

And then, when we came to sentencing, the fact that he had talked about the “obsolescence” of the Geneva Conventions, was specifically cited as a reason for seeking the death penalty.

EIR: And he did receive the death penalty.

Horton: Yes. He was executed in 1946. But, I would say, his ideas, obviously, are not dead.

EIR: Now, you hear, also, from the Administration—Rumsfeld and others—that these memos, drafted up there in outer space, or in the ether some place, have no connection whatsoever, to what happened in Abu Ghraib, or Guantánamo. Was that type of argument raised also at Nuremberg?

Horton: Absolutely! First of all, there was evidence given at Nuremberg, that there had been one meeting at which Keitel had said: All these matters are so dangerous that let’s avoid creating paperwork to deal with them. We will have orders, and make decisions orally, and we won’t leave a paper trail.

This is something he talked about very explicitly, so as to limit the amount of paper. And all paper that was generated about this, was to be very tightly guarded, and kept very secret. Does that strike you as having any parallels to recent developments?

And then, of course, they made this argument: We may

have had policy discussions about this thing, or that thing, or the other thing. But there’s no evidence that shows that these policies were transmitted into orders directly at the front anywhere. Where’s the paper trail showing that?

And the Tribunal was utterly unimpressed with these arguments. They took the view, that if the policies were made at the top, and you saw the results of it out in the front line, that was quite enough. And they moved forward with a notion of almost absolute ministerial accountability: That is, in this case, with respect to the Army, that those in senior command positions—and the ministerial position, of course, would have been Keitel; he would have been the equivalent, effectively, of the Secretary of Defense—they had a responsibility, positively, to enforce the Conventions, and a responsibility to *train* people, and a responsibility to *punish* people who failed to enforce the Conventions.

So, if we see that a consistent pattern of violations going on on the front lines, grave war crimes have been committed and the Minister (in our case Secretary of Defense) is held to account for them. And by “held to account,” I do not mean that he goes in front of a camera and says “I am responsible,” but then suffers no punishment of any sort. No. I mean the death penalty.

EIR: This is exactly the opposite of what seems to be hap-

Historian Fears Repeat of Nazi-Style Fanaticism

Fritz Stern, former provost at Columbia University and a leading scholar of European history, made some attention-drawing comments on Nov. 14, 2004, in accepting the Leo Baeck Award. Stern, whose family fled Nazi Germany in 1938, told his audience that “events of the past 10 days [i.e., around the U.S. Presidential elections] have intensified my reasoned apprehension, my worry about the immediate future of the country that saved us and taught us and gave us so much.” Stern noted the contrast between Hitler, “who preached fear in order to exploit it,” and Franklin Roosevelt’s motto that “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.” There were “unpleasant elements” in the United States in those days, Stern said, “but the dominant note of Franklin Roosevelt’s era was ebullient affirmation of reform and progress.”

The rise of National Socialism “was neither inevitable nor accidental,” Stern asserted, and “the most urgent lesson is that it could have been stopped.”

Among the reasons Stern cited, as to why so many Germans embraced National Socialism, was that Hitler was “a brilliant populist manipulator who insisted and

probably believed that Providence had chosen him as Germany’s savior, that he was the instrument of providence, a leader who was charged with executing a divine mission.” Stern continued: “Some people recognized the moral perils of mixing religion and politics, but many more were seduced by it. It was the pseudo-religious transfiguration of politics that largely ensured his success, notably in Protestant areas.” For example, in his first radio address after taking power, Hitler declared: “The National Government will preserve and defend those basic principles on which our nation has been built up. They regard Christianity as the foundation of our national morality and the family as the basis of national life.”

There is no doubt that Stern intended to warn the United States, and American Jews, about the dangers of Bush and the religious right. “The Jews in Central Europe welcomed the Russian Revolution, but it ended badly for them,” Stern was quoted by the Jan. 6 *New York Times*. “The tacit alliance between the neo-cons and the Christian right is less easily understood. I can imagine a similarly disillusioning outcome.”

On Jan. 20, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* published an interview with Stern, in which the historian described what is emerging in the United States as “a new type of authoritarianism—a Christian-fundamentalist plutocracy system, based on secrecy, intimidation, and lies.”