who headed the Mossad liaison desk at the CIA. In fact, several scientists linked to these mind control operations were associated with Scientology.

Through controlling cults intelligence agencies such as the CIA and Mossad can utilize cult members to infiltrate a wide variety of political groups, research institutes, banks, etc. As a process of the “brainwashing” they’ve undergone, cult members do the bidding of their controllers.

When the CIA and Mossad controllers decide to carry out some particular intelligence operation—such as taking over a targeted organization—they are then able to use their cult members who are in place within those groups.

This is what happened within the IHR. Two open members of the Church of Scientology and another probably secret member who were employed by the IHR were used in the conspiracy to take over the IHR.

And what about IHR man Tom Marcellus—the devout Scientologist? He quit the IHR after swearing out the false affidavit that led to the violent SWAT team raid on the home of Willis Carto, leaving management of the IHR to Weber and his colleague Greg Raven. Marcellus had done what he had been assigned to do, and his job was over. According to Mark Weber’s wife, quoting her husband: Scientology leaders had told Marcellus that it was time for Marcellus to leave the IHR. And so he did.

Clearly, the IHR affair was a big one—and a murky one—involving multiple levels of intrigue about which even many of the players (including, probably, Mark Weber, and certainly Ted O’Keefe) were unaware.

All of this is not a conspiracy “theory.” It’s a fact.

## **Chapter Six**

### **Mission Accomplished: The Crippling of the IHR And the Total Destruction of Liberty Lobby**

Considering all of the evil and powerful forces arrayed against it, the remarkable thing is that Liberty Lobby survived for as long as it did.

The civil lawsuit instigated against Liberty Lobby was continuing, despite the fact that the IHR was collapsing. Essentially, the suit charged that Liberty Lobby “owed” the money that Mr. Carto had given Liberty Lobby from the Farrel estate to the LSF and that Carto never had the right to distribute the Farrel funds as Jean Farrel had indeed wished.

And, in the end, following a trial before a superior court judge in Orange County California, Liberty Lobby lost. On November 26, 1996, Judge Runston G. Maino ruled in favor of the IHR conspirators and held Liberty Lobby and Willis A. Carto and his wife Elisabeth, along with the legitimate IHR directors, Lewis and LaVonn Furr, liable for the extraordinary sum of some \$14 million, with ten percent interest, compounded annually, saying that the Farrel funds did, in fact, rightly belong to the IHR. (This sum included interest and did not reflect, in any reality, the actual \$2,650,000 that had been loaned to Liberty Lobby from the Farrel legacy.)

It is probably no coincidence that, as Liberty Lobby learned after the trial was already underway, Judge Maino just happened to be a friend of Terri Ferrara, the paralegal for William Hulsy, the California attorney who had conspired

with the IHR employees in what Hulsy himself had described as their “disloyal coup d’etat.” Mrs. Ferrara’s husband was a judge on the same court where Maino sat.

In addition, Willis Carto subsequently learned that the California attorney who had “represented” Liberty Lobby before Judge Maino may not have been quite as loyal to Liberty Lobby as he should have been. It was this attorney who urged Carto to go before Maino, rather than taking the case before a jury (as Carto and Liberty Lobby’s primary attorney, Mark Lane) wanted. In fact, the California attorney rushed the case forward, such that Lane himself only arrived on the scene after finding out that the case was already underway! The damage had been done and the case was in the hands of a judge whom, as we have seen, was not very likely to be friendly to Liberty Lobby under any circumstances.

In any event, although the judgment was yet to be appealed (and was, of course, ultimately turned down, the “new” IHR seemed to lagging in its efforts to move against Liberty Lobby and seize what meager assets the populist institution held. However, it was only thanks to the quick thinking of Jim Floyd, a longtime Liberty Lobby supporter from Cullman, Alabama, that Liberty Lobby was not then seized outright by the Judas Goats operating inside the IHR.

In a conversation with an individual who was a supporter of the IHR clique, Floyd learned that the IHR group were actually bragging that their new attorney, one Bryan Sampson, an American, had “Mossad connections” and that, in just days, Sampson was planning a raid on Liberty Lobby’s office in Washington to shut the institution down. Floyd quickly alerted Willis Carto and, before the Mossad-connected lawyer could act, Liberty Lobby filed for bankruptcy with the full and knowing support of the staff of the populist institution. This was May 13, 1998.

The bankruptcy filing put the matter to rest—for a



while. However, it meant that, ultimately, Liberty Lobby would have to pay some sums of money to the IHR, if only for the purpose of making it possible for Liberty Lobby to survive.

But while Mark Weber was repeatedly and falsely claiming that Carto and Liberty Lobby were refusing to settle, the truth is that Carto and Liberty Lobby were refusing to settle on one point and one point alone: Weber and his associates at the IHR were making the extraordinary demand that Carto—the founder of Liberty Lobby—resign his post as treasurer of the populist Institution and relinquish control to a new board of directors appointed by the IHR group. In other words, they wanted to take absolute control of Liberty Lobby, just as the IHR had been corrupted from within.

Needless to say, neither Carto nor the staff of Liberty Lobby nor any of its 100,000 loyal supporters wanted anything to do with such an arrangement. Ultimately, though, a settlement was reached, with Liberty Lobby agreeing to pay the IHR (over a period of years) \$1.2 million—some 70% less than the actual judgment levied by Judge Maino.

And, in fact, over the next several years, the IHR actually received slightly more than \$1,000,000 from Liberty Lobby, not only in direct payments made by Liberty Lobby but also from funds extricated by a collection agency that had seized mail sent to the populist institution containing checks, cash, money orders, etc.

And, in the end (as of this writing, August, 2005) the IHR actually received an additional \$1.7 million from two estates that were originally intended to go to Liberty Lobby but which were seized by the IHR's attorney.

Coupling those funds with a minimum of \$748,000 that Willis Carto had originally given to the IHR from the Farrel legacy, this brought the IHR's swag to a grand total of \$3,479,780.32—considerably more, in fact, than the \$2,650,000 that Judge Maino ruled that Liberty Lobby owed

the IHR.

While Mark Weber—in his public pronouncements—continued to “poor mouth” and say that the IHR had no money and that somehow Liberty Lobby was refusing to “pay up,” the truth was something quite different as many sincere Revisionists quickly began to learn.

Moreover, it also became quite apparent that—despite their courtroom victory—Weber and the IHR group were not quite finished. The real goal, in the end, was the destruction of Liberty Lobby. So it was that another old face from among The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within popped up once again.

It was none other than the ubiquitous Kirk Lyons, the attorney and close friend of Judas Goat Andreas Strassmeir of Oklahoma bombing fame. This attorney who helped spirit Strassmeir out of the country in the wake of the Oklahoma bombing was now lending his legal skill to the conspiracy to destroy Liberty Lobby.

With the backing of the crew at the IHR, Lyons sent out a letter to many Liberty Lobby supporters around the country saying that he wanted to “save” Liberty Lobby.

According to Lyons, the only way to save the populist institution was for a federal bankruptcy trustee to come in and take over Liberty Lobby and fire Liberty Lobby founder Willis A. Carto and all loyal employees whom Lyons suggested were “corrupt or incompetent.”

Operating out of a California mail drop, the North Carolina-based Lyons urged people to contribute money to “LSF/Trustee.” This meant that what money well-meaning folks contributed was going to an account managed (probably by Lyons himself) for the conspirators who controlled the IHR.

By this time, most supporters of Liberty Lobby knew that this was no less than a scam and yet another part of the overall scheme to destroy Liberty Lobby, but what was most

significant about the whole matter was the obvious alliance between the IHR conspirators and Lyons, whose own past record was one that left something to be desired, to say the very least.

Liberty Lobby had finally determined, though, that the IHR conspirators should not be left free to continue playing these destructive games and decided, then and there, to file a major suit against those who had done so much to undermine the populist institution. Perhaps not surprisingly, considering the fact that courts had never been kind to Liberty Lobby, a federal judge dismissed the suit. But, in the meantime, Liberty Lobby had dutifully continued to make its payments in the bankruptcy settlement, was being monitored by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in Washington, D.C.

Although financially crippled by the burdensome payments, Liberty Lobby was still functioning, even as there was turmoil within the IHR itself. While former IHR staff member Ted O'Keefe had finally returned to the fold, following a hiatus of several years, all was not well at the IHR, as O'Keefe soon realized. In the end, O'Keefe was forced out by Mark Weber and his colleague Greg Raven.

But at the time O'Keefe departed—and this is quite significant—he confirmed the fact that Weber and Raven had seriously discussed, openly, in the IHR office, the possibility of ultimately grabbing control of and selling the Liberty Lobby membership list to either the Church of Scientology, the Anti-Defamation League or the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Previously, this had been reported by *The Spotlight*, based on allegations made by a young man, Eric Owens, who had worked briefly at the IHR office and was fired for questioning why these two “loyal Revisionists” would sell the names of American patriots to organizations that were patently hostile to the Revisionist movement. However, many Revisionists who still—inexplicably—supported

Weber refused to believe it.

Yet, when a known (and still respected Revisionist) such as O’Keefe confirmed the allegations, it shed new light on what was really going on inside the “new” IHR.” O’Keefe’s widely-distributed report on intrigues of the IHR is devastating reading that essentially confirms everything of substance that The Spotlight had reported about Weber’s antics and the behind-the-scenes intrigue at the IHR.

So although Weber was increasingly in trouble, he and his backers had a new plan to undermine Liberty Lobby once and for all. The IHR’s attorneys petitioned the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in Washington, calling for the court to find Liberty Lobby in default of its bankruptcy. The IHR attorneys said that because Liberty Lobby had filed its failed suit against the IHR that this was in violation of the bankruptcy agreement. And the bankruptcy judge agreed. He ruled Liberty Lobby in default and ordered the populist institution shut down. Thus, on June 27, 2001—just short of its 46th anniversary, which would have fallen on July 17—Liberty Lobby’s remarkable career came to a tragic end.

That this judge should have made this ruling, unfortunately, is no real surprise. You see, in the early 1990s Liberty Lobby’s newspaper, The Spotlight, was the one widely-read national media voice providing detailed coverage of the now-infamous INSLAW scandal. The Spotlight had exposed corruption by Justice Department officials and other high-level power-brokers who helped facilitate the theft of sophisticated surveillance software that ended up in the hands of Israel’s Mossad and other foreign intelligence services.

Even The Washington Post Magazine was ultimately moved to comment on June 14, 1992 that “If the claims that have been made [about the INSLAW affair] are true, they add to a scandal of monstrous proportions.”

In fact, S. Martin Teel—the federal bankruptcy judge

who shut down *The Spotlight*—had been a front-line figure involved in this “scandal of monstrous proportions.”

Some years prior to becoming the sole U.S. bankruptcy judge in Washington, D.C., Teel had been the key Justice Department attorney defending the Justice Department against charges by Bill and Nancy Hamilton, the owners of INSLAW, a small Washington, D.C.-based firm, that department officials had criminally conspired to steal their software (known as PROMIS).

Then, in 1987, after then-federal Bankruptcy Judge George S. Bason, Jr., ruled against the Justice Department and in favor of the Hamiltons, saying Teel’s clients/colleagues had stolen the PROMIS software through “trickery, fraud and deceit,” Bason was denied reappointment and Teel was appointed in his place.

Bason later charged, in testimony before Congress, and in an exclusive interview with *The Spotlight*’s weekly talk forum, *Radio Free America*, that the Justice Department had conspired to force him off the bench in retaliation for his ruling against the department.

A key player in the effort to dislodge Bason in favor of Teel was then-Deputy Attorney General Arnold Burns, a powerful attorney with long-standing ties to the Anti-Defamation League. Burns was also a founder of “Nesher,” a quietly influential group of some 300 high-ranking federal officials and bureaucrats who meet informally, bound together by a desire to advance the Zionist cause.

Former Judge Bason also raised questions about whether, in fact, Teel was qualified for the promotion in light of his extremely limited experience with bankruptcy litigation.

Be that as it may, Teel was given Bason’s judgeship, a reward for helping cover for a corrupt conspiracy (exposed by *The Spotlight* and *Liberty Lobby*) involving complicity by assets of both the CIA and Israel’s Mossad.

According to investigative reporters Mark Fricker and Stephen Pizzo, "The INSLAW case had become the judicial kiss of death in Washington, with no judge wanting any part of it. INSLAW's allegations raised serious questions about corruption and lawlessness within the Department of Justice, and the banning of U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Bason had sent the judiciary a chilling message." Even Chief U.S. District Judge Aubrey Robinson in Washington, D.C. said of other judges in relation to the INSLAW affair: "They wouldn't touch it with a 10-foot pole."

Perhaps the biggest secret of the INSLAW affair was the fact the INSLAW's owners later discovered the Justice Department's "nazi-hunting" Office of Special Investigations (OSI) was also the base of a top-secret covert operations unit of the Justice Department and that it was the OSI that was actually responsible for the theft of INSLAW's PROMIS software.

In a brief dated Feb. 14, 1994 INSLAW's attorney, former U.S. Attorney General Elliott Richardson made the following astounding charges:

The Nazi war criminal program is . . . a front for the Justice Department's own covert intelligence service, according to disclosures recently made to INSLAW by several senior Justice Department career officials.

One undeclared mission of this covert intelligence service has been the illegal dissemination of the proprietary version of PROMIS, according to information from reliable sources with ties to the U.S. intelligence community.

INSLAW has, moreover, obtained a copy of a 27-page Justice Department computer printout labeled "Criminal Division Vendor List." That list is actually a list of the commercial organizations and individuals

who serve as “cutouts” for this secret Justice Department intelligence agency . . .

The Justice Department’s secret intelligence agency also has its own “proprietary” company that employs scores of agents of diverse nationalities, as well as individuals who appear to be regular employees of various departments and agencies of the U.S. Government or members of the U.S. Armed Forces, according to several sources.

Richardson’s brief also made the astounding suggestion that evidence suggested that independent INSLAW investigator Danny Casolaro was murdered by this secret Justice Department unit inside the OSI.

Since it is no secret that the OSI has worked closely for years with Israel’s intelligence service, a logical conclusion can be drawn that the OSI (and the secret Justice Department unit inside the OSI itself) were effectively acting as assets of Israel’s Mossad. The ramifications were immense.

Considering Teel’s connections to the INSLAW affair Teel, in fact, should never have been allowed to hear Liberty Lobby’s federal bankruptcy in the first place. Teel clearly had an egregious conflict of interest and a very real axe to grind against the populist institution and its weekly newspaper. And in light of his past service to the Mossad and the CIA in the INSLAW affair, his ultimate ruling against Liberty Lobby was almost a *fait accompli*.

Despite the obvious injustice, Liberty Lobby had no recourse. It was another example of what Liberty Lobby attorney Mark Lane had called “The Liberty Lobby Exception”—that Liberty Lobby was subject to biased “special” treatment by the courts. The populist institution had been destroyed. And the illegal take-over of the Institute for Historical Review had laid the groundwork for this conspir-

acy to be set in motion in the first place.

And even after Liberty Lobby's staff members picked up and moved on, founding a new independent national weekly newspaper, American Free Press, Mark Weber pressed on. Although his colleague Greg Raven had bailed out and moved on to greener pastures (his work in wrecking the IHR and destroying Liberty Lobby fully accomplished), Mark Weber orchestrated yet another lawsuit, this time against American Free Press, attempting to claim that the new publication was actually, effectively, "Liberty Lobby in disguise." But even Weber's own lawyers—two Washington-based Jewish-American attorneys, one of whom had high-ranking Republican Party "neo-conservative" connections—saw that the suit was baseless and soon withdrew it altogether.

Although Weber had amassed millions through bankrupting Liberty Lobby, the IHR was obviously going nowhere. Prominent Revisionists such as Germar Rudolf of Australia, Dr. Fredrick Toben of Australia, and even Dr. Arthur Butz, author of the famed Holocaust Revisionist classic, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, publicly condemned Weber's intransigence and his continuing campaign to undermine Willis Carto and American Free Press and the 10,000-subscriber-strong new Revisionist journal, *The Barnes Review*, that Carto established in the wake of the destruction of the IHR. Yet, Weber continued to hang on, with a handful of Revisionists supporting him, largely unaware of what had really happened at the IHR.

"After all," many of them continued to say, "Mark Weber still promotes historical Revisionism. He is an outspoken anti-Zionist. Mark Weber says and writes many good things. Why in the world would the Mossad have any interest in keeping the IHR alive? How could anyone think that Mark Weber might actually be working for the Mossad?"

Those are good questions that this—and previous chapters—have already answered. But the easy and simple



answer to the enigma is this: It's called "controlled opposition." In the chapter which follows we will explain what this means.

## **Chapter Seven**

### **A Modern-Day Version of the Soviet-style "Trust": The IHR as a Mossad "Front" Acting as "Controlled Opposition"**

If the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it might really be a vulture. Look behind the rhetoric and you'll find a dark story that points toward the truth about who has taken over the IHR for their own insidious purposes.

If Mark Weber and the "new" Institute for Historical Review (IHR) are really controlled from behind the scenes by Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad—as Weber critics continue to insist—why would Weber and the IHR still distribute Revisionist material that could be harmful to Israel's cause?

That's a good sound question that puzzled people continue to ask. The best way to answer that question is to respond with the simple phrase: "controlled opposition."

The concept of "controlled opposition" is something that boggles the imagination of the average human being not versed in the covert ways of the worldwide clandestine services agencies.

But in the realm of intrigue that James J. Angleton—the longtime Mossad loyalist at the CIA—once described as the "wilderness of mirrors," the practice by agencies such as the Mossad and the Soviet KGB—not to mention the CIA—of establishing "controlled opposition" groups has a long and

sordid history.

And when these agencies have not formally established such "controlled opposition" themselves, they have often successfully infiltrated independent institutions and taken them over from within. That is precisely what has happened at the IHR.

Look at it this way: if the Mossad wanted to keep tabs on the growing worldwide Revisionist movement, the best way to do it would be to infiltrate the movement from within:

Whoever controls the IHR and its mailing list and its access to contacts in the Revisionist movement on every continent on the globe would have a "lock" on the movement and continuing high-level knowledge of the latest developments in Revisionist research.

While Mossad assets in the ADL are busy on the one hand publicly attacking the IHR and effectively directing new Revisionists into the web of the IHR, the Mossad's assets in control of the IHR are busy "collecting names" and monitoring the growth of the Revisionist movement.

Thus, for the "new" IHR to be effective as a Mossad front, it would then necessarily have to "walk like a duck and quack like a duck" in order to appear to be a legitimate Revisionist venture.

Therefore, the IHR does continue to do what it did in the past—issue Revisionist materials—and recruit (although now far less effectively) new people into the Revisionist movement.

After all, how many Revisionists would contact the IHR or donate to its work if—all of a sudden, after the IHR takeover—the IHR suddenly began reversing its position on historical issues and taking stands contrary to its tradition?

There is another important factor to consider: the "new" IHR was used as a springboard for the continuing attack on Liberty Lobby and The Spotlight.

That is, the IHR—as a corporate entity—was used by its new controllers as the plaintiff in a series of legal actions that forced Liberty Lobby into bankruptcy and which ultimately destroyed the populist Institution. Without the IHR continuing to exist as a legal entity, the campaign against Liberty Lobby could not continue.

Thus, for the purposes of the Mossad, it was vital that—at least for the time being—the IHR be allowed to continue operating. And for this reason, it is necessary that “sincere Revisionists” such as Mark Weber and Ted O’Keefe (who actually was finally forced out of the IHR) be permitted to play public roles in the IHR’s affairs, even though neither Weber nor O’Keefe actually had any authority over the IHR’s corporate structure. And even “sincere” people can be hoodwinked, or blackmailed or coerced or co-opted or compromised—and in some cases not even know it.

That Ted O’Keefe was sincere and thus ripe for manipulation seems to be the case. The instance of Mark Weber—with his own strange connections to the likes of Jared Taylor and their own unusual ventures in Africa—appears to be another story altogether. So while Greg Raven and Tom Marcellus were “working” on O’Keefe and Weber on a day-to-day basis inside the IHR, Weber and O’Keefe were also being influenced at the same time by an outside intriguer, Andrew E. Allen of San Francisco.

Allen’s own ties to the clandestine operations of the CIA and the Mossad in such far-flung areas as Burma and Afghanistan are now part of the public record, thanks to Allen’s own admissions while under oath.

A well-heeled San Francisco socialite, Allen—a self-described “liberal Republican”—personifies the effete intelligence type that caused one critic to say that the acronym “OSS”—as in the name of the Office of Strategic Services, forerunner of the CIA—actually stood for “Oh, So Social.”

In fact, Allen parlayed his inherited wealth and society

connections to great effect with both O'Keefe and Weber—who told his wife with some awe that Allen was "really rich"—who were evidently impressed by the idea that someone "from the Establishment" would be (or so they thought) "sympathetic to Revisionism."

Allen assured both Weber and O'Keefe that he (Allen) had friends high up in the intelligence community who were sympathetic to the work of the IHR, hinting that his friends in the CIA were secretly cheering on the IHR, although loathe to publicly endorse its work.

Weber and O'Keefe were led to believe that if they entered into a conspiracy to dislodge IHR founder Willis Carto from his leadership of the Revisionist institute that not only would the two IHR employees get their hands on "hidden millions" that Carto had allegedly squirrelled away but that the IHR would begin to get covert support from those purportedly sympathetic elements within the CIA.

In recent years, for his own part (and to his credit) O'Keefe has wistfully expressed regrets to a number of people about his participation in the illicit takeover of the IHR and the effective dissolution of the IHR that followed.

O'Keefe cannot help but harken back to those days when he held a responsible position and a comfortable office when the IHR was "the big kid on the block" in the world of Revisionism, a role now long since supplanted by a variety of independent figures and institutions such as Switzerland's dynamic Jurgen Graf, Canada's Ernst Zundel, Fredrick Toben of the Adelaide Institute in Australia and Germar Rudolf, editor of *Dissecting the Holocaust*, the new Revisionist blockbuster, not to mention *The Barnes Review* which, with some 8,000 subscribers, is the world's largest Revisionist magazine.

Weber—thoroughly enmeshed in the conspiracy and unable to extricate himself—remained unrepentant and continues to do the bidding of his behind-the-scenes mas-

ters, knowing that his foothold at the IHR is tenuous, to say the least.

In short, the forces behind the IHR coup knew that they had willing patsies in the palm of their hands and put that knowledge to good use.

As a consequence, the IHR is now nothing more than a “trust” along the lines of the old-fashioned Soviet model except that this particular “trust” is not controlled by the KGB. Instead, it is controlled by the Mossad. The IHR is now, for all intents and purposes, nothing more than one of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within. And Mark Weber remains in charge, acting as the front man for those responsible for the IHR’s—and Liberty Lobby’s—destruction.

**APPENDIX TWO**

**Here's How Much Money Mark Weber and the  
IHR  
Accumulated in the Campaign to Destroy  
Liberty Lobby**

**Michael Collins Piper's  
December 1, 2004  
Letter to Mark Weber**

December 1, 2004

Dear Mark:

I am writing this letter to you both as a personal courtesy and at the advice of my attorney who, it should be noted, has no relationship whatsoever with Willis Carto or any organizations or publications with which Willis has been associated.

Please forgive me for my delay in responding, but what with my two week trip in August to Malaysia and then a one week trip, of more recent date, to Japan, in conjunction with the release of my books, FINAL JUDGMENT and THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WAR in those countries, I have been, needless to say, quite busy, during the last few months.

First of all, please note that this is a letter from Michael Collins Piper alone. It represents my personal opinion and should not be perceived as an indirect communication from Willis and/or Elisabeth Carto or any organization or publication with which either of them are associated.

Neither Willis nor Elisabeth will have seen this letter before it is dispatched, although, needless to say, I did advise both of them that I would be writing this letter and both of them provided me bits and pieces of information that I have incorporated in this letter. However, all of the material utilized is that of my own choosing and, in fact, I chose to reject much of what they provided me.

In any case, I am not—repeat NOT—acting as their agent in any way. This letter strictly represents my personal point of view.

In addition, for the record, it should be noted that my involvement with both American Free Press and The Barnes Review is largely peripheral and I have very little, if anything, to do with the day-to-day operations of either of these publications, popular misperception notwithstanding. I have neither an office nor a desk on the premises. I have absolutely no ownership or proprietary rights in either publication and I have no employee benefits of any kind whatsoever.

As such, it was somewhat comical and, actually, ironic, that you included me—of all people—as a co-defendant in your baseless suit against American Free Press which, of course, you subsequently withdrew . . . and wisely, for your own sake, I might add.

In any event, with that having been said, permit me to continue.

This letter is stimulated, of course, by your communication (both hard copy and by e-mail) addressed to me in care of the office of American Free Press and via an email address for me which appears on the website of American Free Press.

Your letter was a follow-up to a brief discussion between us during the Labor Day weekend conference sponsored by David Irving in Cincinnati, Ohio.

For the record, it should be noted that I was attending the Irving conference at the invitation of Mr. Irving who made the invitation directly to me, without first mentioning the subject to Willis Carto. I was not attending the conference as an agent or spokesman for Willis Carto, although, of course, I did distribute copies of *The Barnes Review* and *American Free Press*.

My purpose at the conference, at Mr. Irving's invitation, was to speak about Willis Carto's history in the Revisionist movement and, only in passing, about the Farrel legacy. The only part that Mr. Carto played in the preparation of my remarks was to provide, at my request, a list of the books and magazines and journals that he had published or republished.

In our discussion at the Irving conference you told me that you (and presumably the controllers of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, whomever they may be) wanted to enter into some form of settlement agreement with Willis



Carto regarding the ongoing litigation and other conflicts stemming from the dispute over what I shall refer to as “the Farrel legacy.”

During our brief conversation, you noted that, previously, you had made a public statement (to an audience at the Irving conference) indicating that you would like to reach a settlement with Willis, and, in fact, a number of persons who were attending the conference confirmed that you had made such an offer.

Parenthetically, I would note that you made your public pronouncement after, earlier that day, I had told the audience in attendance at my lecture that the Legion for the Survival of Freedom had received some \$1.7 million in total from two estates—those of Adelaide Allen and Bob Keifer—that had originally been earmarked for Liberty Lobby.

This information came as a surprise to many people, including several stalwart Revisionists who later informed me that, just hours prior to that, you had, in one gentleman’s words, “been poor-mouthing” and saying that the IHR was in dire financial straits, largely, you said, as a consequence “of Carto.”

(Funny thing, but the IHR was never in dire financial straits when Willis Carto was in charge, but that’s another story altogether. And nor was Liberty Lobby ever insolvent until the massive judgment you and certain parties orchestrated against Liberty Lobby, but that’s also another story altogether.)

Briefly, you suggested that Willis Carto should “return” all of the remaining funds from the Farrel legacy and drop any existing lawsuits against you and the Legion and that the Legion would also drop any further claims. The remaining funds, you suggested, would be placed in a trust fund to be administered by independent parties and distributed for the good works of Revisionists worldwide. I think that is a fair assessment of your comments at that time, or at least as I

understood them. If there is any minor misunderstanding, and I don't think there is, I stand corrected. However, for the purposes of this letter from me to you, that offer, as you shall see, is largely moot, as we shall see.

In any case, Mark, after you mentioned your desire to make a settlement "with Carto," I suggested that you put the offer in writing. Further, I suggested, that you consult with an attorney in preparing the settlement offer and then direct the letter to Willis and/or one of the attorneys who has been representing his and/or Liberty Lobby's interests in the related cases stemming from the circumstances surrounding the conflict over the Farrel legacy.

Upon returning to Washington from the Irving affair, I advised Willis of the rough parameters of the proposed settlement and indicated to him that you had told me that you would put the offer to him in writing.

Well, needless to say, I was quite surprised to subsequently receive your hard-copy letter and your e-mail (the two items being identical), both addressed to me, rather than to Willis or to any attorney representing him or Liberty Lobby.

I also had the distinct impression—although I could be wrong about this—that you had written the letter on your own without benefit of legal counsel.

In addition, that part of the letter which was not a rehash of the rulings of Judge Runston Maino but which purported to contain the framework of a "settlement" was actually rather difficult to understand, and I say this as someone who is, at the least, semi-literate and who also had one year of legal training supplemented by some twenty years of working closely with attorneys and legal documents of all kinds, in addition to having been (at least at one time) fairly well versed in the details surrounding the Farrel legacy and the legal bloodbath that followed.

Legal documents, by their very nature, often tend

toward the abstruse and opaque, but, in my humble opinion, your “settlement offer” was so unclear that no serious legal negotiations could emerge from it.

Your offer should have been framed in very specific language and, even more importantly—as I’ve already said—sent directly to Willis Carto.

To be honest, Mark, I felt as though your letter was simply what one might call a “jiffy job” and that it was a production designed to have the “look and feel” of a settlement offer, something that might be flashed in front of the naïve and unknowing as “evidence” of your good faith—some-what along the lines of “Here’s the settlement offer I made to Carto, but he refuses to negotiate.”

The truth is that the letter was NOT a settlement offer and it was NOT made to Willis Carto.

Regarding the actual amounts received by both Liberty Lobby and the Legion from the Farrel legacy, let us first of all consider what Liberty Lobby actually did receive. And note, too, that the monies received by Liberty Lobby were ALWAYS in the form of LOANS, not grants. All of these loans were earmarked to be REPAYED BY LIBERTY LOBBY TO THE CORPORATE ENTITY ESTABLISHED TO ADMINISTER THE FARREL FUNDS!

That is something that is hardly known by most Revisionists.

In addition, the fact remains that the money loaned from the Farrel legacy to Liberty Lobby had not even come due at the time the Legion was wrested from the control of Willis Carto. The amount received by Liberty Lobby constituted UN-REPAYED LOANS that were not yet even yet due!

Judge Maino ruled that Liberty Lobby “owed” the Legion (vis-à-vis the Farrel legacy) some \$2,650,000, based on the fact that this amount, essentially, had been lent to Liberty Lobby. And had Liberty Lobby been able to continue functioning, not hampered by the lawsuits initiated by you and

the Legion, these funds would ultimately have been repaid. So this, again, is something that is not widely known.

The system of loans set up by Willis Carto (at the encouragement of then-Legion attorney Bill Hulsy) were designed to protect both the Farrel legacy and Liberty Lobby from the Mel Mermelstein lawsuit that was in litigation at the time the Farrel affair was settled. It was a good business move and it made good legal sense. It only became "embezzlement" when you and your associates seized control of the Legion and used that as a springboard to launch the assault on Liberty Lobby. That is the cold, hard truth, Mark and you know it.

All of the funds advanced to Liberty Lobby were accounted for in detailed bank records, including wire transfers from Switzerland to Liberty Lobby and thence from Liberty Lobby to the Sun Radio Network which, in actuality, was the prime beneficiary of the loans, channeled through Liberty Lobby.

I personally sat in with Willis Carto and Liberty Lobby's controller Blayne Hutzel and our attorney, Mark Lane, when the records were put together for presentation to your attorneys in the process of preparing for the trial before Judge Maino in Los Angeles.

I know this for a fact. I saw these records. I saw the totals, Mark. I know that these records were provided to the court and to your attorneys. And that is why I was astounded when you repeatedly said to me, to my face, at the David Irving meeting, that Liberty Lobby had "never provided an accounting of the Farrel funds that it received." Frankly, Mark, I was so shocked at your audacity in making this claim—which I knew to be patently false—that I was hard pressed to respond. I couldn't believe that you would sit there and tell me that I had not seen what I saw. In fact, it was on the basis of these very records that Judge Maino made his ruling, at least in part, insofar as Liberty Lobby was

concerned.

Needless to say, Mark, I have told many people—including some very respected Revisionists—that I think you and your associates were quite shocked to find out that the Farrel funds advanced to Liberty Lobby were no longer extant, that they had actually been expended. It is my belief that you believed that Liberty Lobby was somehow “sitting” on this money when, in fact, it had already gone to the Sun Radio Network! This must have been a very real shock to you, but it is a fact that you cannot dispute. The records prove it. Judge Maino made his judgment based on these records.

And, as I said, these funds would ultimately have been repaid. This is the TRUE story of the money received by Liberty Lobby from the Farrel legacy.

And it should be added that the original charter of the Legion—prior to the time that you and your associates re-wrote that charter, which went back to the original founding of the Legion in the 1950s, very specifically cited radio outreach as one of the ways of communication that the Legion hoped to advance its message.

And as an aside, here’s another point that many Revisionists also are unaware of; that is the fact that the IHR was always a subsidiary of the Legion, just as was the Noontide Press. Historical Revisionism—Holocaust or otherwise—was never, repeat never, the primary or sole purpose of the Legion. It was one of many missions in the realm of free expression to which the Legion was committed.

Your constant claim that the Farrel legacy was earmarked exclusively for Revisionism, specifically Holocaust Revisionism, could not be further from the truth. This is a point that even Willis Carto often failed to mention when he became bogged down in fighting off the Legion’s assault, but it is a fact that cannot be denied.

Now regarding the funds received by the Legion itself

from the Farrel legacy (specifically the bank account in Switzerland) it is important to note that, contrary to what Judge Maino ruled in court, there is some real dispute about how much was actually received by the Legion.

And I hasten to add that while you claim that the Legion only received \$100,000 from the Farrel legacy, there are numerous financial records in existence which suggest that this figure is far less than the actual reality.

For example:

- In September of 1991, Legion received \$100,000 from the Farrel funds.

- In March of 1992, Legion received \$200,000 from the Farrel funds.

- In September of 1992, Legion received \$150,000 from the Farrel funds.

- In October of 1992, Legion received \$100,000 from the Farrel funds.

- In addition, beginning on February 11, 1991, many invoices from printers and authors who were billing the Legion were paid from the Farrel funds totaling some \$100,000.

- Also, employee benefits and salaries at Legion, totaling another \$98,000 were paid over a period of 15 months.

By my accounting, based on the above information, that is at least \$748,000—some \$648,000 more than the amount you have stated in court that Legion received from the Farrel funds!

According to Elisabeth Carto, the total that she can reconcile from the materials she has available is slightly higher: \$755,927 paid to the Legion. However, Elisabeth says, she is certain that the figure is closer to about \$900,000.

So even granting the lesser amount of \$748,000, that is a much higher level of funds that Legion did receive and of which there are existing bank records from the now-depleted bank account in Switzerland that held the Farrel legacy.

These are facts that are not known to most Revisionists, even those who have followed the case closely!

One final point regarding the Farrel legacy. You have constantly made a point, even in swearing out a search warrant for the Carto home and property in Escondido, that there may have been some amounts in uncut gems from the Farrel legacy that somehow were in the hands of Willis and Elisabeth Carto. This is a myth.

As you certainly know, when the Farrel legacy was placed in the hands of Roland Rochat, a Swiss notary given the assignment by both sides in the dispute over the Farrel legacy, Rochat was charged with liquidating these diamonds. These diamonds were sold by Rochat as part of the liquidation of the legacy and placed into the entire amount for distribution between Willis Carto and the Legion and Joan Althaus, with whom the Farrel legacy was in dispute.

In short, Mark, ALL of the funds that Willis Carto assumed control of from the Farrel legacy were either distributed to Liberty Lobby or to the IHR or to other parties (including attorneys, accountants, etc) who were involved in the procurement of the estate. No funds remain from the Farrel legacy.

Now here is something else that MUST be considered if an actual settlement offer is made in good faith. I note, Mark, that the Lennon company of Costa Mesa, which acted as a receiver for Liberty Lobby in its bankruptcy, collecting sums on behalf of the Legion, issued a report dated September 24, 2004, detailing the fact that between 1998 and 2004, some \$1,031,780.32 had been collected from Liberty Lobby directly or from letters containing money and checks that had been sent to Liberty Lobby during this time frame.

This amount also included a number of substantial payments made directly by Liberty Lobby as part of the bankruptcy settlement—including sums as high as \$200,000 on at least one given occasion—until the bankruptcy court

effectively voided the settlement after the Legion charged Liberty Lobby with violating the agreement, the circumstances of which are beyond the purview of this letter.

(The sum also includes the amount of money taken from personal accounts of Willis and Elisabeth Carto and the residue of funds left over from the sale of their home which was seized by the Legion.)

Nonetheless, the fact remains that Liberty Lobby did, in fact, give the Legion \$1,031,780.32 under these circumstances—a point that many prominent Revisionists, to this day, are unaware.

Many persons remain under the illusion—should I say delusion—that Liberty Lobby paid little, if any, to the Legion following the institution of the bankruptcy settlement agreement.

So it is that this \$1,031,780.32 is a substantial amount indeed and, in fact, quite a large chunk of the actual funds advanced, via loan, from the Farrel funds in the bank account in Switzerland.

Add this amount of \$1,031,780.32 to the \$748,000 given directly to the Legion from the Farrel legacy funds in Switzerland, this is a total of

\$1,779,780.32

This is the actual amount of money that the Legion had already received, directly from the Farrel legacy and from the money taken from Liberty Lobby.

Then, Mark, please add to this the \$1.7 million that the Legion has now received from the Adelaide Allen and Bob Kiefer estates.

This brings the total to:

\$3,479,780.32



Quite a substantial amount indeed. And this is far more than the \$2,650,000 that Judge Maino ruled that Liberty Lobby owed the Legion.

Dare I say, Mark, noting the current reported desperate financial straits of the Legion that you described to persons at the David Irving conference, one might logically ask: WHERE DID THE MONEY GO?

And, of course, the fact remains that this is a substantial chunk of the Farrel legacy that Willis Carto assumed responsibility for at the time of signing the settlement agreement with the attorneys for Joan Althaus in 1990.

And, again, this does not include all of the money paid out to attorneys, accountants, expeditors and others who were involved in the procurement of the Farrel legacy, including, I recall, some \$650,000 paid to Swiss banker Francois Genoud, a longtime friend of the Revisionist movement, who played a key role in securing the legacy.

I have been told that you denounced Genoud as a "Nazi," a point that will surprise many Revisionists who worked closely with Genoud over the years, prior to his untimely death in, I believe, 1991.

And at this juncture another little understood matter should be pointed out for the benefit of those who may not be in tune with all of the seemingly peripheral details surrounding the Farrel legacy and the Liberty Lobby bankruptcy. And this is very important!

Many of the funds listed in the previously mentioned total of money (\$1,031,780.32) seized by the Lennon Company included payments for books, videos and other materials, including SPOTLIGHT subscriptions, that people sent to Liberty Lobby AFTER Liberty Lobby had actually gone out of business and was denied the opportunity to continue functioning.

Unfortunately, however, those who sent these payments never received the books they ordered or the subscriptions.

Instead, your receiver, the Lennon Company, took the money and checks out of the mail addressed to Liberty Lobby and directed the funds to the Legion and presumably itself and your attorneys.

I personally received numerous letters from individuals who had ordered copies of my book, FINAL JUDGMENT, but never received them. I was forced to write them letters explaining that the Legion was taking the money they sent to Liberty Lobby and not attempting to satisfy the orders or return the money in any way, shape or form. God only knows how many good patriots and Revisionists across America, really from around the world, were cheated out of their money.

For my own part, I attempted to provide gratis copies from my own extra supply of copies of FINAL JUDGMENT to those who bothered to write, but one can only imagine how many people did not know how to reach me or how to reach the former staff of Liberty Lobby.

In one instance an elderly woman in the Mid-West returned to Liberty Lobby's address what I recall to be \$1600 in silver that she had purchased from Liberty Lobby some years before. She hoped to redeem the value of the silver and had Liberty Lobby still been operating, she would have received that money.

Instead, the Lennon company took the silver and never gave the woman the \$16,000. She has since died, I understand, and is unable to pursue any legal action on her own, although it is conceivable, of course, that her heirs may choose to do so, and this would be a legal difficulty for the Legion, not to mention an utter PUBLIC RELATIONS DISASTER.

Imagine the headlines: "Revisionist Group Sued by Elderly Woman's Estate."

All of this is not to mention the untold thousands of unfulfilled SPOTLIGHT subscriptions and Board of Policy

memberships that were left hanging.

What follows are the number of SPOTLIGHT subscribers and the members of Liberty Lobby's Board of Policy and the total count at the time of the last issue of The SPOTLIGHT. The dollar amounts listed are the values of the remaining subscriptions.

Subscribers:	45,732	\$1,818,302.99
BOP	7,527	\$154,233.14
Total:		\$1,972,536.13

This means that at least 53,259 total patriots and Revisionists were left wanting. To my knowledge, although the Legion effectively assumed "ownership" of Liberty Lobby and its assets—including forthcoming estates earmarked in wills and trusts for Liberty Lobby—the Legion never made any effort whatsoever to satisfy any of these outstanding subscriptions and memberships.

Considering the fact that the Legion was receiving in excess of \$1 million in Liberty Lobby funds, issued directly by Liberty Lobby and seized from its mail, it seems that the honorable and rightful thing to do would have been to at least write these good folks a letter and offer them a free book or back issue of The JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW. This would have not only been good "public relations" for the Legion, but it might have won over potential new contributors and subscribers in a show of good faith. But no such show of good faith ever materialized.

Frankly, Mark, if you had done your job in making some effort in this regard, you might have literally conjured up another "Jean Farrel" out there in SPOTLIGHT Subscriber Land who—in the end—might have left another fortune to the "new" Legion and the Institute for Historical Review.

Now, of course, Jim Floyd, the outspoken Alabama

Revisionist, has been spearheading efforts to organize these, shall we say “disenfranchised” SPOTLIGHT subscribers and Jim puts it bluntly: “Anyone who would open up the letter of a good patriot or Revisionist and take his money and then consciously refuse to send him what he’s ordered or even return the money if his order couldn’t be filled cannot and will not ever classify as an honest man in my book.”

And, Mark, I’m sorry to say, this problem is one that is going to hang over your head and that of the Legion as long as all of these people are left in the lurch. Frankly, your credibility and integrity as at stake.

Even if your Jewish lawyer and your collection agency, the Lennon Company, chose to operate in this underhanded fashion, you could have personally made some effort to resolve this matter. But you did not.

So this is really a matter that—for the good of all concerned, especially those who have lost out—must be considered in the matter of a “global” settlement of this most unfortunate affair surrounding the Farrel legacy. NO REVISIONIST, NO PATRIOT should be cheated of his money.

Only good can come if you make some effort to resolve this and make it a factor in any settlement proposal. I’m confident the names of those who lost out—or at least many of them—are probably available, even at this late date. How about it, Mark? Why not try to make good on this matter.

And regarding the Liberty Lobby mailing list. Here’s a point that should be noted. Although your failed lawsuit against American Free Press failed precisely because of the fact that, contrary to the claims you made, American Free Press had NOT run off with the Liberty Lobby mailing list, the fact is that your agents who came to Liberty Lobby’s headquarters in Washington never took the list with them when our then-controller Blayne Hutzel made the entire list (subscribers and Board of Policy members) available when these individuals came to our office on Capitol Hill, along

with, I might add, all of Liberty Lobby's financial records.

(If I recall correctly, those acting as your agents were local members of the Church of Scientology who volunteered their services, a point that is interesting, especially regarding your constant denial that this Church played any part whatsoever in the circumstances surrounding the demise of Liberty Lobby.)

It was the fault of YOUR agents and your agents alone that the Liberty Lobby mailing list (quite a valuable asset) was never secured. And perhaps, in the end, that is for the best, considering quite convincing stories that you and your associate Greg Raven discussed selling the list to either the Anti-Defamation League or the Church of Scientology—a point I have heard that you have disputed, but not convincingly, in my humble estimation.

There is probably much more that could be said, but I have touched on the relevant highlights that you MUST acknowledge and consider when you make a genuine, formal settlement offer—not a letter to Michael Collins Piper.

Your letter indicated that copies were being sent to members of the board of directors of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, although no individual names of said directors were listed.

As I do not have their e-mail addresses nor do I even know the names of the board, I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to you to a number of prominent Revisionists so that I can be certain that my comments, at least, will be on the record, inasmuch as you involved me in this matter by addressing your initial letter to me.

In addition, inasmuch as this matter certainly does involve other Revisionists, by the very nature of the loose framework of a "settlement" that you have been discussing, I feel it is all the more appropriate that these Revisionists have the opportunity to consider all aspects of the affair, at least as much as I can provide any insights thereon.

In summary: there is NOTHING left of the Farrel legacy, other than (1) the money that was taken from Liberty Lobby by your receiver, the Lennon company, and (2) that money that was earmarked for Liberty Lobby in the Allen and Kiefer estates (and which would have ultimately been repaid by Liberty Lobby, over the long term to the Farrel account in Switzerland).

As a parting note, in the spirit of your initial suggestion, I would comment that I personally will certainly encourage Willis Carto to use the egis of both American Free Press and The Barnes Review to perhaps join with the IHR itself—whatever the IHR constitutes, and it doesn't seem to constitute much more than an Internet website at this point—to issue a hard-hitting fund-raising mailing to raise money to set up a trust fund to be accessed by responsible Revisionists.

Further, I would be pleased to offer, gratis, my own modest talents as a fund-raising letter writer—and I had largely written, by far, virtually all of Liberty Lobby and The Barnes Review's fundraising and subscription letters over a 20 year period (no small accomplishment)—in furtherance of such a project. I would be proud to do it.

However, Mark, your dream of procuring some “hidden” or “remaining” Farrel funds is a pipe dream. It will never happen. Your legal hounds have managed to grab back all of the funds—and more—that Liberty Lobby received and the Legion itself received a substantial amount of the Farrel funds, directly and through payment of Legion bills, from the very beginning. These are facts that cannot be denied. You must consider all of this when making a formal settlement offer, and I hope you will.

In closing, I hope that this letter—an honest effort by yours truly to lay out some little-known but highly relevant facts concerning the Farrel legacy—will contribute to the settlement of this matter.

Please, Mark: do not write me in response to this letter.

Instead, sit down with your attorneys and your board of directors—maybe consult with some respected Revisionists such as Fredrick Toben, Jurgen Graf, Germar Rudolf, Michael A. Hoffman II, David Irving, Robert Faurisson, Ingrid Rimland, Arthur Butz, Bradley Smith, Robert Countess, Michael Santomauro, Mark Farrell—the list goes on and on—and get some good solid input and come up with a very real and very solid and reasonable settlement offer. Then, finally, all of this can be resolved.

The Revisionist movement is much bigger than Mark Weber or Willis Carto or even the IHR and The Barnes Review. Remember that, Mark. No, better yet—as Mel Mermelstein's father would say: "Never Forget."

Constructively,

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

### **APPENDIX THREE**

#### **Former IHR Staffer Ted O'Keefe's First Hand Insider's Expose of What Was Really Going On Inside the Institute for Historical Review**

**(Including Mark Weber's scheme to sell the Liberty Lobby mailing list to the Anti-Defamation League)**

Exit the Whistleblower: My Fall from Grace at IHR

By Ted O'Keefe

In late May I was dismissed as editor of the Journal of Historical Review and removed as treasurer of IHR's parent corporation, the Legion for the Survival of Freedom. As I write this, my status as an employee of LSF/IHR is uncertain.

It is my conviction that my dismissal as JHR editor and LSF treasurer was the result of my expressed concern over IHR's continued, perilous drift and my frank criticisms of the Institute's leadership. I believe that I fulfilled my fiduciary responsibilities as LSF treasurer to the best of my abilities, and that I made significant improvements in the JHR, both in timeliness and content.

My recent experience with IHR has been both humbling and disappointing: disappointing in that I had aspired



to spend the rest of my career as a working revisionist at IHR, humbling because that career has recently all but ended under the bullying of LSF President Greg Raven and IHR Director Mark Weber. I have now reconciled myself to devoting my talents to revisionism outside the IHR, should that prove necessary.

I have written this report to defend my record and reputation as an editor, and to communicate my concerns over IHR's direction and momentum to a limited circle of JHR advisors, IHR supporters, and friends of IHR among other revisionists. I do not intend to damage the IHR, or to carry on a feud with its staff. While I have sought to minimize potentially injurious revelations, it has become increasingly evident that the interest of the IHR is better served by imparting unpleasant facts to the Institute's most important advisors, supporters, and friends than by keeping them unformed.

I have been a full-time employee of the Legion for the Survival of Freedom/Institute for Historical Review (LSF/IHR) for a total of eleven years, and have worked for or with IHR in one capacity or another since 1985. During that time I have served as editor of the Journal of Historical Review (hereafter JHR) and of IHR's newsletter; contributed research articles and reviews to the JHR; edited and written introductions to numerous IHR and Noontide Press books; edited the Noontide catalogue, the chief vehicle for promoting sales of IHR and Noontide books; written ad copy for books, tapes, the JHR, and IHR conferences; written fundraising letters; and played an important role in winning the Mermelstein and Carto cases by carrying out hundreds of hours of unpaid research to produce evidence that proved crucial in the courts.

When, from 1995 to 1999, LSF/IHR's financial woes prevented my salaried employment, I contributed a lead research article to the JHR; painstakingly edited an inade-

quate translation of Roger Garaudy's *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, correcting many erroneous citations in the original; edited and made extensive factual corrections to the English translation of the

important Islamist book *Holocaust Deception*; and conducted legal research for the LSF. During those years I also edited thirty-one issues of Bradley Smith's newsletter *Smith's Report*; contributed a regular column to the magazine *Instauration*; line-edited and fact-checked Ingrid Rimland's three-volume trilogy *Lebensraum*; wrote articles and reviews for a number of highly regarded nationalist publications; and proofread or copyedited about two dozen books for Carol Publishers, a large New York publishing house.

My writing and editorial duties for IHR and *Noontide* quickly acquainted me with two important facts of for the Institute. First, that IHR/*Noontide* is effectively excluded from the normal channels of advertising and distribution – and therefore IHR/*NT* sales and fundraising are overwhelmingly dependent on direct mail. (Neither Bradley Smith's many radio and television appearances for the Institute a decade or two ago, nor IHR's presence on the Internet, has been able to generate new supporters in any numbers.) In consequence, IHR's management and staff must do everything possible to maintain and expand its mailing list of proven buyers and contributors.

The second reality is that the audience for the *Journal of Historical Review* and IHR's historical monographs consists almost entirely of interested lay persons, rather than the academics who subscribe to most other such journals. Thus, while writing and editing research articles and reviews for *JHR* occupies a central place at IHR, the larger utility of an IHR editor lies in his ability to grasp the concerns of the thousands of persons whose names make up IHR's mailing list. The editor must communicate with them

in writing that effectively promotes enthusiasm and interest in IHR and its cause – interest and enthusiasm that will result in contributions, subscriptions, and sales for the Institute.

This communication for the Institute I learned to conduct in different types of writing for various specific purposes. The JHR, of course, has won the IHR great prestige among persons attracted to revisionism by publishing original research articles on its chief specialty, revising the Holocaust, and many other articles and reviews on revisionist subjects, often of a high scholarly and literary tone. Editing IHR's newsletter, on the other hand, involved not merely reporting IHR "news" but allowed me frequent, personal, and emotional communication not possible with a proper journal – with the primary purpose being to increase contributions and other support for the Institute. While it is the scholar's temptation to explain, to inform, or to edify when explaining products for sale, the many advertisements I have written for IHR and Noontide over the years have had one purpose: to sell.

As different as are the formal purposes and tones of the above and other types of communication to IHR readers (for example, fundraising letters; editorial notes to JHR readers; cover letters for the JHR), they create a whole, in which I sought to fashion an editorial voice for IHR that expressed organizational self-assurance, indeed jauntiness, sophistication without losing the common touch; defiance without shrillness; solemnity as warranted; intelligence; humor; and idealistic, though hard-headed, devotion to IHR and the revisionist cause.

Following an influx of cash from a short-lived settlement with Carto, LSF/IHR rehired me in September 1999. (In a letter to the Board a few months earlier, President Raven described my prospective return as a "tremendous benefit to the Legion and the cause of revisionism" [Exhibit

1].

Although IHR's much diminished productivity and effectiveness, above all the decline in the JHR during the preceding five years, worried me, I was still confident that the costs of the Carto suits were to blame for much of IHR's slump, and that Mark Weber's problems with the JHR might be attributable to temporary problems.

I believed that it was possible for Raven, Weber, and me to function as a team. We were close in age, had complementary abilities, and had worked together before. Each of us was to have one or more discrete areas of responsibility (Raven: administration, legal; Weber: the JHR; O'Keefe: book publishing). I felt that, given IHR's simultaneous difficulties and opportunities, the self-evident interest in getting the organization rolling again would enable our cooperation.

Thus, following my return, I sought to work as harmoniously as possible with President Raven and Director Weber. My efforts were hindered from the first, however, as Raven and Weber proved to be often uncommunicative, and sometimes secretive, about LSF/IHR problems. Unlike most enterprises that depend on cooperation, we very rarely had meetings (perhaps once every two or three months), and these dealt only with major decisions or emergencies. These meetings seldom involved probing give-and-take, "brainstorming," or other creative exchange, relying instead on set-piece presentations and brief, decorous discussion. I was frequently excluded from meetings between Raven and Weber on important questions, even after I became LSF treasurer in September 2000. During my first year of employment I several times made known my concern that better communication, better planning, and better teamwork was needed [Exhibits 2, 3, 4, 5].

Until March 2001 my principal responsibility was as book editor: evaluating manuscripts, dealing with authors, and editing manuscripts accepted for publication. I wrote

the introduction and cover copy for *Founding Myths*, which has gotten much praise and sold well; successfully advocated the reprinting of Lothrop Stoddard's *Into the Darkness*, and edited its new introduction; wrote picture captions, a revised introduction, and jacket copy for the still unpublished *Holocaust Deception*; wrote a well-received introduction, and jacket copy, for Noontide's reprint of *Imperium*; edited the important Holocaust revisionist monograph *The Gas Chambers of Sherlock Holmes*; and worked on other manuscripts and on reprinting IHR and Noontide "books. From September 1999 to March 2001, I also edited and wrote articles for the JHR; wrote and edited three issues of the IHR newsletter; edited the 2000 Noontide catalogue; wrote ad copy and fundraising letters; spoke at IHR's 13th conference in 2000; translated or interpreted historical, legal, and business documents in French, German, Spanish, Italian, and other languages.

The *Journal of Historical Review* is the most important of IHR's publications. Through its academic program, its distinguished roster of editorial advisors, and its record of revisionist scholarship, it confers great distinction on the IHR among revisionists and those sympathetic to revisionism. The JHR has also been the engine that pulls the IHR train. Its subscribers have traditionally been the hard core of the Institute's mailing list: on average more committed, more enthusiastic, and more active than the rest of the list (which has typically been several times larger than the number of subscribers to the JHR).

Serious problems with the JHR's publishing schedule from 1995 to 2001 [Exhibit 6], as well as a catastrophic drop in subscriptions [Exhibit 7], resulted in repeated efforts during those years by President Raven to prod Editor Weber to speed publication [Exhibit 1]. From mid- 999 to 2000 President Raven attempted to persuade the Board to act to pressure or to replace the Editor, without success [Exhibits

1, 8, 9]. Recognizing that the JHR was also troubled by grave deficiencies in editing and content, President Raven directed me to research these shortcomings in depth and to recommend potential remedies. In the resultant report I analyzed and described specific and chronic lapses in the JHR, documenting what IHR advisers, subscribers, and friends had been hinting for years: a marked decrease in original research articles, most damagingly on the "Holocaust"; the virtual disappearance of reviews; neglect of up-to-date, inhouse, original reporting and comment on news of interest to JHR subscribers, in favor of reprinted commentary, often months or years old; failure to organize and make maximally comprehensible each issue; failure to utilize IHR conference lectures for JHR content (two published in the nine months following IHR's May 2000 conference and before his resignation); the alienation of contributors and the jading of subscribers through heavy-handed editing into a uniform and monotonous style. In the same report I suggested concrete improvements to repair these deficiencies, and gave a clear presentation of my goals for content and schedule and of my understanding of IHR policy regarding JHR content [Exhibit 10]. This report, along with President Raven's letter recapitulating several years of failed attempts to discipline or replace the Editor [Exhibit 11], was presented to the Board. Thereupon Weber resigned, and I assumed editorship of the JHR at the end of February last year.

During my first year as editor (March 2001 -March 2002) I sent seven issues to press and cut approximately two months from the five months the JHR was behind schedule when I took over [Exhibit 12]. The issues of the JHR which I have edited have included timely research articles and reviews (the sine qua non of a historical journal); six lectures presented to IHR's last conference. original and up-to-date revisionist news and comment; explanation and

exhortation from the editor to subscribers (in interpretative "From the Editor" essays and in cover letters soliciting contributions); and other features both useful to LSF/IHR and satisfying to subscribers. In my first year as JHR Editor I cultivated new JHR writers such as Don Heddesheimer ("The War Journalism of Boris Polevoi," JHR 21/1), the late Audre Pinque, or "MacKenzie Paine" ("At the Tolerance Museum," JHR 20/1), Richard Widmann ("Transfer to the Reich," JHR 21/2), and Scott Smith ("Disney's \$140 Million Dud," JHR 20/3), and re-enlisted a number of contributors estranged by my predecessor. It has been my policy to be prompt and fair with authors, by quickly informing whether their submissions have been accepted for publication, or rejected for whatever reason [Exhibit 13]; by editing, not rewriting, articles for publication; by making no substantive changes (other than minor conformances to house style) without the writer's approval; and by insisting that writers be paid as promptly and as fairly as possible [Exhibits 14, 15, 16]. It has been my aspiration above all to make the JHR a publication that its subscribers are once again eager to read, and I believe that in this I have had some success.

During the following year I grew increasingly worried about LSF/IHR's financial condition. In mid-May 2001, for the first time in my eleven-year tenure at LSF/IHR, staff paychecks were deferred [Exhibit 17]. On June 14, 2001, President Raven informed the staff that the Liberty Lobby, a defendant in the Carto case, would soon be bankrupt, and that LSF/IHR was prepared to sell a key Liberty Lobby asset, the Spotlight mailing list, to the highest bidder. He mentioning two possible buyers: the Anti-Defamation League and the Church of Scientology. When I protested that such a sale would badly damage IHR's reputation, Raven defended it on the grounds that LSF/IHR's "current situation is not sustainable," that without selling the list to ADL "the IHR has no future." He also strongly hinted that firing me and Eric

Owens, another dissenting employee, was the only practical alternative [Exhibits 18 and 19].

I was next told by Raven and Weber that my apprehensions at our evident readiness to sell the names of "patriots" (among them doubtless not a few revisionists) to hostile groups were groundless because there had been no offer from such groups. I continued to express my unalterable opposition to a possible sale to the ADL to President Raven and Director Weber, and alerted the LSF Board of Directors to the problem [Exhibits 20 and 21].

Despite my efforts to restrain him, Owens broadcast emails (intended to be kept internal) from President Raven and Director Weber which made it clear that Raven was indeed countenancing the sale of the Spotlight list to the ADL [Exhibit 22]. Owens was fired, but the potentially gravely damaging emails soon reached the website of Willis Carto's Free American Press site. I succeeded in having an emergency Board meeting called in order to prevent a sale of the Spotlight mailing list to the ADL and like organizations [Exhibits 23 and 24]. During this meeting the Board expressed its adamant opposition to the LSF's selling the Spotlight list to the ADL.

Following the Board meeting I issued a public statement that alleviated much of the suspicion of LSF/THR that had arisen following the leak of the telltale emails. My statement exonerated Raven and Weber, imputing nearly all blame to Owens for his impetuosity [Exhibit 25] – despite the strong evidence to the contrary. During the week-long (June 14 to June 20) ADL crisis, I experienced intense hostility from President Raven, one manifestation of which was his tampering with my email password so that I could neither send nor receive messages while in the office. Since that time he has treated me with either coldness or undisguised animosity. Throughout the incident, during which I



experienced much upset, Director Weber sided completely with President Raven. To date neither has shouldered any responsibility, nor expressed the least regret, for his role in the affair.

Here it is worth noting that there would likely have been no flap over selling the Spotlight list to the ADL if IHR had been attending to its traditional income-producing activities, above all by promoting its large stock of books and tapes. In that case, instead of a penniless IHR trying to sell revisionism's implacable enemies a list that reportedly contained the names of over 50,000 readers interested in many of issues addressed by IHR and the Noontide Press, the Institute could have kept the Spotlight list and devised a mailing capable of bringing in many new names as well as a strong infusion of cash. To this day, as of my knowledge, LSF/IHR has been unable to recover the Spotlight list, which by now, under the tender ministrations of the Carto forces, is probably all but worthless.

At the June 220 emergency meeting the Board of Directors elected as its Chairman Robert Berger Lynch, an engineer and attorney with considerable experience in serving on corporate boards. Lynch asked that President Raven devise a budget, previously unknown at LSF/IHR, and ordered that the staff begin holding periodic and frequent meetings. The Board urged that President Raven "report more frequently to board members on corporate financial and legal affairs," at least once a month, more often if needed. The Chairman also asked that Raven submit to him a list of LSF/IHR employees, to include job titles and descriptions, and recommended that a mission statement be drawn up for IHR [Exhibit 26]. Shortly afterward, President Raven submitted a list of employee job titles (of which he attributed to himself about a dozen), but without job descriptions (his list betrayed that no employee had even titular responsibility for editing books, for editing the Noontide catalogue, for

editing a newsletter, or for organizing IHR's conferences') [Exhibit 27]. Within a week or two, to my knowledge the Chairman and Director Weber were ignoring every one of the Chairman's other instructions.

At a meeting of staff during the ADL crisis I had for the first time expressed strong concern over IHR's overall lack of direction and drift. To which President Raven had replied, only partly facetiously, "That's what we do here: we drift." The drift continued, and LSF/IHR's financial crisis intensified throughout the summer and early fall of 2001. Payment of salary to staff for the period ending July 1 was delayed until October 2; for the period ending October 1, until October 25. Raven's efforts to stave off bankruptcy were devoted almost entirely to recovering the chief assets from the Carto and Liberty Lobby bankruptcy (the Spotlight list, the Cartos' house, and a substantial bequest from a supporter in New Jersey), none of which was recovered by the end of 2001.

In my office of Treasurer, I pressed President Raven and Director Weber for financial and legal information. I seldom got specifics, except to hear periodically that either disaster loomed, or that the unexpected generosity of a supporter or benefactor had providentially bailed LSF/IHR out of impending financial collapse (as happened once or twice last fall). In a memo of September 6, 2001, to LSF officers and three Board members, President Raven repeated his emergency message of June 14, 2001, reporting that LSF/IHR's financial situation was "bad": there was less than \$5,000 on hand, and the corporation owed \$65,000, including "substantial amounts of money" to "key vendors" (e.g., our printers), who could not to be counted on for service until our bills were paid [Exhibit 28].

During these months, I repeatedly recommended to President Raven and Director Weber, orally and in writing, that we plan and act to make the most of LSF/IHR's tradi-

tional strengths and assets. I urged that LSF/IHR increase revenue through more effective promotion of its inventory of books and tapes (with a sale value of several hundred thousand dollars), by means of fresh advertising and by offering discounts. In mind of LSF/IHR's recent inability to publish anything new, I urged that outside books be bought and resold to increase interest in our book promotions. I called for scheduling and organizing a conference without delay, and recommended that the IHR begin planning for the resumption of a regular newsletter as soon as feasible. To generate the necessary resources for these steps, I advocated that LSF/IHR approach its most generous contributors with a concrete plan for returning the organization to its core functions – research, publishing, sales, fundraising, and outreach to non-revisionists – in exchange for those contributors' aid, holding out the anticipated Carto assets as a sort of collateral for those supporters who might prefer to lend, rather than contribute, their support [Exhibits 29]. My written and spoken pleas evoked neither action nor comprehensible explanations for their inaction from the President and IHR's Director.

I communicated the above ideas for revitalizing LSF/IHR to the Chairman and two other LSF Directors as well as the President and IHR's Director [Exhibit 30]. Two weeks later, at LSF/IHR's annual Board meeting, Chairman Lynch called for intensified efforts to promote and sell LSF/IHR's inventory, and urged a more dynamic IHR website. The Chairman again suggested creating a mission statement for IHR, and applauded a draft statement I read to the meeting [Exhibit 31].

To provide for closer direction of the staff, the Board authorized formation of an informal executive committee consisting of the Chairman, LSF Director Harvey Taylor, LSF Director and Secretary Weber, LSF's President, and LSF's Treasurer [Exhibit 32]. To date, however, IHR continues to

be without a mission statement, to have a lackluster website (in particular the cardinally important home page), and to fail to promote its books and tapes effectively.

The money crisis wore on through the fall. On November 8 we learned from the President that the corporation was once again out of money, just weeks after receiving a large donation. I continued to advise, with increasing urgency, that LSF/IHR promote the sale of its stock through better advertising, discounts, and offering new books from other publishers.

Although LSF/IHR had recently had good success in selling (at steep discounts) a large number of books (many of which LSF/IHR had long stocked and sold) recently acquired from James J. Martin's publishing house, President Raven and Director Weber opposed discounting our stock if so doing would result in a paper loss against prior costs of production, storage, shipping, etc., as if the value of the inventory, much of which has been exposed to heat, cold, dampness, and insects in IHR's warehouse for years, might appreciate in the future – and as if the high price in rent of warehousing tens of thousands of books and tapes, which easily occupy half of IHR's premises, were not a consideration. IHR management's refusal to discount books that aren't selling is of course completely at variance with standard publishing and bookselling policy.

At this meeting President Raven, who in the past had opposed reselling books for fear of endangering the LSF's tax status, stated that buying and selling books from other publishers led to problems with vendors, and that he had difficulties in computing sales taxes on out-of-state orders. In a memo to three Directors and President Raven, I reiterated and elaborated my previous concerns and repeated certain critical observations I had made in the meeting.

My persistence in pressing for action to revitalize IHR achieved only one tangible result: the President and the

Director began a campaign of pressure and harassment evidently intended either to silence me or to drive me from the Institute.

In producing JHR issues 20/1 (Jan-Feb 01) and 20/2 (Mar-Apr 01) I had gained over a month of time lost by my predecessor [Exhibit 34]. My performance on issues 20/3 (May-Jun 01) and 20/4 (Jul-Aug 01 ) was less satisfactory, partly owing to a shortfall in usable material, partly over the need to adjust to the changed situation after September 11, but also due to my anxieties over LSF/IHR's financial straits. Nonetheless, in my first eight months as editor I was able to produce four issues (the best showing for the JHR in years), and I had grown confident of my ability to fill each issue with first-rate material.

During those months cooperation on producing the JHR left something to be desired. I tolerated (grudgingly) occasional changes to the text of articles introduced by the Chairman or the Director during the formatting process. I did my best to use the cumbersome Adobe FrameMaker software program, designed for producing books, as a word processor. I accepted President Raven's control over the final formatting of all JHR text, despite his (or FrameMaker's) inability to make proper footnotes (resulting in page after page of endnotes in longer research articles); to generate more than a couple of levels of headings (a severe liability in a periodical); and to format pages of text in anything other than two columns.

On November 8, 2001, President Raven and Director Weber informed me of their plan for an "intervener" to take over any issue of the JHR I had failed to complete by deadline. The intervener would then fill the issue with stopgap material and bring it to press. I protested this drastic remedy: it seemed premature (all the more so because the intervener was to be the JHR's previous editor, IHR Director Weber) and it introduced serious problems of editorial con-

trol. Nonetheless, I decided to take the intervener proposal as a challenge. I announced my intent to fill a double issue, JHR 20/5-6 [Sep-Dec], by Christmas vacation, and told the President and Director that I would be moving to a back office in the warehouse in order to focus on editing and writing 64 or more JHR pages in the following six weeks. Working in the back office was not an innovation: I had retreated there from time to time during the previous two years, and the year before President Raven had urged IHR Director Weber to move there to complete his book on the Holocaust [Exhibit 35]. At this time neither Raven nor Weber objected to my plans for a combined issue or for relocating to the back office.

During the month and a half before Christmas, President Raven's only response to my challenge was to be hostile and uncommunicative. During the same period Director Weber entered my office a dozen times or more to offer articles or ideas for articles, and to attempt to pressure me into running items I chose not to publish. My rejections, then and afterwards, were due to my desire to keep the race question out of the JHR, in line with an IHR policy that had been much trumpeted by Director Weber as a reason for Carto's ouster; to my resolve to consider the Jewish question only within well-defined revisionist parameters; and to my insistence on balance, proportion, relevance, freshness, and other typical editorial concerns. Although I had been devoting a growing portion of the JHR to news and comment about revisionist concerns and revisionist activity (including several sizable articles by Director Weber), at the end of November I was presented by Weber with a memorandum claiming that I was violating JHR policy by neglecting "revisionist activism" [Exhibit 36]. He concluded this memo by stating: "If need be, I will appeal to the other members of the corporate board to back me on this."

I was able to write and edit enough content to fill a 72-

page issue by the time of my departure several days before Christmas. In addition to editing two lengthy articles (by Brian Renk and Daniel Michaels) and various shorter pieces, I wrote about fifteen pages of news, commentary, and reviews. This required working seven days a week: visiting the local university library to comb through two dozen or so historical journals for the articles best fitted for the "In Other Journals" feature; reading books for review as I walked to and from work; and spending Thanksgiving day in my apartment to edit a major research article.

Since the intervention threat had put a premium on supplying edited text at the expense of such final details as proofreading and production, I chose to leave those to President Raven and IHR Director Weber. For all their avowed readiness to complete an issue, it took them three weeks to bring that issue to press, during which time (I subsequently discovered) they made various unauthorized changes in the text, illustrations, caption, and cover photograph. In line with his earlier practice, Weber failed to include a cover letter - a potentially costly omission since the year-end issue called for a strong pitch to resubscribe to the many readers whose subscriptions were lapsing. Rather than concede that I had done good work in gaining two months on our goal of returning the JHR to schedule and in filling a double issue with outstanding material, Raven and Weber instead faulted me for this or that minor editorial imperfection, and argued that somehow the JHR had lost ground.

A reason for my retreat to the back office had been harassment that I had been getting for some weeks before from the shipping clerk, Gary Ontiveros. After my move to the back, Ontiveros intensified his annoyances. To his previous practices of making insulting remarks about my presumed medication ("Did you take your Prozac today?"), felicitations on my making the morning coffee ("You'd make

somebody a nice wife in jail"), and belching loudly and repeatedly in close proximity to my desk in the front office, Ontiveros added: making crank (hang-up) phone calls to me over the intercom; loudly rattling my door; and providing running, sneering commentary every time I came out to go the refrigerator, the bathroom, etc. Ontiveros' behavior was surprising to me, because we had previously been amicable enough. Despite the distractions, however, at first I did not protest, believing that Ontiveros would eventually give up if he couldn't rile me.

On Tuesday, January 29 of this year, President Raven scolded in an email that since "once again, we did not make enough money to provide for even our own paychecks," paychecks would once again be deferred [Exhibit 37]. Reminded that the 2002 Noontide catalogue was past due, President Raven stated that the catalogue was nearly complete and that it remained only for IHR's Director and me to look it over [Exhibit 38]. When I defended my contribution to LSF/IHR against Raven's insinuations, he characterized me as "delusional" [Exhibit 39].

On my initiative we met the next day. President Raven told me that if the current issue, JHR 21/1 (Jan-Feb 2002) were not at the printer's by February 15 (five weeks after the previous JHR had gone to press), he would "drop the hammer" by ordering that I not be paid for that period. Both Director Weber and I challenged his authority, and fairness, in making this threat. At this meeting I protested. For the first time, the ongoing hazing I had been receiving from Ontiveros. President Raven and Director Weber stated that it was useless to attempt to control Ontiveros' behavior, Weber characterizing the clerk as a "force of nature," and Raven pointing to his long record of obstreperousness. When I demanded that the President reprimand Ontiveros and order that he cease his harassment, Raven told me that the matter was between me and Ontiveros. When, following this



meeting, I asked Ontiveros why he was behaving as he had, he accused me of threatening, him and stated that he would answer only to President Raven.

Several days later, after another confrontation with the shipping clerk, and reluctant to work in the unheated back office in the cold of last February, I announced that I would temporarily work from my home [Exhibit 40]. President Raven countered with a memo in which he argued that it was up to me to gain Ontiveros' respect, and bade me to return to my desk (meaning my front office cubicle). His memo also taxed me for hypocrisy, sloth, bad manners, cowardice, cheating subscribers, claiming special privileges, and having grown surly and "conspiracy-minded" [Exhibit 41]. I defended my conduct in an email in which I noted: "It strikes me that Gary took the generally chilly atmosphere around here, which dates from my refusal to see the sale of the Spotlight [mailing list] to ADL, Dees, et al., go unchallenged, as some sort of license. Even so, that it was tolerated when I was under intense pressure to produce the last Journal is inexplicable to me" [Exhibit 42].

A few days later I discovered that while President Raven had refused to reprimand Ontiveros face to face, he had issued a revised version of the "Employee Guidelines," dated February 1, 2002, which included this odd new rule: "Employees are not to make gratuitous and/or rude noises - including singing, humming, whistling, belching, or talking to oneself - which disturb other employees" [Exhibit 43].

As February 15 neared, President Raven and Director Weber intensified their efforts to depict the JHR as falling increasingly behind schedule to LSF Directors and other interested parties. This was attempted by representing my optimistic target date a hard-and-fast deadline; by assessing my shortfalls from target dates as time lost (i.e., bringing out an issue in six weeks rather than the aspired five counted as the "loss" of seven days); assigning the previous editor's lag

to me; and harassing me or tolerating my harassment to distract me from my duties. Uncertain as to whether I would be paid, and concerned about the attacks on my editing, I hit on the idea of polling leading JHR subscribers in hopes of gaining support. I received about twenty replies from the thirty or forty revisionist scholars and leaders to whom I emailed the poll. The response was overwhelmingly positive, and contained much useful advice and criticism as well. Several replies are appended as Exhibit 44; two emails in that group are actually unsolicited evaluations of the following issue, JHR 21/1.

I had reported President Raven's threat to withhold my salary to the Chairman of the Board and Director Harvey Taylor. Both seemed supportive, and each stated that he was gratified by my willingness to continue working with President Raven. After days of tension, I was paid in full for the first two weeks in February, thanks to pressure from the Chairman and other Directors. A week later, Chairman Lynch visited the LSF/IHR offices. He met separately with President Raven and me (IHR Director Weber was on vacation). At a meeting with the two of us, the Chairman called for better communication and more meetings, reaffirmed my editorial control of the JHR, and charged me with obtaining all relevant data on IHR's financial situation. The Chairman also asked President Raven what the circulation of the JHR was. Although he conceded that it had fallen drastically since 1995, Raven informed the Chairman that the JHR's circulation was impossible to determine.

For a week or two following the Chairman's visit, there was a partial thaw in relations between President Raven and me. At a staff meeting two weeks after the visit, I discussed my problem areas in editing, and refrained from searching questions or criticism vis-a-vis Raven and IHR Director Weber's performance in IHR's continuing crisis. Buoyed by material on hand, and planning to write a long article I had

already researched, I ventured to try to finish the next JHR in thirty days, offering April 1 as a target date (not a deadline). Still, Raven and Weber gave no specific answers to my questions about LSF's legal situation in the Carto cases, or on ideas for making our inventory more salable through discounts or new advertisements. Nor were they able to set a date for completion of the catalogue, despite Raven's earlier notice that the catalogue, although nearly finished, was late as of January 29 [Exhibit 37]. On March 14, the President informed us that, after estimating projected expenses, IHR had under \$3,000 on hand to meet other expenses over the coming several months.

A few days later, a telephone conference between the staff and the Chairman was arranged to address my concerns over IHR's continuing failure to generate income through sales of its stock. The conference foundered, however, on the objections of IHR (and LSF) Director Weber, who asserted afterwards "that such meetings were a waste of time and money" [Exhibit 45]. I replied with an email that stressed the critical importance of generating maximum feasible income from our large stocks before summer

For a while after the Chairman's visit, Ontiveros' antics died down. Around the beginning of April, however, the shipping clerk resumed his badgering of me. On April 5 both Director Weber and I asked President Raven to order Ontiveros to cease. While Raven stated that "this has gone too far," and agreed to speak to Ontiveros, he again refused to discipline him, and declared that he could provide no guarantee that Ontiveros' harassment would not resume. In a memo dated April 25, and placed in Ontiveros' and my files, President Raven described me, quite falsely, as "mightily agitated" during our conversation, and made no mention of the IHR Director's participation on my behalf [Exhibit 47]. In the same memo Raven reiterated in writing that he would not guarantee that he could control Ontiveros'

behavior in our workplace. This memo represented me as "in far worse breech [sic] of conduct than Ontiveros," "abusive toward others," and "utterly in breech [sic] of the employee guidelines." President Raven concluded another memo of the same day, addressed to Ontiveros and copied to me, by telling the clerk (who had asked Raven to reprimand me): "Again, thanks for understanding, and for helping to make LSF a better place to work" [Exhibit 48].

Since returning to LSF/IHR in 1999, I had noticed that Ontiveros was often sullen and uncooperative. He was frequently rude to customers on the telephone. He had repeatedly harassed two promising employees, Ron Gray and Eric Owens; when I raised this problem with President Raven at the time, he blandly informed me that Ontiveros was simply afraid that they might make him expendable. One employee told me that Ontiveros had hung up the telephone on his wife; the wife of another employee told me that the clerk had done the same to her. Searching employee files after Ontiveros had begun harassing me, I discovered memos written by Director Weber that recorded repeated instances, indeed a "persistent pattern," of rudeness and insolence toward him by Ontiveros [Exhibits 49, 50, 51]. In one of these, his memo of May 12, 1998, Weber stated: "Greg acknowledged that Gary is sometimes rude, not only to me, but also to customers he deals with over the phone. Greg said that he has admonished Gary about speaking rudely to customers."

As March passed President Raven and IHR Director Weber began to insist that my target date of April 11 (a JHR turnaround of thirty days) was a formal deadline. Weber intensified his threats to remove effective editorship from my hands by having the Board establish his control of JHR "policy," including decision on content. Raven continued to withhold information on LSF's financial situation and decision making from me. Both Chairman Lynch and I (as treas-

urer) were presented with something of a *fait accompli* by President Raven when he announced to us in March that, due to LSF's poor financial situation, the corporation had been forced to go into partnership with our attorney, Brian Sampson, to obtain the Carto house, a recovered asset that was encumbered by an exemption that had to be paid to the Cartos.

The catalogue continued undone, deferring vital income from sales. New books, such as *Holocaust Deception* (which IHR had contracted to publish years before and which has sat, ready for publication, on the Chairman's desk for two years), continued to go unpublished, while IHR classics were not reprinted. Thus Arthur Butz's *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the Institute's most important book and its all-time bestseller, on which President Raven and various employees had been tinkering for a year and a half, is now effectively out of print [Exhibit 52], and was to be excluded from the next catalogue [Exhibit 53].

Distressed by all these things, after a sleepless night I called in sick on Wednesday, April 10, and stayed out of the office for ten days. While I was depressed, I did not call my doctor, since I was neither delusional, nor panicked, nor suicidal, and I continued to take my prescribed medication. My conduct in temporarily retreating from work, family, and friends was an irrational, but I believe understandable, response, given my diagnosed condition of bipolar disorder (or manic depression), to the pressures, concerns, and unabated harassment under which I was working.

President Raven and Director Weber have long been familiar with my disability, which reportedly occurs with some frequency among creative persons. They were able to observe my behavior after the October 1993 ousting of Carto, when, following months of tension and a climactic free-for-all on IHR's premises with the Cartos and their hired

goons, I suffered an intense manic episode and was briefly hospitalized. During the next year I missed much time at work due to clinical depression, and left IHR in August 1994. In January 1995 my condition was diagnosed and I began treatment, which has continued to the present. On applying to IHR/LSF to return to full-time employment in 1999, I fully described my diagnosis and treatment in a letter to Weber [Exhibit 54]. At that time President Raven expressly mentioned, in a letter to the Board, the possibility that I might "relapse" [Exhibit 1].

Since returning to work at LSF/IHR I have made no secret of the fact that I am being treated for bipolar disorder, have mentioned my prescribed medication (lithium) to the other employees many times, and have made regular visits to my doctor during work hours since summer 2000. I believe that President Raven's various descriptions of me as "conspiracy-minded" [Exhibit 41] "delusional" [Exhibit 39]; and suffering "paranoid delusions" [Exhibit 55] were attempts to ridicule this disability as well as to represent me as deranged to members of the Board and possibly to other parties. And I strongly suspect that the President and the Director deliberately sought to induce in me some kind of mental breakdown through the various kinds of harassment they have subjected me to in recent months.

On April 23 I spoke by telephone to the Chairman, who urged me to resume my editorial duties at the office. I returned the next day. After speaking to Director Weber, I learned that he had done minimal editing on the current issue, despite an email he had sent me on April 17 stating that he was intervening to finish the issue on instruction from President Raven. On April 25 President Raven sent members of the Board a memo of his dissatisfaction with my alleged "lack of contrition" and "claim for special rights and privileges." He made the following prediction: "It appears, therefore, that we are fast approaching a situation where

Ted will either have to be fired for gross insubordination, or he will undertake some rash action that will precipitate the termination of his employment" [Exhibit 56].

In another memo of the same day, President Raven threatened to dismiss me for "job abandonment" for working in the back office and defiance of "normal work procedures and practices as outlined in the employee guidelines" [Exhibit 57]. Although there had been no complaints about the hours I worked at the office, I was next ordered to punch in and out on a timeclock.

During a meeting on April 25, President Raven told me that the Board had empowered him to take editorial control out of my hands. I asked for written confirmation of this, and received none. In a separate conversation, Director Weber urged on me an arrangement whereby he would step in as "acting editor," with final say over content, while I did the work of preparing articles for publication. I made clear to both Raven and Weber that I believed that only the Board had the authority to dismiss me as editor, reminding them of President Raven's several years of unsuccessful lobbying to have the previous editor replaced.

During the weekend of April 27-28, my level of anxiety so increased that I began to fear the onset of a manic episode. My doctor advised that it was most important that I avoid that. Thus I stayed home the next week, calling in each day to specify the reason for my absence to President Raven and Director Weber.

When I felt able to return to the office Monday, May 6, I found that President Raven had declared that I was no longer JHR editor [Exhibit 58]. Raven faulted me in the same memo for not consulting him and the IHR Director about "specifics of producing an issue" of the journal. I continued to express my position that only the Board was empowered to dismiss me as editor; that I would continue to work on articles I had chosen for the current JHR; and that, while I

welcomed consultation with both the President and IHR's Director, as editor I did not feel it was my obligation to approach them.

On or about May 6, Chairman Lynch informed me by telephone that he supported my continuing as editor under working conditions without harassment, and offered me the prospect of regaining the pay I had lost during my absences if I could speedily finish the current issue of the JHR to my regular standard. On May 6 several members of the Board discussed my case. After believing he had mustered a majority of Board members in support of his position, the Chairman learned that LSF Director Harvey Taylor had decided to give unconditional support to the President and IHR's Director [Exhibit 59]. Chairman Lynch was thereupon asked to resign as Chairman of the Board by President Raven, in a letter which excoriated him for backing my "lunatic version of events here." Raven further wrote: "Throughout it all, you insist on dealing with Mark and me in a high-handed and duplicitous manner. Your ignorance of the situation here and your ingratitude toward Mark and myself are inexcusable" [Exhibit 60]. Given his inability to convince the other Directors that operations at IHR needed oversight and improvement, Chairman Lynch resigned from LSF's Board.

On May 9 I was told that by Director Weber that President Raven had left the office to seek legal advice on dismissing me as Editor. On the next day both Raven and Weber told me that they had not been aware that I had a disability. I was informed by the President that my employment was in danger, and was again faulted for not surrendering JHR editorial control without a written notice of dismissal from the Board.

Several days later I sent a petition, with supporting evi-



dence. to LSF's remaining Directors, asking them to restore my editorial control under working conditions free from harassment, to dismiss Gary Ontiveros, and to allow for restoring the pay I had lost due to the harassment. As I awaited the Board's answer, Director Weber pressed me to consign him editorial control as "acting editor," while I did the editorial work. On May 21, Weber assailed me for alleged imperfections in the several articles and reviews I had edited for the current issue. After I stood behind my work, on the next morning I was handed a letter by Raven that placed me on "unpaid administrative leave" until June 3 [Exhibit 61].

Despite my having petitioned LSF's Board of Directors, I had little confidence that it would act boldly to change things. I could not help but recall that in 1999 none of the remaining three directors (besides Mark Weber) had so much as answered a letter from President Raven containing his threat to resign if Weber were not dismissed as JHR editor (Raven's letter came after several years of attempting to get the Board to act on the editorial crisis).

In early June I was mailed a copy of the Board's undated resolution rejecting all my requests [Exhibit 62]. I was also dismissed as LSF's Treasurer, in evident disregard of my diligent attempts to generate corporate income and to protect corporate assets. It seems clear that the resolution was drafted by Raven and Weber, and it would appear that the Board approved it without serious discussion. Since then I have avoided, on medical advice and my own preference, taking part in what for me had once been a calling as well as an aspired career, but since last fall has been a distinctly hostile work environment: the Legion for the Survival of Freedom and the Institute for Historical Review.

As I completed this report, on June 19, 2002, the current issue of the Journal of Historical Review, which President Raven and IHR Director Weber have controlled since April

17, has yet to be delivered to the printer.

#### **APPENDIX FOUR**

### **Dr. Robert Faurisson's Letter Accusing Mark Weber of Abandoning Traditional Revisionism**

Robert Faurisson to Mark Weber, editor of the Journal of Historical Review, December 17, 2003

On December 10, I sent you a message in which, inter

alia, I wrote: "Tell me whether or not you say, as I myself have so clearly stated for so many years, that the alleged Nazi gas chambers and the alleged Nazi gas vans never existed." You soon replied to all the other parts of my message but not to that one.

I had to repeat my question three or four times over three or four days before getting your answer, which is now: "I do not like to say that 'the Nazi gas chambers never existed', in part because I do not regard myself as any kind of specialist of 'gas chambers', and in part because

I avoid making such categorical statements (on any subject)". This brings us back to your April 1993 position when, at a dinner in Washington, I asked our guests to say YES, NO or I DO NOT KNOW to the sentence: "The Nazi gas chambers existed". Your own answer was "MAYBE".

The next day or so I told you how ashamed I had felt of you with that answer. You told me you had been wrong and that you would never give such an answer again. But look: ten years later, you are doing it again.

People who accuse Adolf Hitler and Germany of having conceived, invented and used such Weapons of Mass Destruction as "the gas chambers or gas vans" have been unable, in more than half a century, to substantiate their formidable accusation; finally, those WMDs were never to be found, never to be seen, never to be shown or even drawn. But you, Mark Weber, a supposed revisionist, you keep on saying that you "do not like to say" that the abominable accusation is so obviously false!

Mark Weber has had a friend and collaborator, Robert Faurisson, who, already in the very first issue (Volume 1, Number 1) (Spring 1980) of the *Journal of Historical Review*, published a short essay on "The Mechanics of Gassings" and, in Volume 2, Number 4 (Winter 1981), published another short piece entitled: "The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to be Physically Inconceivable". In more

than twenty years, the Liars and Defamers of Germany have been unable to refute either of those essays, particularly the latter, which, in the words of Barbara Kulaszka, as early as 1981 put forth so clearly and briefly all of the subsequent revisionist argumentation on the alleged Nazi gas chambers.

Recently, Mark, you have stated on an American radio talk show: "I do not deny the Holocaust happened but..." I immediately told you how deadly wrong it was to make such a concession to The Big Lie and Defamation. And you agreed, promising you would not do it again. The trouble is that I no longer trust your promises in such matters. I could cite you another recent example of a possible disquieting concession on your part but will refrain from doing so.

In any case, if the Editor of the Journal of Historical Review "does not like to say" that the abominable accusation against Germany is clearly a lie, a calumny, a slander, an act of defamation, I am ill at ease being on his Editorial Advisory Committee. So, Mark, please take my name off your Committee roster. I am afraid some of your personal enemies among the revisionists will take the opportunity of this letter to criticize you even more. I warn those people that they may do so on the sole condition that they have, for their part, already clearly stated that the alleged Nazi gas chambers or gas vans never existed not only in such or such camp or place but nowhere else either.

**APPENDIX FIVE**

**Dr. Arthur Butz Calls for the Resignation of  
Mark Weber as editor of  
the Journal of Historical Review**

November 29, 2002

Dear Mark,

I have received and looked over the May/August (sic) issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. It is 32 pages in length, with 4.5 pp. of ads, not counting the covers. Since a normal bimonthly issue consists of 40-48 pages, you have cut the length to approximately 1/3 of normal. Subscribers are entitled to feel cheated.

When in early 2001 Ted O'Keefe took over the *Journal* from you, its schedule was five months behind. The January/February 2002 issue, the last to appear while Ted O'Keefe was employed, was three months late, having picked up two months in the year he was editor. The March/April 2002 issue, published under your editorial control after he left, but whose main contents were prepared by him, was six months late. If the current issue had been dated May/June, it would have been seven months late. Since you have called it the May/August issue, I suppose you now view the present publication schedule as five months behind, as it was in early 2001. Is that something you are celebrating?

Ted's double issue (September/December 2001) had to be a real double issue. Your double issue is a 2/3 or at best 80 percent [of an] issue.

I found the contents not only meager but generally uninteresting, old hat, and/or stale. From the Weber/Irving remarks on Fritjof Meyer, a reader could draw the conclusion that what revisionists have been saying all along is that there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz, only near Auschwitz.

I thought the best thing was the letter by Graf, but I

don't think it was so good as to merit publication for republication was not the deletion of the redundant words "is equally absurd" that appeared in the March/April issue; that trivial error could have been overlooked or handled in the Corrections on page 16 if noted at all.

The republication of the Graf letter is one of those little things that can have enormous implications. It is like a fortuitous flash of lightning that illuminates a dark corner concealing some crucial secret. Even if you have some sort of explanation, the reader will conclude that you are not focused on what you are doing because you apparently forgot that the letter was published in the previous issue.

That interpretation makes a lot of sense. As I have said many times, you are the best qualified person, in terms of knowledge and ability, for the editor's job. That you don't perform is explained by the apparent fact that you are not focused on it.

Every gentle effort that has been made in the past, such as Greg Raven's nagging of you, and my discreetly expressed complaints starting several years ago, has been of no avail. Criticism during the past six months has been less gentle and no more effective. Your failure to perform now can only force me to conclude that you never will perform as editor. I give up and I believe everybody else already has.

Not long ago I received the current issue of Germar Rudolf's journal, with the "IHR: Sinkt das Schiff" article. A few weeks later, in a weird counterpoint of confirmation, I received "May/August" issue!

Of course I condemn GR's [Germar Rudolf's] personal attacks on you, and I congratulate you for not responding in kind. That doesn't get the Journal into the mail either.

Any reader of the Journal sees that there is something very wrong there. At this point the source of the trouble is inescapably clear. Your stewardship has brought it to the brink of extinction.

As a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee, I ask that you resign as editor of the Journal. Since no editor worthy of the job would take it under the condition that you retain oversight, I ask you to surrender that role as well.

Best regards,

Art Butz.

Here's the eye-opening first-hand account, by Eric Owens, a former employee of the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), of what's really going on inside the IHR and of the plan by IHR figures Greg Raven and Mark Weber to sell the mailing list of the now-defunct Spotlight to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

Owens, a young Celtic folk musician who has been involved in political affairs for some twelve years, was the newest employee of the IHR, hired earlier this year. It was after he discovered the plan by his superiors, Raven and Weber, to sell The Spotlight subscriber list to the IHR and went public that Raven fired him.

The former IHR employee told the whole amazing story in an interview on July 31 with Pastor Dan, host of an Internet radio program that can be found at [wdx.com/2seed/](http://wdx.com/2seed/). (Cassettes or CDs of this interview and previous programs can be had by writing: Tapes, PO Box 5151, Huntington, Indiana 46750 or call (219) 356-2611.)

What follows is a slightly abbreviated transcription of Owens' remarks.

In the course of his interview, Owens pointed out that, "I had no beef with the IHR before this thing happened. I was quite happy with my job. I'm not a Spotlight or [Willis] Carto guy or anything like that. I never worked for Carto. I wrote one article for him and felt I was underpaid and never wrote anything else. That was pretty much it." So Owens cannot be accused of being a shill for Willis Carto or the now-



defunct Spotlight.

Those who have had any doubts about the intentions or the integrity of Greg Raven and Mark Weber may read Owens' comments for themselves and will find that, in fact, his words have an eerie echo of the very things that The Spotlight reported over the years about the IHR affair.

I had contacted the IHR to see if they wanted anybody to work there and it turned out that they did. It was right before the Beirut conference and I guess they felt that they had some money coming in and that they were going to need an extra person. I went down and interviewed and got the job and I was really happy about it. I wanted to have a movement job where I could work full time for my race, the way I see it.

I was very happy there and so I started off, supposed to kind of help out and I had a lot of skills so I was supposed to anything that they needed. I laid out some advertisements for them and got them some ads on some websites, things of that nature, as well as transcribing speeches and things for the Journal of Historical Review. After a few months they made me an Assistant Editor of the Journal and things were going along great.

At the time, we were proofreading Arthur Butz's book [The Hoax of the 20th Century] which is supposed to be rereleased and so everything was fine. I was quite happy there. Then it just kind of came out of the blue—this whole thing.

It was really just bizarre. I was working, proofreading this book. They've had a long-running legal battle with Willis Carto and Liberty Lobby, who published The Spotlight. I had pretty much stayed out of all of that. It was kind of the main theme of the IHR—that legal battle—internally, anyway. There's at least as much time and effort given to that as

there is putting out the Journal.

I didn't really have a strong opinion on the case, one way or the other. I didn't really know that many details about it. I've heard bad things about Carto in the past from a lot of people I respect and I had never heard anything bad about the IHR except from *The Spotlight*, and unfortunately *The Spotlight* has printed some bad things about other people that I know to be good. So anyway, I figured, I'm on the right side of this issue.

Although I thought the legal battle was in bad taste—to have two racial or quasi-racial groups, at least—battling over movement money to the point where lawyers seem to be getting all the money that racialists have donated. It seemed like a drag. I just kind of stayed out of it. I wasn't really interested in the inter-office talk about the case. I would just kind of let it go by and let them handle it and I did my job.

Anyway, it was pretty typical. Greg Raven, the president of the IHR, had gotten off the phone with one of lawyers—he has several lawyers. He got off the phone and he walked over to Mark Weber's desk. Mark is the director of the IHR. He was telling him—well, I just heard “ADL” and something about the ADL making some—wanting to buy the Liberty Lobby, because they [the IHR] were about to seize the Liberty Lobby. Apparently it was winding down and they were about to get ahold of it.

When I heard this, I thought, “Whoa, what's that?” I jumped out of my chair and walked over there so I would hear this, since it sounded bizarre to me. So when I went over there, they were indeed saying that the ADL had made some kind of offer through one of his [Raven's] lawyers. I expected there to be laughter all around and everybody to say, “Yeah, ha ha ha, we're going to sell to the ADL.” That wasn't at all what was happening.

In fact, the gist of it was like “Wow! How much can we get [from the ADL]” and “That's going to be great.” It was real-

ly bizarre.

I looked at Ted [O'Keefe], who is the editor of the Journal, just to see if my ears were deceiving me. Ted grimaced at me like he was indeed hearing the same thing I was. I was just flabbergasted.

Anyway, so it ended up with it getting kind of divided in half. Me and Ted were adamantly opposed to any idea, the whole idea, of selling anything to the ADL. Greg and Mark kind of closed ranks together and were actually defending the idea.

Basically, they were going to seize the Liberty Lobby and all the court decisions were going in their direction. So there were something like ten days or so before this would actually take place. So we were kind of pressed for time. These guys were going great guns for this.

We opposed it and then they argued with us about it and we exchanged several e-mails about it, as well as conversations. Basically, Ted started it off by saying that we shouldn't even considering selling to any of these people and I agreed. I seconded him. Then, Greg sent [an e-mail] back, basically saying that, "Well, we're not making enough money. Things are kind of running around, and if we don't -" he sort of mockingly said, "We can go out of business with our principles intact or we can see what kind of offers there are and make our decision."

At that point, Ted went and told Arthur Butz, being that he is on the IHR's advisory committee. He told Arthur Butz and wanted to let him know about this, and then wanted to try to contact a couple of board members. Well, when Greg Raven and Mark Weber found out that the board members were going to find out and that Arthur Butz had been informed, they pretty much freaked out.

They went into the bank office and had a private meeting between the two of them and excluded Ted and myself. It [was] kind of normal for them to exclude me from meet-

ings since I was the low guy on the totem pole and Greg doesn't like anyone else to discuss his ideas. Mark is pretty much—well, he's called the "director" but he really doesn't do anything there. So Greg kind of gets to run the show and Ted is more into just publishing and not into confrontation. That was fine.

I didn't mind being excluded. I figured I was new and that was no problem. But it was very strange for them to exclude Ted. Ted was the editor of the Journal and up until then Ted was never excluded from any meetings. It was real backroom, sneaky activity to have a meeting without Ted being invited in.

So they came out of the meeting after about an hour or an hour and a half and they called a meeting for all four of us. We all sat down and basically the gist of the meeting was just to pressure Ted and I (although they really didn't confront me too much, because up until that point, I hadn't said anything publicly; I was waiting to see if Ted could handle it). They just pressured Ted not to tell anybody else. That was their whole concern: that he not tell anyone else.

In exchange, Ted and myself also asked, "Well, this doesn't even have to be an issue. All you guys have to do is say that you aren't going to sell to the ADL under any circumstances."

The reason why we said that is because they had started backpeddling. The board members and Arthur Butz had started becoming alarmed about this and they started to pretend that this had never happened [and was] just a figment of Ted's and my imagination and that there had been no offer at all from the ADL and that it was just kind of a joke and that we took it wrong.

This was after a couple of days of arguing about it, really arguing over the issue. So it wasn't like this was some sort of flippant remark that we mistook. They were really willing to go around and around about it.

Anyway, we said, "All you have to do to ease our concern is to just say flat out that if there ever would be an ADL offer, that you would reject it out of hand." Then they started basically backtracking and saying that it was all just kind of a figment of our imaginations.

So then, at that meeting, we said, "Fine. If that's the case, then state it clearly that no matter what happens, if there was ever an ADL offer that you would turn it down out of hand and we can all go on our merry way." When we said that, they were silent.

Then Mark Weber asked me, "Well, well, how much would they [the ADL] have to offer before you would agree to selling to the ADL?" I said, "None," and he said, "None?" like I was crazy or something. Then he said, "What if it were—I forget exactly what he said, 'ten million dollars?' or some [large sum] like that?" And Ted said, "No." Then Mark said, "You know that after a couple of months of haggling it would be down to \$10,000," or something like that. The whole idea was that, to the bitter end, they were going to defend [the idea of selling to the ADL]."

At this point, I just didn't trust these guys at all anymore. I didn't know who I was working for anymore. So it just became clear to me that I just couldn't work there anymore with these guys running the show. It was wrong.

I told Ted, "I've got to go public with this. I've got to let people know what's going on." Ted said, "No, no, no, don't do that. We'll handle it internally. Let me handle it."

So I said, "Okay. Let's call a board meeting. Let's at least let the whole IHR, the people on the board, know what's going on here so that there are no surprises later." He said he would do that. So he called a few of the board members, two or three of them.

The days went ticking by and nothing was happening, except that a couple of board members e-mailed saying that they wanted to be notified if any sale was going to take

place, or something like that.

At first I thought Greg and Mark were just deranged to want to sell to the ADL, but then after a couple of days, and after they started changing their story and pretending to me and Ted that the discussions had never occurred, then I knew they were liars. At that point, I was just really afraid to let it go on their word whether or not there was a sale taking place or not, because Greg was the only one in touch with any attorneys.

I don't know the legal procedures. I didn't know if there was something that he could cook up with one of his attorneys that would be un-doable by the time people found out. So at that point it got down to something like five days before this seizure of the Liberty Lobby, which boils down to just a mailing list since [according to Greg Raven—Ed.] Carto has diverted funds to other companies and this and that to keep all of his assets from being seized. So it basically came down to Liberty Lobby was going to consist of a mailing list of Spotlight subscribers.

At this point, I figured, I've tried to work internally and nothing is being done and now it's my reputation on the line. Either I am going to sit by and let these guys handle it and maybe there won't be an ADL sale or maybe there will be. But I would still know that my two superiors were two people with no morality and people who would sell out patriotic mailing lists to the highest bidder, even if they be enemies. That wasn't acceptable to me.

In the worst case scenario, it would be that they would go and sell to the ADL through some trick behind our back. I care about my reputation: I'm going to be "Eric Owens, who worked at the IHR, those guys who sold the mailing list to the ADL." So I just decided I couldn't work this way.

I forced the issue and talked to Ted again. I gave Ted five or six chances to get this thing resolved and to get a board meeting called. It didn't happen, so then I just went public.

I sent the whole story out on a public e-mail list, giving times and dates, and even included e-mails from Greg and Mark and Arthur Butz and everybody involved. This list was largely supporters of the IHR, so that they would know.

A couple hours after that, when Greg found out, I was fired for doing it. That was that. Then I packed my stuff, went home, and started looking for a new job.

Afterward, I didn't feel like I wanted to make it my life's work fighting with the IHR. I figured: "The information is out there. People can do what they want with it." I know that there are a lot of people so desperate for a voice that they are willing to accept leadership like [Raven and Weber] or, at least, they are willing to ignore, or deny to themselves, that the facts are true so that they can feel good about still supporting people like that. I understand that's the case and that's fine, so I wasn't going to bother trying to browbeat people with it and I just left it be.

Unfortunately, Greg Raven doesn't let it be, and he's been posting things against my character on the Internet, still to this day. Up until then I had turned down interviews on this show and other shows and even in right-wing newspapers about the issue because I didn't want attacking the IHR to be my reason to be. At this point, if they (Greg Raven, in particular) are going to attack my character, then it doesn't do me any good to sit on my hands.

Both of these guys are friendly guys and they can charm visitors, but they have no moral character. Obviously, from the discussions I had with Mark [Weber], it was clear to me that he was willing to bend any rule or do anything if there's enough money involved. So I just lost faith in them. Ted is still there and that's fine. He's willing to overlook a lot so that he can keep his job as editor. He got really cold feet when I went public and as it wore on, he saw that his job might be in jeopardy so he closed ranks with them in the end.

When they finally had their board meeting, it was only because I had gone public and it just ended up with them issuing a statement that they wouldn't sell to the ADL. But mostly the theme of the meeting was to do damage control because I had gone public. So the underlying problems are still there.

It's clear they have no loyalty to a lot of the people who are donating money to them. They are just people that I never want to talk to or deal with again. It's a sad thing.

The idea of being able to work with the IHR, and doing something that I believed in, kind of overwhelmed my better judgment. Normally when I see people involved in ten-year-long legal battles with other patriotic groups, I know that these guys are no good. I should have listened to my gut.

Greg Raven is president of the company and he runs the whole thing as his own personal enterprise, so basically Mark is a puppet director. He's not a director of anything. He doesn't do anything there, just kind of sits at his desk and contemplates his naval and sends e-mails. Greg's word is law. It's undisputed and that's the way it is.

The board of directors are really hands off and don't really know what's going on there. These guys are busy with their own lives and not real hands-on. They are hands-off. They don't know what's going on. When I actually got hold of the board of directors they didn't know who I was and I had worked there for like six months. In fact, I had to explain to a couple of them who Ted [O'Keefe] was and he's the editor of the Journal. So that shows you what kind of board of directors it is.

With that kind of a board of directors and Mark being kind of a non-entity and Ted being without any leadership role, then you basically have a one-man operation and that's Greg Raven. He knows all about the finances, he knows all about the lawyers, and he's running the show.



As far as production, they are not really putting anything out. They are getting the Journal going again and it's coming out regularly, and that's because Ted is handling the Journal, but I forget how many months they are behind, because when Mark was ostensibly the editor he got so far behind that it had to be taken out of his hands and put in Ted's hands. It's poorly run. It's another thing to have an organization with utterly corrupt leadership. Unfortunately they've got both situations there.

## **APPENDIX ONE**

### **What Hath Carto Wrought?**

**A list of all of the newspapers,  
magazines, books and pamphlets that Willis  
Carto has printed or reprinted over the years.**

Quite a remarkable list.

This might be of interest to Revisionists who have only heard negative things about Willis Carto that have emanated from those who are obviously unable to achieve the same stellar publishing record themselves —MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

**Here is the List:**

The Spotlight Newspaper - Weekly issues from 1975 through summer 2001

The Barnes Review magazine - Monthly and then bi-monthly from 1994 to present

American Free Press newspaper - Weekly beginning in the fall of 2001

Sixty issues of RIGHT newsletter, October 1955 to September 1960.

Seven Volumes of The American Mercury, published MONTHLY by WAC from 1968 to 1980.

Forty six volumes of the Journal of Historical Review, quarterly, Spring of 1980 through Winter 1992-1993.

Five volumes (8.5 x 11 format) of the JHR - Published in 1993 by IHR. NOTE: The "new" management of the IHR seem to have failed miserably and have been unable to churn out more than a handful of issues of the IHR's journal. Contrast this to the amazing output of Willis Carto and, for that matter, of Germar Rudolf.

Liberty Lowdown, newsletter by Liberty Lobby, Feb 1 1963 - June 1971, one hundred issues - additional volumes were published.

Liberty Letter, Nov. 1960 to June 1969 - One hundred issues, additional volumes were published.

Washington Observer Newsletter, approximately 200 issues, possibly more. Published beginning in 1965 up through approximately September 1976.

Western Destiny, multiple issues.

The First National Directory of Rightist Groups, Publications, and Some Individuals in the United States and Some Foreign Countries.

The Job Can Be Done, by Aldrich Blake (1954) - on the civil rights decisions.

White America, by Earnest Sevier Cox

Teutonic Unity, by Earnest Sevier Cox

Lincoln's Negro Policy, by Earnest Sevier Cox

Sex vs. Civilization, by Elmer Pendell

The Federal Reserve Bank, by H. S. Kenan

Dr. Strangebob: The Story of Robert Strange McNamara

The Moscow Treaty IQ and Racial Differences, by Henry Garrett

This is a Republic-Not a Democracy

The Occult Technology of Power

The Myth of the Six Million, by David Hoggan

Debunking the Genocide Myth, by Paul Rassinier

The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses, by Paul Rassinier

The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, by H. L. Mencken

Facts Are Facts, by Benjamin Freedman

The Anti-Christ, by Friedrich Nietzsche

Martin Larson's Best

The Case of Tyler Kent, by John Howland Snow

The Hybrid Race Doctrine, by Dr. Bela Hubbard

The Inequality of the Races, by Count Arthur DeGobineau

Timothy McVeigh: Mastermind or Patsy?

Money Made Mysterious, essays on money that appeared in THE AMERICAN MERCURY

Our Nordic Race, by Richard Kelly Hoskins

Tax Rebellion USA, by Dr. Martin A. Larson

Tax Revolt USA, by Dr. Martin A. Larson

The Great Tax Fraud, by Dr. Martin A. Larson

The Essene Christian Faith, by Dr. Martin A. Larson

The Hoax of the 20th Century, by Dr. Arthur Butz, originally Noontide Press, 1977

The Controversy of Zion, by Douglas Reed

Liberty Lobby Membership Cookbook

Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace, by Harry Elmer Barnes

Who Started the First World War?, by Harry Elmer Barnes

Revisionism and Brainwashing, by Harry Elmer Barnes

Blasting the Historical Blackout, by Harry Elmer Barnes

The Barnes Trilogy

Barnes Against the Blackout

George C. Wallace: The Electable Conservative

The Third Rome: Holy Russia, Czarism & Orthodoxy, by M. Raphael Johnson

Our Money Martyred President: A Tribute to Lincoln, by Colonel Dall

Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century, by Harry Elmer Barnes

FDR: My Exploited Father-in-Law, by Colonel Curtis B. Dall, published by IHR

Iron Curtain Over America, by John Beatty

Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Reappraisal, by H. Keith Thompson

Racial Realities in Europe, by Lothrop Stoddard

Advancement to Barbarism, The Development of Total Warfare, by A. J. P. Veale

The Veale File: War Crimes Discreetly Veiled

55 Men: The Story of the Constitution, by Fred Rodell, Noontide.

The Constitution of the United States: Its Sources and Applications, by Thomas J. Norton, Noontide.

The Secret Team, by L. Fletcher Prouty

Lindbergh on the Federal Reserve Failure at Nuremberg

No Time for Silence, by Dr. Arthur App

Report From Iron Mountain, by Leonard Lewin

Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War, by George Morgenstern

The Empire of the City, by H. C. Knuth

Communism in Germany

Waters Flowing Eastward

The Dynamics of War & Revolution, by Lawrence Dennis

The Coming American Fascism, by Lawrence Dennis

A Trial on Trial: The Great Sediton Trial of 1944, by Lawrence Dennis

Onward Christian Soldiers, by Donald Day

Gruesome Harvest, by Ralph Franklin Keeling

The Burden of Empire, by Garet Garrett

The Malmedy Trial

Worldwide Growth and Impact of Holocaust Revisionism, by Keith Stimeley

Behind the Balfour Declaration, by Dr. Robert John

Man & Technics, by Oswald Spengler

Sketches from Roman History, by Senator Tom Watson

FDR: The Other Side of the Coin, by Hamilton Fish

The Holocaust: 120 Questions & Answers, by Charles Weber

JFK: The Mystery Unraveled

Is Anne Frank's Diary a Hoax?, by Dietlieb Felderer

The Great Holocaust Trial, by Michael A. Hoffman II

The Dartmoor Massacre, by Vivian Bird

The Brainwashing of the German Nation, by Udo Walendy

The Lehrplan, translated by Carl Hottelet

Final Judgment, by Michael Collins Piper (multiple editions)

Best Witness: The Mel Mermelstein Affair and the Triumph of Historical Revisionism, by Michael Collins Piper

The New Jerusalem, by Michael Collins Piper

The High Priests of War, by Michael Collins Piper

Ways That Are Dark, by Ralph Townsend

Why I Survived the H Bomb, by Akira Kohchi

The Philosophy of Alfred Rosenberg, by James Whisker

The Myths of the 20th Century, by Alfred Rosenberg, translated by Vivian Bird; the only English edition at that time.

Eugenics & Race, by Dr. Roger Pearson, 1966 by Noontide Press

War Is A Racket, by Smedley Darlington Butler

Anti-Zion, by William Grimstad

The Liberty Lobby Congressional Handbook

Defend America First, America First Committee speeches

America First: The Middle East Problem in the Light of America's Traditional Policy of Non-Intervention, both booklet and tabloid editions.

White Paper on the Constitutional Convention

White Paper on the ADL

White Paper on the Genocide Convention

The Sovereignty Resolution

Free Trade & The Constitution, by Gus Stelzer The Citizens Rule Book

Innocent at Dachau, by Joseph Hallow

The Garbage Man: The Strange World of (ADL Spy) Roy Edward Bullock

The Deposition of ADL Official Alan Schwartz

Survival and Leaderless Resistance

Is the Diary of Anne Frank Genuine?, by Robert Faurisson

Flashpoint, by Ingrid Weckert

This Age of Conflict, by Ivor Benson

The Source and Technology of Illegitimate Power

The Zionist Factor, by Ivor Benson

The French Revolution, by Nesta Webster

The Strength of Samson, by Michael H. Brown

The Secret of Life, by Georges Lakowsky

The Impeachment of Man, by Savitri Devi

The Life of An American Jew in Racist, Marxist Israel, by Jack Bernstein

The War & Warriors Series:

- The Red Knight of Germany, by Floyd Gibbons
- The Cruise of the Raider, by Roy Alexander
- With Rommel in the Desert, by Heinz Schmidt
- The Life & Death of the Luftwaffe, by Werner Bomback
- The Cross of Iron, by Heinrich
- Stuka Pilot, by Hans Rudel
- Panzer Leader, by General Guderian

From Moscow to Berlin, by General Zhukov

Commander Extraordinaire, (Otto Skorzeny), by Charles Foley

The Forced War, by David Hoggan

The Myth of the New History, by David Hoggan

Campaign in Russia, by Leon Degrelle

Epic: The Story of the Waffen SS, by Leon Degrelle

Hitler: Born at Versailles, by Leon Degrelle - volumes two and three were translated and supposed to be in production before the destruction of the Institute for Historical Review

A Primer on Money, by Wright Patman

The Last Days of the Romanovs, by Robert Wilton

Behind Jonestown, by Ed Dieckmann

The Confessions of Kurt Gerstein, by Henri Rocques

Germany Reborn, by Herman Goering

Senator Joe McCarthy: The Story of A Great Patriot, by Larry Lent

Profiles in Populism, by Willis A. Carto

Populism vs. Plutocracy, by Willis A. Carto - expanded version of Profiles in Populism

Conspiracy Against Freedom A Populist Bibliography, by Robert Hilton Weems

Getting Elected: A Populist Guide

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry, by Walter Sanning

The Man Who Invented Genocide, by James J. Martin

Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence, by Wilhelm Stäglich

The Auschwitz Myth, by Wilhelm Stäglich

A Revisionist Bibliography, by Keith Stimeley

Can You Survive?, by Robert DePugh

Katyn, by Louis Fitzgibbon

Imperium, by Francis Parker Yockey

Rudolf Hess: Prisoner of Peace

Survival and Leaderless Resistance, by Liberty Lobby

Looking Forward - map for conservative political affairs in the post-Goldwater period

The How - Liberty Lobby's record of its political aims

Ambush at Medina: The Murder of Gordon Kahl

A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations

The Newstates Constitution, edited by Colonel Dall

Spotlight on the Bilderbergers

Inside the Bilderberg Group

The Disaster That is GATT ,by Trisha Katson

The Sovereignty Proposal, by Ken Bohnsack

How to Maximize Your Estate Planning Options

How to Probate Proof Your Estate

How to Use the Taxpayer Bill of Rights

The Medical Monopoly vs. Your Freedom of Choice

Will the New Technology Take Away Your Liberty?

The Secret Plan to Uproot the US Constitution

Drugs, Banks & Money Laundering

What a One World Government Will Mean for America

Origins of the Balfour Declaration, by James J. Malcolm



Coup D'Etat: The ADL Scheme to Seize Control of Latin America

The Six Million Reconsidered, by William Grimstad

The Road Back: A Survival Guide

100 Best of The SPOTLIGHT - two volumes 1986 and 1987

108 Astounding Stories by The SPOTLIGHT