

John C. Zimmerman  
Holocaust Denial

### Author's Preface

In the 1970s I learned about people who deny the Holocaust. My introduction to the movement came with the publication of Arthur Butz's *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Over the years, I continued to be interested in this movement. A good part of my interest has to do with a long held fascination in conspiracy theories. This particular conspiracy theory - that the Holocaust is a conspiracy of various elements, especially Jews, trying to frame innocent Germans - always fascinated me. In the summer of 1995 I decided to finally undertake an analysis of the movement's arguments. At the time, I was not aware that the ultimate product would take as long to complete as it did or be as comprehensive as it turned out. I learned that Butz is only a small part of the movement and far from being the most important writer on the topic.

I am not a historian. Non historians who write about historical topics leave themselves open for inevitable criticism. There are two very different and salient examples of non - historians who have written on the Holocaust. In 1953 Gerald Reitlinger's *The Final Solution* was the first comprehensive book published on the Holocaust. Later on he wrote the highly acclaimed *The SS, Alibi of a Nation, 1922-1945*. About a year or so ago I was reading an opinion in a highly respected journal which stated that *The Final Solution* was still the best book on the topic, despite all that had been written in the intervening years. Reitlinger's *The Final Solution* continues to be cited and praised in Holocaust scholarly literature. Yet, Reitlinger was a specialist in art (see his *The Economics of Taste and Eastern Ceramics and Other Works of Art*), not a historian.

On the other end of the spectrum is Arthur Butz, an electrical engineering professor. His *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, as will be seen throughout this book, lacks any merit whatsoever. It is full of speculation and unsubstantiated conspiracy theories. Even Holocaust deniers have stopped taking the book seriously as can be seen by their seldom citing it in their own works.

Like Reitlinger, and unlike Butz, I have employed the historical method, which is to critically examine and evaluate documents before making conclusions, rather than choosing materials (and excluding others) to fit an agenda.

However, it needs to be emphasized that *Holocaust Denial: Demographics, Testimonies and Ideologies* is not a book about Holocaust history. Rather, it is a book that examines the underlying arguments made by the movement's principal writers. It differs from Professor Deborah Lipstadt's excellent *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* in that her examination was geared more towards the history of the movement and less towards an examination of the underlying arguments. This book is just the opposite. The movement's background and ideology are discussed in Chapter 7, but the principal focus is always on the actual arguments. I want to emphasize that it is not the purpose of this book to prove that the Holocaust occurred, though many will believe this to be the case. The existence of the Holocaust has been proven for many years. Rather, it is the purpose of the present study to examine the mendacious techniques and fallacious methodologies used by deniers.

In this respect, the book has a generic value for anyone who wants to examine the claims made by groups or individuals that certain events did not occur. For example, several years ago I learned that there were individuals who denied the mass murder perpetrated by Cambodia's Khmer Rouge against

between one and two million of that country's 7 million inhabitants. Though I have not had time to undertake a comprehensive examination of these claims, my limited familiarity with these arguments leads me to believe that they are similar to those made by Holocaust deniers. There are also academics and others who want to rehabilitate the mass murderer Joseph Stalin by claiming that he did not really murder that many people after all. Today there is a movement in Japan to deny that country's crimes against the Chinese and Koreans during World War II. The Turkish government has always denied the genocide against the Armenians during World War I. Thus, Holocaust denial is not an orphan.

Why undertake an examination of denial's arguments? This in itself is a controversial subject, and I am aware that many people will take offense to the book for that reason. Some already have. Historians rightly refuse to even answer deniers just as scientists refuse to answer those who claim that the earth is flat. (Yes, there actually is an organization which claims the earth is flat). In this respect, Professor Lipstadt's book is more geared towards the historian. However, the claims made by deniers may gain more credibility as the last of the World War II generation dies off and with them the memory of those times. Holocaust deniers are persistent, smart and dedicated and they know how to gain publicity for their cause. As will be seen in Chapter 7, they are dedicated to rehabilitating Hitler and Nazi Germany, though they often try to conceal this fact. It is for this reason I believe that now is the time for a thorough analysis of their arguments.

The drawback of the present work is that deniers will claim that the mere fact it was written shows they are having an impact. On the other hand, failure to address their arguments leads them to say that this shows they have validity, otherwise there would be an answer. This is the dilemma one faces when addressing their arguments and it is the reason historians rightly tend to ignore them altogether. The reason for the present work is that although Holocaust deniers are not taken seriously today, this could change in the future. Therefore, I have long believed that an in depth analysis of their arguments is needed. At the same time, I realize why historians are reluctant to undertake this task. I would probably not have undertaken this endeavor had I been a historian.

I was very fortunate to have the help of many good people in writing this book. Donna Evans, a secretary in the University of Nevada, Las Vegas College of Business, suffered through many early drafts until I finally learned how to use a computer. Judith Jenner of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, translated much of the German language sources used. Karola Raab of UNLV and Gord McFee and Dr. William Samelson of The Holocaust History Project also provided valuable translation help.

John Drobnicki, a reference librarian at City University of New York and Holocaust History Project member, made many valuable suggestions on how to improve the manuscript after reading it. John, who is also one of the world's foremost experts on the literature of Holocaust denial and has published extensively on the topic, offered valuable advice at a key point in this book's history which eventually led to its publication.

Carroll Lucas, whose report appears in Appendix IV, spent many uncompensated hours in the National Archives examining the Allied photos taken of Auschwitz in 1944 expressly for the purpose of this book. His report will become a standard reference on the Auschwitz photos taken by the Allies in 1944. He brought to bare all of his 45 years experience of photo analysis in the preparation of the "Lucas Report." Mr. Lucas thanks Archive -2 personnel in the United States National Archives who assisted his research.

Mark Van Alstine and Dr. Richard Green, both of The Holocaust History Project (<http://www.holocaust-history.org>), read the manuscript and offered valuable criticisms. The late Mark

Van Alstine also offered many valuable insights into Auschwitz. Mark is greatly missed by The Holocaust History Project.

Jamie McCarthy and Dr Dan Keren, both of The Holocaust History Project, also provided valuable commentary for some of the contents appearing in Chapters 9 and 10. Dr Ulrich Roessler of THHP provided invaluable assistance in helping me obtain documents from Germany used in Chapter 10. Harry Mazal, one of the founders of THHP, provided valuable assistance.

The Institute for Forensic Research in Cracow, Poland gave me permission to reproduce the report it issued in 1994 in Appendix III. My thanks to Dr. Richard Green for providing me with his expertise on the Institute's findings and for writing the foreword to Appendix III.

Cindy Johnson of Mesa, Arizona worked diligently in putting the print proofs together.

The following individuals provided me with the archival materials cited in Chapters 9 and 10. Aaron Kornblum, the archivist at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C.; Mr. Peter Fisher of the Mauthausen Memorial Museum in Austria; Frau Gresens of the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz, Germany; and Mr. Jerzy Wroblewski, Director of the Auschwitz State Museum in Oswiecim, Poland.

The staff at the UNLV Dickinson Library was always very obliging in helping me obtain library and interlibrary loan materials. The staffs at Rutgers University's Alexander Library in New Brunswick, New Jersey, Princeton University's Firestone Library and the Jewish Division of New York Public Library were always very helpful.

Finally, thanks to my mother who had seen it all before and was present at the creation.

Any errors or omissions which appear in this book are my own.

John C. Zimmerman Las Vegas, Nevada April 8, 2000

John C. Zimmerman

## Holocaust Denial

For my mother and to the memory of my father,

Elliot Zimmerman, who fought in North Africa and the Beaches of Normandy.

### INTRODUCTION

A few years ago the Weekly World News, an American tabloid known for printing unbelievable stories, did a cover story about a man who had written a book which claimed that President John F. Kennedy was still alive. A check of books in print and various organizations that track Kennedy assassination literature reveal that the book was never published. Although the idea that President Kennedy was not in fact killed in Dallas in November 1963 has been around since the 1960s, few people have ever heard of it and those who have pay no attention.

However, if few people are aware of the theory of a live President Kennedy, most have heard of the Holocaust denial movement which claims that there was no concerted effort by the Nazis to exterminate the Jews. Holocaust deniers have successfully publicized their movement to the extent that they have received media coverage by leading newspapers and television stations. The highly acclaimed Sunday television weekly 60 Minutes did a feature story on Holocaust denial.

Most of the argument has centered around the existence of gas chambers in the six camps which were known to exterminate Jews.<sup>1</sup> Four of the camps were destroyed by the Germans in order not to leave evidence of the extermination. These were Treblinka, Sobibor, Belzec and Chelmno (also known as Kulmhoff). Auschwitz and Majdanek are still standing. The deniers focus their attention on Auschwitz, probably the best known in the west of all the camps. Auschwitz also served as a labor camp for

Germany's war effort. The Auschwitz gas chambers are examined in the ninth chapter of this book.

After World War II, the population figures for Jews in Europe show a decline of between 5 and 6 million.<sup>2</sup> The largest decline occurred in Poland where one-half of all European Jews killed lived before the war. The easiest way for the deniers to prove their case would be to show large numbers of Jews in those countries where they existed before the war. This would be easiest in Poland where Jews were highly concentrated and spoke a distinct language, Yiddish. Yet, deniers prefer to focus on gas chambers because it is an easier subject to argue — the Nazis, as will be seen, destroyed much of the documentation concerning their activities in the camps — than to show what happened to Jews under German control during World War II. In this respect, the inability to locate Europe's Jews after the war has always been the major failure of Holocaust deniers.

Holocaust denial existed in Germany in the 1950's.<sup>3</sup> However, it was a French writer named Paul Rassinier who may be regarded as the godfather of modern Holocaust denial. Rassinier was a prisoner in a concentration camp that did not have gas chambers. He argued that much of the documentation to substantiate the Holocaust was fake and witnesses to the Holocaust were liars. He stated that only 1.5 million were killed and 4.5 million Jews emigrated from Europe between 1931 and 1945.<sup>4</sup> He presented a bewildering array of statistics to "prove" his emigration theories but was unable to cite any sources. Nevertheless, he is widely revered in the denier movement even though the technical arguments he made are no longer cited by deniers. Rassinier's principal contribution to denial was to pioneer conspiracy theories about the evidence which documents the Holocaust.

The next significant, and best known denier, is Arthur Butz, an electrical engineering professor at Northwestern University. His book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, is the most widely promoted of all denial materials. Butz argued that (1) any statements by Nazi leaders during World War II about killing Jews were just hyperbole; (2) captured German documents substantiating the statements were forgeries; (3) Nazis who confessed to war crimes were forced into confessing by vengeful victors, and some innocent Nazis confessed in the belief they would get a good deal from the victors, and (4) Jewish eyewitnesses lied because it was advantageous to do so. In what appears to be the only academic journal to review this work, the reviewer noted: "By the time one has subtracted all the material that Butz wants rejected, little remains of World War II documentation except a few Nazi records and the apologia of SS men."<sup>5</sup> However, for all his dismissal of the evidence, Butz could not explain what actually happened to the Jews under German control. He thought that many had ended up in the Soviet Union, but was vague on the point. He theorized that whereas documents which showed Germany's murder of Europe's Jews were forgeries, the absence of documents showing the resettlement of Jews was because they had been destroyed by the Allies. <sup>6</sup>

The next major denial book was the *Auschwitz Myth*<sup>1</sup> by Wilhelm Staglich, a West German judge. Though better written and argued than Butz's work, Staglich repeated many of the familiar conspiracy theories. Staglich showed his legal training by arguing that documentation proving the Holocaust was forged, but if the documents were not forged then they meant something other than what they said. However, Staglich did not attempt to explain what actually happened to Europe's Jews.

The "answer" to what happened to Europe's Jews was attempted by Walter Sanning, possibly a pseudonym,<sup>8</sup> in *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* published in 1983 by the Institute for Historical Review, the foremost purveyor of Holocaust denier materials in the United States. The book has a laudatory foreword by Arthur Butz. Briefly stated, Sanning's thesis is that the Germans could not

have murdered millions of Jews because these Jews were never under Germany's control.

Sanning's book is the most sophisticated piece of denial ever written. There is no direct talk of conspiracies or forgeries. The book says nothing about killing, concentration camps, gassings or even Nazis. Auschwitz is not mentioned. He cites many "Jewish" sources in pursuit of his theories. However, a closer look at Sanning's book reveals a pattern familiar in Holocaust denial, though more subtly stated. For example, early on (p. 13) he describes the American Jewish Yearbook as "reputable". In fact, the Yearbook is cited 66 times in his 453 reference notes. But later on (p. 195) he dislikes the Yearbook's population figures for Jews outside of the Soviet Union and states that they do "not conform to reality, political reasons were decisive for putting the number so low". The figures are described as "obviously manipulated". Thus, the clear implication is that the Yearbook is involved in a conspiracy to suppress the true numbers because the real numbers would reveal that no Holocaust occurred.

Sanning's *Dissolution* is probably the most important denial work to date because it indirectly attempts to validate all other denier works. This is because if it can be shown that Europe's Jews actually existed someplace other than under Germany's control, then all of the theories of conspiracy and forgery which have been proffered by other deniers become feasible.

Denier works are usually ignored by academic reviewers. This is both a drawback and a benefit. A drawback because deniers cannot achieve academic respectability, but a benefit because their claims are not closely scrutinized. Sanning's book appears to have only received passing notice in one academic journal, and then only as one of a number of books under review. The reviewer, John Conway, is a noted historian on Germany. Conway knew that he was being taken in by Sanning, but was not in a position to evaluate his demographic data. Conway stated that such an evaluation would have to be done by someone else at a later date. The leading denier journal saw the review as a sort of validation for Sanning's book since Conway did not attempt to refute his data.<sup>9</sup>

This book is the first comprehensive analysis in any language to examine all of the major arguments of Holocaust denial. It was inspired by the copy of Sanning's book in Princeton University's Firestone Library. A student was making notations in the book attempting to refute its data. Not surprisingly, the student simply could not answer the mass of data on the fictitious population movements Sanning was presenting as fact. This study will also address demographic claims made by other deniers. Shortly before Sanning's book was published a denier publication announced that it would be "the definitive study of the demographics of the Jewish population of Europe during World War Two, rendering all other studies. . . obsolete or superfluous".<sup>10</sup> This assertion, along with all of the other claims of Holocaust denial, will be examined. The demographics of Poland, the Soviet Union, Hungary and the Netherlands will be examined. The focus will then shift to the controversy surrounding the eyewitness testimonies of victims and perpetrators. Finally, the ideology of denial's major publications and writers will be examined. The gas chambers and crematoria will be thoroughly examined in light of denier claims as part of the ideology discussion.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

### CHAPTER 1

#### POLAND'S DEMOGRAPHICS

The number of Jews counted in the Polish census of 1931 was 3,113,900.<sup>1</sup> Estimates of the Jewish population in 1939, the year Poland was invaded by Germany and the Soviet Union, place the population between 3.3 to 3.5 million. In *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* (hereafter cited in the text) Walter Sanning tried to depopulate Poland of its Jews so that few would come under German control. He placed the actual number of Jews in Poland at the war's outbreak in 1939 at 2,664,000 (p. 32).<sup>2</sup>

He did this by citing a statement in a publication by Munich's Institute for Contemporary History that in the years following 1933 about 100,000 Jews annually emigrated from Poland. The Institute gives no source for this assertion. In fact, this is the only mention of Polish emigration in the article. The article deals mostly with German-Jewish emigration. Moreover, the article does not state to which countries these Jews immigrated from Poland whereas it does give such a discussion for German emigrants. The purpose of the article, as is clear from the title, is to deal with German emigration.<sup>3</sup>

The official Polish figures for the years 1931-1937 place total Jewish emigration at 109,716. These figures were published in 1940, before the Holocaust, so that Sanning could not claim they were "politically motivated". The figures also gave a breakdown as to which countries the Polish Jews immigrated.<sup>4</sup> A Jewish emigration of the size claimed by the Institute would surely have been noticed.

However, there is no mention of such a large scale emigration in any of the studies dealing with Polish Jews in the inter war years from 1919-1939.<sup>5</sup> When figures are cited, the official ones are used.<sup>6</sup> A study of minorities in Poland during the inter war years also cites the official Polish emigration figures.<sup>7</sup> It is probable that few, if any, are even familiar with the Institute's numbers.

Sanning did not take into consideration that there were simply not enough outlets for a Jewish emigration of the size claimed.<sup>8</sup> Most Polish-Jewish immigration from 1931 onwards was to Palestine. However, there were severe restrictions on immigration to Palestine and Polish-Jews had to compete against other Jews. Moreover, within the Polish-Jewish Community there was a concerted effort to discourage Jewish emigration by such diverse groups as Jewish Bundists, assimilationists and even Zionists.<sup>9</sup>

Faced with an overwhelming amount of evidence that the Polish-Jewish emigration of 100,000 annually could not have taken place, most scholars would probably relegate the Institute's statement to a footnote. At the very least, any serious writer who wanted to use such a number would ask the Institute how it obtained its figures and where these alleged emigrants went. It is obvious that Sanning never did this. However, this writer did make such an inquiry of the Institute. The Institute's reply failed to shed any light on its figures.<sup>10</sup>

This would not be the first time that Sanning seized at a number, no matter how tenuous, and used it as authority while ignoring all contrary evidence. He would usually justify his sources by stating that they were "Zionist" or "Jewish". He incorrectly called the Institute "pro-Zionist"<sup>11</sup> (p. 32) and stated that its figures were right while the official figures are subject to doubt. However, Sanning could not trace these emigrants to any country. He simply said they went to Palestine, the United States, South America and Western European countries without providing any details. The official figures trace the destinations as well as departures.

After creating a fictitious emigration from Poland, Sanning argued (p. 31) that many of them went to the United States between 1933 and 1943. Official United States immigration figures for Jews from 1933 and 1943 show a total of 168,128 entered from all countries.<sup>12</sup> However, Sanning never gives a country by country breakdown of Jewish immigration. In fact, very few of these Jews were from Poland. Total Polish-Jewish immigration into the United States from 1933-1943 was approximately 9,300.<sup>13</sup> The official annual immigration quota for all Poles was 6,524 per year.<sup>14</sup> However, actual Polish immigration never came close to the quota.<sup>15</sup> This should have alerted Sanning that only a few of his 100,000 annual could have come to the United States. For it would only be logical that all the quotas would be used up before any additional Polish-Jews entered.

Sanning had to attempt to place as many Polish-Jews into the United States as possible because they would then be out of the German sphere of influence. If they immigrated to countries surrounding Poland they would have eventually come under German control after the outbreak of the war.

Information from the Census of Religious Bodies shows 4,770,647 Jews in the United States in 1937 compared with 4,228,029 in 1927. Sanning decided that the growth was too large by 326,000 to be accounted for by natural increase (excess of births over deaths). He made this determination (p. 160) by projecting the annual national increase of the United States onto the Jewish population. However, a national average growth rate is not necessarily indicative of any group. Most Jewish immigrants from 1880-1917 were from Eastern Europe and had high fertility rates. Sanning could have seen this if he had compared Jewish natural increase from 1928-1937 to the natural increase from 1918-1927. From 1918-1927 natural increase was 524,000 compared to a natural increase of 470,000 from 1928-1937.<sup>16</sup>

The Jewish population in 1918 was 3,388,951 and 4,228,029 in 1927.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, the decade from 1918-1927 not only saw a larger percentage natural increase in the Jewish population but a larger quantitative natural increase on a smaller base population. Jewish natural increase was placed at 75,000 annually in 1914.<sup>18</sup>

Sanning then quoted an article by American Jewish demographer Dr. Mark Wischnitzer published in 1944 where he estimated the Jewish population at 5,199,200.<sup>19</sup> Sanning states (p. 161) that the rise by 429,000 from the 1937 United States Census of Religious Bodies is "much too large for any possible natural increase." But Wischnitzer never said that the increase was due solely to natural causes. In fact the number Wischnitzer used came from the American Jewish Yearbook. The increase was the result of immigration of 149,344 from 1937-1943 and estimated natural increase of 279,209.<sup>20</sup> The estimated natural increase over a six year period is quite reasonable when compared to the natural increase over the previous years. Moreover, Sanning's use of Wischnitzer is instructive. In 1942 Wischnitzer had traced the migration of Jews from Europe and had used the official Polish figures for Jewish emigration.<sup>21</sup> Sanning ignored this study by Wischnitzer yet attempted to use another Wischnitzer article to convey a meaning which was not only never intended, but totally unwarranted.

Finally, Sanning quoted a statement made in 1943 by Assistant Secretary of State Breckenridge Long that a majority of the 580,000 refugees who entered the United States since 1933 were Jews. Sanning believed (p. 161) that majority could mean 70% and placed the total Jewish immigration at 406,000. Long's statement would figure prominently by Sanning in defending his Polish-Jewish immigration figures from some questions raised by an Australian professor.<sup>22</sup> However, Sanning failed to reveal that Long would later correct himself by saying that 580,000 visas had been issued, but less than half were utilized because the victims could not reach the United States.<sup>23</sup>

Sanning also made much of the fact of Long's statement that many Jews had entered on visitor visas, the implication being that they were still here and not included in the immigration figures. However, the total amount of Jewish and non-Jewish aliens admitted on visitor visas from July 1, 1938 who were still here in 1944 was 15,000.<sup>24</sup> More importantly, however, is that neither Long nor anyone else ever spoke of Polish-Jewish immigration. As noted earlier, only 9,300 Polish-Jews entered the United States from 1933-1943. If there were any illegal Jews in the United States they most probably were Germans who entered from third countries. For the years 1938-1940 a majority of the Jews who entered the United States were from Germany.<sup>25</sup>

For all of his speculation about Jewish immigration into the United States from 1933-1943 Sanning was unable to offer evidence of any unrecorded Jewish entrants much less Jews from Poland.<sup>26</sup> A close reading of his book reveals that he arrived at nearly all of his numbers by using the above type of selective quotations coupled with unsubstantiated guesswork.

Polish Deportations

In September 1939 the Soviet Union and Germany attacked Poland and divided the country. Consequently, the Jewish population came under the control of both countries. Sanning placed that population at 1,607,000 under German control and 1,026,000 under Soviet control (p. 39). He then stated that there was a Jewish flight from the German controlled area to the Soviet area. The Soviets, according to Sanning, then deported 750,000 Polish Jews into the Soviet Union. Sanning then reduced the Jewish population under German control by 750,000. He had assumed that all deportees were Jews who fled from the German side. He had now reduced the Jewish population under German control to 857,000. He writes (p. 44) that an additional 100,000 Jews fled German control to two Rumanian provinces.

Sanning had now reduced the number of Jews under German control to 757,000. However, he believed that the actual number was lower. He based this on an article in the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia which stated that the Joint Distribution Committee had provided aid to 630,000 persons. Sanning writes (p. 44) that "[m]any more Jews than that simply did not exist in German controlled former Polish territory". Before analyzing Sanning's claims, his statement concerning the Joint Distribution Committee should be examined because it sets the stage for how he used his sources and arrived at his conclusions. The committee was obviously limited as to the amount of people it could assist, and the Universal was never claiming or attempting to give the impression that aid was reaching only those Jews who remained in the German occupied sector of Poland. In fact, in the course of the Universal's discussion of the committee, the following is noted:

"In the German occupied area about 1,725,000 Jews were subjected to the full force of German fury. Some 250,000 lost their lives during the 12 months after the outbreak of the war. At least an equal number were uprooted from their homes. They, together with the remaining Jews of Poland, were herded into ghettos, beaten, driven from their homes, dragged into forced labor gangs and reduced to beggary. Once again starvation and disease took their toll. The death rate in the Warsaw ghetto, containing over 500,000 people in a 100 square block area, rose to 15 times its pre-war size."

"Throughout this tragic period the network of institutions which the J.D.C. had built up in Poland since the first World War stood it in good stead. . . J.D.C. help was reaching 630,000 people daily in over 400 localities throughout the German occupied area.. ."27

Sanning's calculation that there were 2,633,000 Jews in Poland at the outbreak of the war is based on his claim that 100,000 emigrated annually since 1933. As noted earlier, this claim is unsubstantiated and contradicts all known data and scholarly study in this area. The real population figure was between 3.3 and 3.5 million. The lower number will be used. After the invasion about 2 million Jews came under German control and 1.3 million under Soviet control.<sup>28</sup> Some sources may vary slightly on these numbers, placing more or less Jews in one zone or the other. However, no source has ever used Sanning's 2,633,000. The German area was divided into an area known as the incorporated area, which contained 600,000 Jews, and the General Government which had 1.4 million.<sup>29</sup> However, hundreds of thousands of Jews were forced into the General Government from the incorporated territories.

Following the invasion two significant Jewish population movements took place. The first was from German controlled Poland to Soviet Poland. Scholars who studied this movement place the number anywhere from 300,000 to 350,000.<sup>30</sup> The Polish Commission of inquiry on German crimes following the war placed the number at 300,000.<sup>31</sup> Sanning created confusion by quoting the Encyclopedia Judaica five times from four volumes as reporting significant population movements from German-Poland to Soviet-Poland without ever citing a number. In fact, the Judaica stated that 300,000 Jews had

made this move.<sup>32</sup>

More Jews did not flee because they were prevented from doing so by the Soviets. The Germans would force entire Jewish communities across the borders but they were shipped back to the German side.<sup>33</sup>

The second major Jewish population movement, and the most important for the purposes of this study, were the deportations from Soviet-Poland into the Soviet Union in February, April and June 1940 and June 1941. It must be emphasized that even though the Jews, who constituted ten percent of Poland's population, were disproportionately represented in the deportations the vast majority of deportees were non-Jews.

Sanning quoted three Jewish individuals (p. 42) that 1 million Jews were deported. The best known is Rabbi Aaron Petchinik who wrote that in June 1940 1 million Jews were deported in two days. Sanning also quoted one Jacob Zukerman to the same effect. However, an examination of Zukerman's testimony before a congressional committee reveals that he states the 1 million movement took place at the beginning of 1940, the February 1940 deportation.<sup>34</sup> A second witness gave the committee the impression that the 1 million could have been deported in April 1940 since he mentions the spring of 1940. Thus, according to these three witnesses up to 3 million Jews were deported. Sanning is the only writer on this topic to take the 1 million number seriously. He also quoted the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia which in 1942 believed that 600,000 Jews had been deported, and another source who gave the number 500,000. This is how Sanning arrived at a total deportation of 750,000 Jews.

Significantly, he ignored other Jewish estimates which placed the number much lower. An early Tel Aviv source placed the total deported Jews at between 50,000-70,000,<sup>35</sup> the Institute for Jewish Affairs stated that 100,000 Jews were affected,<sup>36</sup> the World Jewish Congress placed the number at 300,000 " while the highest number of 400,000 came from the American Jewish Committee.<sup>38</sup>

The sources which have been accepted by historians to determine the number of deportees have been Polish. Poland's ambassador to the United States during World War II wrote that 250,000 Jews were deported.<sup>39</sup>

As was noted above, Sanning had quoted two witnesses before a congressional committee as giving the number of 1 million Jews. However, Sanning ignored the committee's findings. The committee reported that the total amount of deportees was 1,692,000.<sup>40</sup> The committee did not give a breakdown of these deportees. However, this number corresponds exactly to a study done by the Polish military in 1945. The percentage of Jews in the deportations was 19.4% or 328,000.<sup>41</sup>

Another prominent Polish study that historians rely on was done by the Polish Embassy in the Soviet Union. It found that 30% of all deportees were Jews.<sup>42</sup> This percentage was arrived at by examining 120,000 files from the Red Cross.<sup>43</sup> The total of all Polish deportees was estimated at 1,230,000 which means that 369,000 Jews were deported. The Polish Ministry of Justice also estimated the total deportees at 1,230,000. <sup>44</sup> Another Polish study stated that the total amount of all deportees in the first three stages (February, April and June 1940) was 760,000.<sup>45</sup> All of these Polish studies were ignored by Sanning.

The official Soviet figures on the total amount of all deportees, including Jews, was 388,000.<sup>46</sup> However, historians have rightfully ignored these figures just as they have the claim that 1 million Jews were deported. Sanning also ignored this source, but was willing to quote Stalin (p. 73) as an authoritative source for certain population movements when it served his purpose.

Sanning also argued that 100,000 Jews, many of whom were Polish, made their way to Rumania and were able to escape on ships from Turkey. His source for this is Gerald Reitlinger. What Reitlinger actually wrote was that "it was possible to run a daily small steamer from Constanza to Istanbul, bringing a moderate flow of immigrants to Palestine on the [legal] quota."<sup>47</sup> Total legal Jewish immigration to Palestine from 1939-1945 was 69,000 from all countries. Figures for Polish Jews from 1939-1941 amount to 3,000.<sup>48</sup> No figures exist for 1942-1945, but it is unlikely that many more than 10,000 Polish Jews could have reached Palestine.

The Jews in Soviet occupied Poland came under German control when Germany invaded on June 22, 1941. Sanning vaguely attempted to show that all of these Jews were evacuated by the Soviets. As will be shown in Chapter 2, no such evacuation from Soviet Poland took place. The total amount of Jews in Soviet Poland was about 1.3 million. According to the minutes of Germany's Wannsee Conference, which dealt with the "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem in Europe, at the end of 1941 the Jewish population of Poland's General Government was 2,284,008 and the rest of Poland held 820,000 Jews.<sup>49</sup> These numbers seem high because they do not appear to take into account Jewish deaths which occurred under German control from 1939-1941.

The total amount of Jews who came under German control in Poland from September 1939 to June 1941 was between 2.8 and 3.1 million. These numbers do not include Jews deported into the Soviet Union. Sanning's attempt to place the number at one-fourth of this amount is a fiction.

Following the war between 240,000 and 250,000 of the deportees returned to Poland. When added to the remaining 30,000 Jews a total of 275,000 Jews lived in Poland for some time between the summer of 1944 and 1947.<sup>50</sup> They eventually emigrated.

This means that there were between 2.8 and 3.1 million Jews under German control who are unaccounted for. Since Sanning, like other deniers, could not explain what happened to these Jews, he manipulated his sources to create non-existent population movements out of Poland. He would do this by seizing the highest number from any source available without subjecting it to critical scrutiny, even when all the evidence proved his numbers wrong. Using this technique, anyone could "prove" anything about the number of Jews killed. For example, in May 1944 a German newspaper in Danzig reported that as a result of actions in Poland and Hungary "five million Jews have been eliminated in these two countries."<sup>51</sup> In fact, the actual number from Poland and Hungary combined was about 3.5 million. However, accepting this 5 million at face value could lead one to inflate the actual number of dead to between 7 and 8 million.

The Ignored Evidence on Polish Jews

Sanning writes (p. 44) that German sources do not say anything about the number of Jews under German control. "Of course the Germans spoke of millions of Jews in the occupied Polish territory but their figures were not based on a census, not even on estimates". This is blatantly false. Sanning simply ignored all of the German evidence because it proves that his numbers are fictitious. The process of what happened to Polish-Jews has been detailed elsewhere.<sup>52</sup> This study will examine some of the key demographic evidence ignored by Sanning.

Although most studies focus on deportations of Polish Jews to the death camps, it is important to note that many Polish-Jews were never deported because they died in the ghettos. This occurred because the Germans decided to concentrate Jews into highly restricted areas. Not surprisingly this caused many Jews to die from diseases such as typhus, cholera, hunger and general deprivation. This is a subject totally ignored by deniers. In the Warsaw ghetto the original Jewish population numbered 360,000 but rose to between 445,000 to 500,000 as the result of ghettoization. Monthly statistics show 83,000 people died from September 1939 to November 1942. In the Lodz ghetto 45,000 died out of a population of 200,000.<sup>53</sup> Thus, 128,000 people died of general deprivation out of less than one-fourth of the Jewish population of Poland. Various sources estimate that 500,000 Jews died of general deprivation.<sup>54</sup>

The average food rations for Jews in 1940 was 413 calories daily and 253 daily calories in 1941. However, Germans in Warsaw received 2,613 calories daily.<sup>55</sup> A German official reported: "The Jews remain determined to escape starvation and to live on the outside [of the ghetto]. In the past month thirty Jews who had left the ghetto without permission and wanted to flee were shot."<sup>56</sup> Hans Frank, Germany's Governor General in Poland, recorded the following in his diary:

"Investigations carried out by this [medical] department have shown that the greater part of the population received only some 600 calories while the normal requirement is 2,200 calories. The people are so exhausted that they may become an easy prey to typhus. The number of cases up to date has reached 40%".<sup>57</sup>

The President of the Board of Food and Agriculture at a meeting of the heads of the Departments in the General Government on August 24, 1942 stated:

"Supplies for the existing populace, whose numbers have been swelled

by the arrival of 1.5 million Jews, should cease. The 300,000 Jews who are working as laborers or in some other capacity in the German interest should be issued with the rations specified for Jews, augmented as may

be necessary from time to time to maintain their working capacity. The rest of the Jews, who number some 1.2 million, should no longer be

issued with foodstuffs of any kind."<sup>58</sup>

Frank then entered the following in his diary: "The fact that we have condemned to starvation death 1.2 million of Jews — let it be merely mentioned in passing. It is self-evident that the possibility of the Jews not dying from starvation will hasten — it is hoped — anti Jewish measures."<sup>59</sup> Elsewhere he notes: "Food supplies for the ghetto are insufficient. To this must be added the lack of soap and the

communal living in small confined spaces. According to the reported state, 2,405 cases of typhus have been noted till now. The actual figure however is much higher."<sup>60</sup> His most revealing entry was from a speech on December 16, 1941:

"We must destroy the Jews wheresoever we should meet them. . . The Jews are also most detrimental to us as gluttons."

"We cannot shoot 3.5 million Jews, neither can we poison them. We shall have to take steps however designed to extirpate them in some way. . . How and where it will happen will be decided by special department which we must form and install."<sup>61</sup>

The rounding-up of Jews in Poland and deportation to death camps was known as Operation Reinhard. Two of the best known actions of this operation occurred in Warsaw and Galicia. General Jurgen Stroop, who was in charge of the Warsaw deportations, provided what is probably the most detailed account of any Operation Reinhard action. He reports that from July 22 to October 3, 1942 310,322 Jews "were removed". In April 1943 a revolt occurred in the ghetto which took Stroop about five weeks to put down. He issued very detailed daily reports about how many Jews were killed or captured each day. In his final summary report of May 24, 1943 he stated that "[o]f the total 56,065 Jews apprehended, [these are in addition to the 310,322 captured] about 7,000 were destroyed directly in the course of the grand operation. . . 6,929 Jews were destroyed via transport to T II. . ." The reference to T II is Treblinka.<sup>62</sup> Stroop was thus able to account for 366,387 Jews. As will be recalled, the ghetto contained between 445,000 and 500,000 inhabitants from 1940 onwards. In February 1943 Himmler called for the "razing of the ghetto" and "we must achieve the disappearance from sight of the living space for 500,000 sub humans" [untermenschen].<sup>63</sup> This gives a good idea as to how many Jews died in the ghetto before being sent to the death camps.

The Galicia operation was carried out by General Katzman. He reported that the "obsolete statistics of 1931" show 502,000 Jews in the area. The Committee of Jews reported 350,000 Jews at the end of 1941. However, Katzman notes that this figure is incorrect because the final amount "evacuated" was 434,392 as of June 17, 1943, but only 21,156 are now in the camps. This number will be reduced in the future. He also notes that Jews "still caught in small numbers are given special treatment"<sup>64</sup> — a term which, as will be seen, meant killing.

The Stroop and Katzman reports irrefutably belie Sanning's contention that the German sources say nothing about the number of Jews under German control and that German figures were not based "even on estimates". Both reports give considerable detail that the German authorities in charge of the "evacuations" were aware of the magnitude of the situation.

The most important piece of evidence on the disappearance of the Jews is the Korherr Report. Dr. Richard Korherr was a statistician with the Third Reich and was commissioned by Heinrich Himmler, who was given overall authority by Hitler to implement the "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem in Europe, to ascertain the number of Jews who disappeared. Sanning's book may be the only work in this area to totally ignore the Korherr report.

There were two reports. The second one stops at March 31, 1943. It states that "the reduction of the Jewish population of Europe from 1937 to the beginning of 1943 could be estimated at 4.5 million", one fourth of whom have emigrated. However, information is only provided for the emigration of 557,000 Jews.<sup>65</sup> Interestingly, Korherr's numbers are close to that of the World Jewish Congress which in 1942 stated that 4 million Jews "are on the verge of complete annihilation" due to "starvation,"

"shooting" and "poisoning".66

Korherr could not give a complete breakdown of all the Jews. He

acknowledges that his data is incomplete, especially with regard to Soviet Jews. However, he did have some data on Polish-Jewish deportations. In the first report he lists 1,449,692 Polish-Jews under the following heading as of December 31, 1942: "Transportation of the Jews from the Eastern province to the Russian East." This number is broken down as follows: "Number passed through the camp in the general government [of Poland]... 1,274,166" and "through the camp at Warthegau [Polish incorporated territory]... 145,301." The reference to the camp in the General Government is undoubtedly to the camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka while the reference to the Warthegau is to the Chelmno camp. However, that these Jews were not really in the "Russian East" is clear from the second report where he states that "[i]n Europe the Jews are, or rather were, concentrated in the formerly Polish, Russian and Baltic territories..." (italics added). Thus, he acknowledges that the Jews are not in the Russian territory. He does not

My where they are at the time of his writing. These are nearly twice as

many Jews as Sanning claimed were in Poland.

His reference to passing through the "camp" is instructive because his figures show only 9,127 Jews in concentration camps as of December 31, 1942. After receiving the report Himmler wrote on April 9, 1943:

"What is of primary importance to me at the moment is that as many Jews be transported to the East as is humanly possible."

The language of transporting Jews to the East was quite prevalent in 1942 and 1943. In the minutes of the Wannsee Conference of January 20, 1942, where the Final Solution of the Jewish problem was decided upon, it is stated that Germany had forbidden Jewish emigration in the Fall of 1941. The following excerpts are relevant:

"The emigration program has now been replaced by the evacuation of the Jews to the East as a further solution possibility, in accordance with previous authorization by the Fuhrer. . .

"Under proper direction the Jews should now in the course of the Final Solution be brought to the East in a suitable way for use as labor. . .in which task undoubtedly a great part will fall out through natural diminution..."

"The evacuated Jews are brought first group by group into the so called transit ghettos, in order to be transported from there farther to the East."67

The following year Martin Luther, a member of Germany's Foreign Ministry who attended the Wannsee Conference, wrote that deportations were a temporary measure. "The Jews will be moved on further to the Occupied Eastern Territories as soon as the technical conditions for it are given."68

On June 19, 1943 Himmler's hand written record of his discussions with Hitler states that the latter said that the "deportations of the Jews must go on regardless of any unrest it may cause during the next three or four months, and that it must be carried out in an all-embracing way". On October 6, 1943

Himmler stated that he had emptied large Jewish ghettos. "By the end of the year the Jewish question will have been settled in all the occupied countries. Only a few individual Jews who have managed to slip through the net will be left."<sup>69</sup> A census taken in July 1943 found 203,000 Jews remaining in the General Government.<sup>70</sup> In January 1944 Hans Frank announced that the General Government had "perhaps 100,000 Jews."<sup>71</sup> Thus, Frank had achieved his earlier announced goal that "I shall expect the Jews to disappear. They must move out. I have started negotiations to push out the Jews to the East." He wanted to do this because "if the Jewish race were to survive in Europe. . .this war would have meant only a partial success."<sup>72</sup>

This is the German evidence that Sanning ignored because he could not explain it. Jews from Poland, and indeed all of Europe, were being moved "east". But what did that mean? This has always been the biggest problem for deniers. The Jews were not in concentration camps because German figures for these camps as of August 1943 show a total population of 224,000 which included Jews and non-Jews.<sup>73</sup> So where were the Jews? None of the German documents which talk about movements to the east give a location.

Holocaust historian Yitzhak Arad used a variety of sources, including train transport records, to trace 1.5 million Polish-Jews to the three Polish camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka through July 1943. The dates of transport, origins of the transports and amount of people involved are given.<sup>74</sup> His numbers up to December 31, 1942 are similar to Korherr's statistics for Jews "passed through the camp in the general government." Two deniers have written:

"German railway records have been cited as evidence that hundreds of thousands of Jews were exterminated at Treblinka.. While there is little doubt that these documents are genuine, and that they confirm transports of Jews to Treblinka, they are not proof of an extermination program..."

"As already mentioned the balance of evidence indicates that Treblinka II — along with Belzec and Sobibor — was a transit camp, where Jewish deportees were stripped of their property and valuables before being transferred eastward into German occupied Soviet territories."<sup>75</sup>

This is a rather remarkable admission. The authors do not explain by Jews who are going to be deported eastward are being stripped of their property. Wouldn't they need their belongings at the resettlement? There are a series of German documents which deal with the vast quantities of valuables and clothing seized from Jews in Operation Reinhard. Much detail is given about the items, quantity, value and storage. However, no details are provided about the people from whom the items were taken.<sup>76</sup> Many of these documents are stamped "Secret". One document, signed by the head of the Economic and Administrative Main Office, speaks of "old garments" seized as the result of "Jewish resettlement that have been sent from the camps of Auschwitz and Lublin [Majdanek] up to the present date." The document speaks of transporting the clothing to the Ukraine, but nothing is said about where these Jews were "resettled". The clothing filled 825 train boxcars. Why wouldn't those being "resettled" be allowed to take their clothing with them — unless it was known that they no longer had a need for clothing.

In fact, the real meaning of "resettlement" becomes clear when the document states that prior transportation problems to the Ukraine "prevented the delivery of old clothing intended for the racial Germans there".<sup>77</sup> Another document signed by Odilo Globocnik, who implemented Operation Reinhard, mentions one thousand boxcars of textiles and other valuables seized.<sup>78</sup>

The two deniers cannot explain where these Jews are being deported to because the railway records end at Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor. Moreover, Treblinka was a constructed camp site by the Germans, not an established town. There was no transport from Treblinka to the Soviet Union. The railway line for Treblinka ran from Warsaw to Bialystok in Northeast Poland.<sup>79</sup> Bialystok was the closest point to the Soviet Union. Anyone from Treblinka being resettled in the Soviet occupied territory would pass through Bialystok. However, a German railroad table for Bialystok shows Jews being taken from there to Treblinka, with the empty cars returning to Bialystok.<sup>80</sup> In other words, they were being moved away from the Soviet territories by being sent to Treblinka. Holocaust historian Gerald Reitlinger described Treblinka as "a single improvised camp, from which there was no transport to take [the Jews] any further."<sup>81</sup>

One of the two deniers' sources for these deportees being sent to the Soviet Union is Arthur Butz, who argued that German statements about moving Jews eastward should be taken at face value. He favored the explanation as the Soviet Union being the ultimate destination. He wrote that "[w]hile we have a good idea of where these settlements were, we know little else about them other than that they existed." Butz, however, could not give any specifics as to exactly where these people were transported other than that they ended up in the Soviet Union. He did acknowledge that most of the Jews of pre-war Poland were moved out, but the lack of specifics was attributed to the "Allied occupation" which "destroyed the relevant German records" on resettlement.<sup>82</sup> He offered no proof for any of these assertions.

Butz and others who have offered this resettlement theory have never attempted to explain the mechanics of resettling such a large group of people. Where were they housed and fed? Did the Germans build towns in the Soviet Union specifically for resettlement of Jews? What were the transport routes? A resettlement of this magnitude would have required a tremendous amount of German resources. The only German resettlements known of during the war was the resettlement of ethnic Germans onto territories occupied by Germany.

Moreover, the resettlement of millions of people would not have gone unnoticed. Yet, there is not a single document relating to such a resettlement. Even if all of the documents were destroyed, as Butz contends, many people would have known the specifics of such a program. It would have taken hundreds, if not thousands, of Germans to have carried out the resettlement and at least as many people to have been involved in the building projects. Yet, no one has ever come forward to testify about such a resettlement. This is strange since it would have made an ideal defense at the Nuremberg War Crimes trials and subsequent trials. Certainly the high ranking Nazis would have known the specifics of such a policy. In fact, former high ranking transportation specialists in Germany during the war did not offer Soviet resettlement as a defense in post-war trials, though none of them seems to have admitted that they knew the real purpose for the train transports.<sup>83</sup> As will be shown in Chapter 6, no war crimes defendant offered resettlement as a defense, even those who denied any knowledge of the Holocaust.

In Chapter 2 it will be shown that the Germans were busy exterminating all Jews under their control in the Soviet Union. Yet, deniers would have us believe that at the same time the Germans were engaged in mass killing in the Soviet Union, they were resettling Jews from Poland and other countries there. One of the principal features of Germany's policy in the countries it controlled was to rid those

countries of all their Jews. All Jews were to be moved "east". However, the movement was always to Poland. Jews transported from Hungary, France, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and Germany were always sent to Poland, except for 50,000 German-Jews sent to Latvia and Byelorussia. The Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation has been able to trace the destination of 102,893 Dutch-Jews who were deported; 94,000 were sent to Poland while the remainder were sent to Camps in Germany and Czechoslovakia.<sup>84</sup> In all of the population movements from all of these countries there is no evidence of resettlement in the Soviet Union. Soviet and Rumanian Jews were killed within their own territory.

Moreover, it is beyond credulity to believe that the Germans would have been willing to expend the resources needed for such a resettlement. As was shown earlier, Jews were subject to reduced food rations. It was also German policy to seize Jewish belongings. How is it that the Germans, who were so concerned about preserving their resources, and so unconcerned about Jewish starvation and living conditions, would undertake a resettlement project that would have drained Germany of hundreds of millions of reichsmarks? Interestingly, deniers will at times argue that it made no economic sense to murder all of the Jews. However, from a cost standpoint it would have been much more costly and time consuming to resettle them. The only denier argument remaining is that these Jews were simply shoved across the border into the Soviet Union and abandoned. This is the implication of the aforementioned article by the two deniers. However, this does not really help the denier case since the essence of this argument is that the Jews were allowed to die from deprivation of food and shelter instead of being killed in gas chambers.

Much evidence about the specifics of the Nazi policy was destroyed. Otto Globocnik, who was in charge of Operation Reinhard, wrote a "Top Secret" memo on January 5, 1944 that states:

"With regard to the complete final accounts of "Operation Reinhardt" I must add that all vouchers should be destroyed as soon as possible, as has been done in the case of all other documents pertaining to this operation."<sup>85</sup>

SS men who participated in Operation Reinhard had to sign an oath of secrecy not to discuss it "because the process of the evacuation of Jews is a subject that comes under "Secret Reich Document" in accordance with censorship regulation. . .,"<sup>86</sup> What could have been so secretive about an "evacuation" that such an oath would be required?

It is known that as early as 1942 certain orders known as "Führer Ordinances" were never to be seen by outsiders. The orders were destroyed in what was officially called "Handling of Effacement".<sup>87</sup> In 1945, as the Allies were closing in on Germany, the Gauleiter and Commissioner for Reich Defense, Sprenger, issued a secret order.

"All files, particularly the secret ones, are to be destroyed completely. The secret files about . . . installations and deterring work in the concentration camps must be destroyed at all costs. Also the extermination of some families, etc. These files must under no circumstances fall into the hands of the enemy, since after all they were secret orders by the Führer".<sup>88</sup>

The "detering work in the concentration camps" and which "families" were being "exterminated" is not specified.

The German evidence which has survived clearly shows that there was no Soviet resettlement policy. A document dated June 28, 1942 from Germany's Foreign Office mentions Auschwitz as the final

destination for 40,000 Dutch-Jews, 40,000 French-Jews and 10,000 Belgium Jews.<sup>89</sup> Another document from the security police shows 45,000 Jews going to Auschwitz.<sup>90</sup> A report dated July 28, 1942 from Himmler's field adjutant states:

"Since July 22nd one train a day with 5,000 Jews goes from Warsaw to Treblinka via Malkinia, as well as two trains a week with 5,000 Jews each from Przemysl to Belzec."<sup>91</sup>

Nothing about the Soviet Union. A meeting held by the German Ministry of Transport in Berlin from September 26-28, 1942 decided the following on the "Evacuation of the Polish-Jews" as proposed by the Chief of the Security Police.<sup>92</sup>

"Two trains daily from the Warsaw district to Treblinka. One train daily from the Radem district to Treblinka.

One train daily from the Cracow district to Belzec. One train daily from the Lvov district to Belzec. One train daily from Radem district to Sobibor.

One train daily from the north Zullon district to Belzec. One train daily from the central Lublin district to Sobibor."

One would think that if there was a plan to transport Jews into the Soviet Union it would have come up at this meeting. Yet, all of the transports end at a Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka. Another document under the heading of "German Reich Railways" dated January 13, 1943 for "Special trains for resettlers" for transports from January to February 28, 1943 shows train transports for Jews to Auschwitz, Treblinka and a ghetto in Czechoslovakia. However, nothing is said about the Soviet Union.<sup>93</sup>

One of the actual transport lists was published in 1961.<sup>94</sup> It is entitled "Transportation Schedule No. 567" dated March 26, 1943. It states that the transport is valid until May 6, 1943, thereby suggesting that a daily run will be made until that date. The transport is called a "special train" which is to transport "resettlers". The train must make a number of stops. Some of the stops are referred to as a "special schedule"

(Sonderplan). There is a heading for "Special Orders" [Besondere Anordnungen] which states that the destination for the 2,000 Jewish "resettlers" is Treblinka. The instructions for the transport are quite detailed. However, nothing is said about the Soviet Union. Similarly, a report by the military police on April 12, 1943 details a transport of

2,400 Jews from Yugoslavia. The places and times stopped during the journeys are listed. The report states that "[t]he final destination, Treblinka (the camp), was reached on April 5, 1943. . .,"<sup>95</sup>

A detailed report on a transport of 8,200 Jews to Belzec was filed by the Security Police for trains in 1942. The report is entitled "Resettlement from Kolomea [in Poland] to Belzec." The report details the conditions of the transport and the places stopped along the way to Belzec. However, nothing is said about any transport out of Belzec because the journey ends there. An archeological excavation at the Belzec site in 1998 uncovered thousands of unburned bodies with the ashes of those burned in 33 mass graves <sup>96</sup>

The purpose for these transports was known by some. That the term transportation to the East did not mean the Soviet Union is provided by Hans Frank. In a diary entry on December 16, 1941 he states that he has entered into negotiations to have the Jews deported to the East. However, he was told in Berlin:

"Do you think that they will be housed in settlement villages in the Ostland? . . . why all this bother? We can't do anything with them in the Ostland or Reichskommissariat either: Liquidate them yourselves."<sup>97</sup>

The Reichskommissariat Ostland and Reichskommissariat Ukraine were German occupied Soviet territories which bordered Poland. These are the areas where Jews would have been resettled had such a policy actually existed.

A German Army publication in 1940 quoted Himmler as saying:

"All races, and particularly the Jews, will be sent to the General government in the future. This means that some 500,000 - 600,000 Jews will be transferred there [from Reich areas of Poland]."<sup>98</sup>

Once again, there is no mention of resettlement in the occupied Soviet territories. On July 19, 1942 Himmler sent out a memo stating that the entire Jewish population of Poland's General Government be "resettled" by December 31, 1942 because a "total cleansing "is necessary and therefore to be carried out."<sup>99</sup> Nine days later he sent out a "top secret" memo stating that "[t]he occupied territories will be purged of Jews. The Fuhrer has charged me with the execution of this very difficult order."<sup>100</sup> However, if all of the General Government's Jews were to be "resettled", while all territory (including Soviet territories) under German control were to be "purged" of Jews, where were they to be "resettled?" The answer had already been provided in January 1942 when Britain's Ministry of Information cited an official German document which stated that "the only things Jewish that will remain in Poland will be Jewish cemeteries."<sup>100a</sup>

By 1943 the "Final Solution" policy was in full force. In a speech on February 24th Hitler announced: "The struggle will not end with the destruction of Aryan mankind but with the extermination of Jewry in Europe."<sup>101</sup> In an April meeting with Hungary's Admiral Horthy he stated that in Poland the "Jews are just pure parasites... If the Jews there did not want to work they were shot. If they could not work they had to succumb. They had to be treated like tuberculosis bacilli. . ."<sup>102</sup> In February, Himmler's adjutant, in response to reports in the British press of exterminations, sent the following memo: "On the instructions of

[Himmler] I am transmitting herewith to you a press dispatch on the accelerated extermination [Ausrottung] of the Jews in Occupied Europe."<sup>103</sup>

The answer to what was happening to the Jews was in the Korherr Report. In the first report he gives a breakdown of "evacuations from Reich territories including the Eastern territories" from various countries up to December 31, 1942, not including the Soviet Union. The report then states: "Total evacuation (including. . . special treatment) 1,873,549." On April 10, 1943 Korherr received a letter from Himmler's adjutant that the words "special treatment of Jews" must not be used. Rather, Himmler wanted to replace "special treatment" with "Transportation of Jews out of the Eastern Provinces to the Russian East. Number of those passed through the camp in the General Government. . . through the camp in Warthegau." This clearly shows that the term transporting Jews to the East really meant "special treatment". On the previous day Himmler wrote that he considered the Korherr Report "good

material for a later date if necessary, namely for cover-up purposes." There is an abundance of documentation to prove that the words "special treatment" (sonderbehandlung) and "evacuation" were code names for killing.

In September 1939 the head of the security police wrote that "a distinction must be made between those who may be dealt with in the usual way and those who must be given special treatment. The latter case covers subjects who...are suitable for elimination, without respect for persons, by merciless treatment (namely, by execution)".<sup>104</sup> One week later a memo on a staff meeting at the Reich Security Main Office indicates the sections which are responsible for special treatment. In the text and subheading the word "execution" is placed in parentheses next to "special treatment".<sup>105</sup> A Himmler memo of February 20, 1942 states: "Special treatment is carried out by hanging".<sup>106</sup> A later memo issued by Reich Security states: "The aim of application of special treatment is above all the intimidation of foreign labor... The execution must take place on the scene. . ." <sup>107</sup> A memo issued for the Chief of Security Police Kommandos for concentration camps states: "Executions must not be carried out near the camp... The Kommandos are required to keep records of the completed special treatments. . . As regard to carrying out of the executions..."<sup>108</sup> A memo labeled "Secret" from the SS in Munich in early 1942 states that 2009 Soviet prisoners "have been placed for "Sonderbehandlung"". <sup>108a</sup>

The "special treatment" caused consternation in some quarters. German General Kube, who witnessed such actions in the Soviet occupied territories, was dismayed. Kube's reservations were summarized by Reich Commissioner Lohse in a memo of June 18, 1943:

"The fact that the Jews receive special treatment [sonderbehandelt werden] requires no further discussion... Just imagine the enemy finding out about such incidents and making capital of them! . . . "It is, however, possible for cruelties to be avoided and for those liquidated to be buried. I myself do not think that locking men, women and children in barns and setting fire to the latter is a suitable method for combating partisans, even if one wishes to exterminate [ausrotten] the population."<sup>109</sup>

Kube's protests, however, brought resentment from those carrying out the "special treatments". In a memo dated July 20, 1943, Lt. Colonel Strauch of the Security Police writes that "I arrested and subjected to special treatment 70 Jews. . ." Strauch protests Kube's attitude:

"I was again and again faced with the fact that my men and I were reproached for barbarism and sadism, whereas I did nothing but fulfill my duty. . . It was our fault that the reputation of Germany was being ruined in the whole world. It was also true, he said, that my men literally satisfied their sexual lust during these executions."<sup>110</sup>

A report from the German occupied Smolensk in the Soviet Union states: "On October 8, 1941, began the complete liquidation of the Jews. . .The number of Jews who came under "special treatment" amounted

to about 3.000."<sup>111</sup>

Use of poison gas was also a method of special treatment. The following memo of June 15, 1942 to the Reich Security Main Office from Riga, Latvia states: "A transport of Jews, which has to be treated in a special way arrives weekly... The three S-vans, which are there, are not sufficient for that purpose. I request assignment of another S-van (5 tons). At the same time I request the shipment of 20 gas hoses for the three S-vans on hand (20 Diamond, 1 Sewer), since the ones on hand are leaking already."<sup>112</sup>

The S-vans were mobile gas chambers which patrolled the Soviet occupied territory. The technical problems of the gassing were discussed in a "Top Secret" memo of May 16, 1942 by SS Lieutenant Dr. Becker:

"The application of gas is usually not undertaken correctly. In order to come to an end as fast as possible, the driver presses the accelerator to the fullest extent. By doing that the persons to be executed suffer death from suffocation and not by dozing off as was planned."<sup>113</sup>

The link of poison gas to special treatment is further illustrated in a memo of August 26, 1942 where permission is given to the Auschwitz concentration camp "for dispatch of a truck to Dessau to load material for special treatment..." Dessau is where the poison gas Zyklon B was manufactured. <sup>114</sup>

Particularly interesting is a memo of July 3, 1944 from the Gestapo District Headquarters in Dusseldorf requesting "that those persons [foreign workers] subjected to special treatment be sent to a crematorium to be cremated if possible... the proclamation by means of posters of the execution of the death sentence in the labor camp will be continued."<sup>115</sup> The link between special treatment and cremation has been established through the recently uncovered Auschwitz archives in Moscow where every document in a 120 item inventory of material for building the crematoriums in Auschwitz for an eight day period was captioned: "Concerning: Prisoner of War Camp Auschwitz (Carrying Out of Special Treatment)"...<sup>116</sup> Thus, the purpose for the crematoria is clear.

The meaning of "evacuation" is made clear within the Korherr Report. In the first report it is stated that the "evacuation of [the Jews] in the Russian territories" and the Baltics is 633,300. Deniers who claim that Polish Jews were being evacuated to the Soviet Union have never explained why Soviet Jews were simultaneously being evacuated from the territories in the Soviet Union. Where were they being evacuated to? In the second report Korherr acknowledges that "it was not possible to count all the deaths of Soviet Russian Jews in the occupied Eastern territories while those in the remaining European part of Russia and on the front have not been included at all". Korherr is not only acknowledging that his original number is an understatement, but that the "evacuations" of the first report for Soviet Jews are in fact "deaths". In this respect it is important to note an often overlooked aspect of Korherr's first report regarding the concentration camps Auschwitz and Lublin (also known as Majdanek). In producing the Jewish prisoner figures for these camps he states that "Jews in the evacuation stations of Auschwitz and Lublin are not included in these figures." It is well known among Holocaust historians that Jews who were immediately killed at these camps upon arrival did not receive registration numbers, a topic to be discussed in chapter 5. Therefore, there is no doubt that Korherr's "evacuation stations" are in fact gas chambers. Some guards at Auschwitz were required to take an oath under pain of death not to reveal any information about "Jewish evacuations" (Judenevakuierung) and to do their utmost to expedite the rapid and smooth implementation of these measures.<sup>117</sup> What could have been so secret about these "evacuations" that such an oath would be required? Recall that a similar oath had to be signed by SS participants in Operation Reinhard.

The meaning of the term evacuation was made clear in a letter by Dr. Ernst Wetzel, head of the policy board of the Racial Policy Office, to Reich Commissioner Heinrich Lohse in October 1941:

"I herewith let you know that Herr Brack, head of the Fuhrer's Chancellery, has declared to be inclined to cooperate in the establishment of the localities required as well as of the gassing apparatuses [vergasungsapparate]. . .For the time being Jews are being evacuated from the Reich proper.. .in order later on to be deployed for labour... As the situation is there are no objections to the liquidation of Jews with the Brack method if they are incapable of work."<sup>118</sup>

Victor Brack had been one of the prime movers of Hitler's euthanasia policy in which 71,000 Germans, Jews and non-Jews, who were aged or ill were killed.

Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Minister of Propaganda and confidant, made the following entry in his diary on March 27, 1942:

"Beginning with Lublin, the Jews in the General Government are now being evacuated eastward. The procedure is a pretty barbaric one and not to be described here more definitely. Not much will remain of the Jews. On the whole it can be said that about 60 percent of them will have to be liquidated whereas only about 40 percent can be used for forced labor."<sup>119</sup>

Probably the best known use of the word evacuation being equated to killing was made by Himmler in his Posen speech of October 4, 1943.

"I am referring here to the evacuation of the Jews, the extermination of the Jewish people. This is one of those things that is easily said: "The Jewish people are going to be exterminated .." this is an unwritten and never to be written page of glory in our history. . . "We had the moral right. We had the duty towards our people to destroy this people that wanted to destroy us... Because we have exterminated a germ, we do not want in the end to be infected by the germ and die of it."<sup>120</sup>

Two days later Himmler stated:

"What about the women and children? I have decided that this too requires a clear answer. I did not consider that I should be justified in getting rid of the men — in having them put to death, in other words — only to allow their children to grow up to avenge themselves on our sons and grandsons."<sup>121</sup>

Another favorite term used for killing was "resettlement".<sup>122</sup> A German report on an action in Kiev in September 1941 states:

"Orders are that Jews are to be "resettled". This takes place as follows: the Jews are ordered at short notice to report to specific collecting points 'with their best clothes and their jewelry. . . They are led away [after depositing their belongings] from the road and liquidated. The situations that arise in the process are so horrifying that they cannot be described. The effects on the German squads are inevitable — the executions can

usually only be carried out under the influence of alcohol."<sup>123</sup>

Another report from Kiev by one of the Einsatzgruppen killing Squads boasts of how 30,000 Jews were tricked "who, until the moment of their execution still believed in their resettlement, thanks to extremely clever organization." The report goes on to state that 75,000 Jews "have been liquidated in this manner. . ."<sup>124</sup>

In October 1942 the authorities in the Auschwitz camp were given permission for a five ton truck to go to Dessau, where Zyklon B poison gas was made, "to load material for Jewish resettlement. The permit is given to the driver."<sup>125</sup>

The use of code words for a secret action is not unusual. In Germany, experimental work in the development of poison gas for warfare during World War I and after was undertaken by the "Technical Committee for the Destruction of Noxious Creatures" founded in 1917. The work was done under the cover of attempting to eliminate agricultural insects.<sup>126</sup>

Similarly, the German euthanasia program against the ill and elderly, which claimed 71,000 lives from 1939-1941, was carried out under the auspices of "The Charitable Foundation for the Transport of Patients." The patients were "transported" to killing centers.<sup>127</sup> Recently declassified British intelligence intercepts of German radio messages in 1941 reveal the extent that the Germans sought to conceal the killing of Jews. Up until September 13, there were many radio intercepts of mass killings in the Soviet Union. However, on that date a coded message was received that future executions would be delivered by couriers, "not by a radio system vulnerable to interception." The Commander of the Order Police in Berlin insisted that such executions be treated as "most secret matters of the Reich."<sup>128</sup>

The Nazi use of code words has led deniers to claim that these words did not mean killing even though the above discussion can leave no doubt as to their meaning in the Korherr Report and elsewhere. Thus, when Arthur Greiser, who was part of Operation Reinhard in Poland, informed Himmler that "action for the special treatment of about 100,000 Jews in my province that has been approved by you. .." it is clear that he means killing.<sup>129</sup> Ironically, it may have been Hans Frank who anticipated that there would someday be a denial movement when he wrote in his diary on August 2, 1943: "We started here [in Poland] with 3.5 million [Jews] and now only insignificant working parties are left. As for the remainder — we shall say some day — they migrated".<sup>130</sup>

## Madagascar

One of the arguments that frequently arises among deniers is that the term "Final Solution" meant the resettlement of Jews in Madagascar, not killing them. It is true that Madagascar was mentioned by the Nazis within the context of resettling Jews before the outbreak of the war. However, it is difficult to believe that anybody in a position of authority in Germany could have actually believed that Germany's Jews, much less those in all of Europe, could have been resettled there. In 1937 the Polish government sent a commission to Madagascar to report on the possibility of Jewish colonization. One member of the Commission reported that only 15,000 Jewish families could be resettled there while the other two members, both Jews, stated that only small groups could be settled and that they would be exposed to tropical epidemics.<sup>131</sup>

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

### CHAPTER 2

#### SOVIET UNION DEMOGRAPHICS

The Soviet census of 1939 found approximately 3 million Jews. More Jews came under Soviet control as the result of the Soviet-German alliance when the Soviets invaded Eastern Poland, the Baltics, and Bessarabia and North Bukovina in Rumania. In addition to the 1.3 million in Eastern Poland discussed earlier, about 250,000 from the Baltic countries and 330,000 from Rumania came under Soviet control. When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union in June 1941 most of these Jews came under German control. Also, territory which housed approximately 2,150,000 from the Ukraine, White Russia and Russian provinces came under German control.<sup>1</sup> About 800,000-1,000,000 Soviet-Jews were beyond German reach.

Sanning attempted to show that most of the Jews who lived in areas which came under German control were saved due to a special Soviet evacuation plan for Jews. He quoted (p. 92) Joshua Rothenberg, a specialist on the Soviet Union, as writing: "Much of the Jewish population of the conquered territories escaped annihilation by fleeing before the invading armies arrived." What Rothenberg actually wrote was as follows:

"In the wake of the rapid German penetration into the conquered territories, more than a million Jewish men, women and children were machine-gunned by the Einsatzkommandos (special German units given the task of carrying out the mass execution of the Jewish population).

Much of the Jewish population of the conquered territories escaped annihilation by fleeing before the invading armies arrived."<sup>2</sup>

Sanning (p. 93) quoted the American Jewish Yearbook for 1943 that the evacuation of the Baltic Jews started a week before the invasion, thus attempting to give the impression that they escaped. The Yearbook did state that some Jews were evacuated, but it also stated:

"In spite of earlier reports that a substantial part or even a majority of the Jews had succeeded in fleeing before the German army, the most reliable information would indicate that a relatively small percentage had escaped to the interior of Soviet Russia. The great majority of the Baltic Jews could not or would not leave and they came under the rule of Nazi tyranny."

Sanning (p. 93) quoted the Encyclopedia Judaica to the effect that one week before the war "many people, including Jews, were hastily deported as politically unreliable." Once again Sanning was attempting to show that Jews were being moved out of the territory which would come under Nazi control. While the Judaica did speak of deportations, the wider context of what it said can be seen from the following: "The entire country was occupied by the Germans within one week, so that only a handful of Jews managed to escape into the Soviet interior."<sup>4</sup>

Sanning (p. 94) relied on the Soviet-Yiddish newspaper Eynikeyt to show that the Soviets had saved 80% of the Soviet Jews. Eynikeyt was published by the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, a Soviet controlled organization whose purpose was to support Soviet policies.<sup>5</sup> Sanning (p. 94) accepted Eynikeyt's claims and its supporters at face value even though the source from which he obtained the Eynikeyt quotes reproduced them to show that "[t]he communist propaganda machine has been extremely successful in propagating this myth."<sup>6</sup> Predictably, Sanning ignored Eynikeyt's reports about Nazi atrocities towards Jews. In particular, in a 1943 article entitled "Ukraine Without Jews" it was reported: "Hitler killed all the Jews he met in the Ukraine, everyone without exception. No less than a million." The reporter also wrote that "in all this travelling I only met one Jew."<sup>7</sup>

This Eynikeyt report is very similar to a report filed by Dr. Hans-Joachim Kausch of the German Propaganda Ministry in June 1943, who had prepared it after his 19 day trip to the Ukraine. The report was not meant for the public:

"There were 1.1 million Jews among the 16 million inhabitants of the territory of the Ukrainian civil administration. They have been liquidated without remainder. As a matter of fact, during our entire trip, we saw only four Jews. . ."<sup>8</sup>

There have been five major studies on the Soviet evacuation policy, four of which were available to Sanning.<sup>9</sup> He ignored all of them. The following is a brief synthesis of these studies.

There was much confusion among Soviet forces in the areas where Jews were concentrated after the German invasion. For a brief time people in those areas, including Jews, were prevented by Soviet forces from leaving. This was due to the surprise nature of the attack and lack of direction from Moscow. Many Jews who could have escaped were killed by the Germans. There was a subsequent evacuation policy for all Soviet citizens. The claim that there was a special policy for Jews was promoted by Communist propaganda in the West. However, all historians now agree that there was no such policy because the Soviets never published any documents or furnished any proof. One writer who promoted the view that there was such a policy would later admit that "[n]o document has been found to confirm the fact."<sup>10</sup>

Evacuation priority was given to Communist officials and administrators. Jews who fell into this category did receive priority. One of the problems faced by the Jews was that during the 21 months from 1939-1941 that the Soviet-German alliance was in effect nothing was printed in the Soviet press about German attitudes towards Jews. Thus, many Jews who might have escaped were unaware of the danger.

A German report from the Ukraine in July 1941, shortly after the invasion, stated: "The Jews are strikingly ill-informed about our attitude towards them and about the treatment Jews are receiving in Germany or in Warsaw. . .they do believe that we will let them be if they apply themselves diligently to their work."<sup>11</sup> The success of the evacuation efforts varied according to location. All together, estimates of the total Jewish evacuation range from 1 million to as high as 1.5 million out of a total of 4.2 million Jews in the conquered Soviet territories. The 1.3 million Polish Jews in former Soviet occupied Poland are included in this total. Sanning's claim that 80% of all Jews were evacuated is based purely on Communist propaganda intended for Western consumption. No historian has ever taken such claims seriously.

Sanning also argued that the total Jewish population of the Soviet Union increased from 1939 to 1959. The 1939 census found approximately 3,020,000 Jews while the 1959 census counted 2,267,814. This later figure includes the Baltics and parts of Rumania whereas the former does not. When Baltic and Rumanian figures for 1939 are added to the 1939 census the number increases to about 3,650,000. Sanning argued that the real number of Jews was 3.75 million in 1959, the implication being that the Nazis really did not kill many Jews in the Soviet Union. He based this conclusion on estimates of the Jewish population in some cities made by the Encyclopedia Judaica which were higher than the official Soviet figures. He accepted the estimates as being firm figures for these particular cities and found that in the aggregate the estimates exceeded the actual count by 65%. He then increased by 65% the figure for the entire Jewish population of the Soviet Union.

The following are illustrations of four of the prominent cities mentioned by the Judaica. In Moscow, the official number was 239,000, the Judaica said "some opinions evaluate the number of Moscow's Jews as high as 500,000."<sup>12</sup> The official 39,000 figure for Minsk "was estimated to be in fact between 50,000 and 60,000."<sup>13</sup> The 102,000 figure in Odessa "has been estimated at about 180,000."<sup>14</sup> The 162,000 Jews in Leningrad (now St. Petersburg) "was probably closer to 200,000."<sup>15</sup> Neither the Judaica nor anyone else cited by Sanning claimed to have any concrete numbers which contradicted the Soviet census.

It has been known for some time that due to Jewish assimilation into Soviet society there are a number of Jews who do not identify themselves as Jewish. A study published in 1967, which appears to be the only one to ever scientifically address this issue, estimated the understatement at 400,000.<sup>16</sup> Sanning ignored this study.

Sanning also ignored the fact that the understatement probably also appears in the 1926 and 1939 censuses. This shows that the number of Jews was in all likelihood actually higher on the eve of World War II than the census amount. The evidence for this comes from the 1897 Russian census which found a total of 5.2 million Jews of which about 2.9 million were in the area of post World War I Russia.<sup>17</sup> A large emigration of about annually occurred from 1897 to the outbreak of the war in 1914.<sup>18</sup> However, the high Jewish population natural rate of increase was able to replace emigration, <sup>19</sup> and one estimate placed the number of Jews in 1910 at 5.6 million.<sup>20</sup> The 1926 census only showed 2,680,000 Jews.<sup>21</sup> A Soviet economist stated that 300,000 Jews had not declared their nationality in 1926 while a similar

estimate was given for the 1939 census.<sup>22</sup> The decrease was due to Jewish assimilation which could be seen by the decline of Yiddish from 96.9% in 1897 to 72.6% in 1926 to 41% in 1939.<sup>23</sup> Thus, the tendency for many Jews not to give their true nationality dates from well before World War II. Sanning ignored this because he wanted to minimize the number of Soviet Jews before the war and maximize the number after.

A German report from the occupied Byelorussia in mid-1942 made the following observation:

"Of all the areas in Ostland, [Eastern Territories] Byelorussia had always been the most densely permeated by Jews... According to the last census in 1931, more than 500,000 Jews were living in the western areas. . . . Only part of the Jews admit to being Jews, as we know from experience, in order to hide their identity. Thus, only a part of the Jews is included in the number of Jews listed who actually live in Byelorussia. Thus, the actual total is much higher.<sup>24</sup> (emphasis added)

An interesting commentary is provided by the American Jewish demographer Mark Wischnitzer in an article that, as noted earlier in the previous chapter, Sanning misrepresented in relation to a point he was trying to make. Wischnitzer noted that the first decade of the 20th century, following the 1897 census, showed a marked increase of Russian Jews despite the high emigration, and that their number was Unofficially estimated to be 7 million at the outbreak of the first world war.<sup>25</sup> Using Sanning type techniques one could take this 7 million, make the appropriate reduction for Jews in territories lost by Russia after World War I, project natural increase, and arrive at 5 million Jews in the Soviet Union in 1939, instead of 3 million.

### Ignored Evidence on Soviet Jews

The fate of Soviet Jews was chronicled in the reports of the Einsatzgruppen and Security Police killing squads which operated in the occupied Soviet Union. There are also a number of reports from the Wehrmacht (German Army). Following what had become a well defined pattern, Sanning ignored any mention of these reports since this would have destroyed his thesis of minimal Jewish casualties in Soviet territories.

The Einsatzgruppen and Security Police reports have caused many problems for deniers because they give graphic details on the killing operations which took place on Soviet territory. Generally, these reports are totally ignored in denier publications, the notable exception being Arthur Butz. He claimed that these reports are forgeries, as he had with most other evidence on the Holocaust. Butz wrote that whereas the myth of Auschwitz was created in Washington, the Einsatzgruppen reports were created in Moscow.<sup>26</sup>

Wartime forgeries have been quickly exposed. After World War I the so called Sisson documents purported to prove that Lenin was an agent of the German government. These documents were eventually exposed as forgeries.<sup>27</sup> One of the best examples was the so called "Hitler Diaries" which

were "discovered" in the early 1980's. They were immediately found to be fraudulent.<sup>28</sup> However, no denier, including Butz, has ever offered any evidence that the German documents presented at Nuremberg proving the Holocaust are forgeries.

The case of the Katyn Forest massacre is instructive in this respect. The Soviets massacred thousands of Poles in the Katyn Forest. For years following the war the Soviets claimed that the crime had been committed by the Germans. During the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials the Soviets even had Katyn Forest added as one of the charges against the Nazis. However, a vigorous German defense resulted in the charges eventually being dropped.<sup>29</sup> The Katyn shootings were very similar to the type of operations carried out by the Einsatzgruppen. One would expect that if the Einsatzgruppen reports were forgeries there would have also been a number of documents showing German responsibility for Katyn accepted as fact by the Nuremberg tribunal. Also, since it is often claimed that innocent Germans were forced to confess to crimes they did not commit, one would expect many of those who confessed to Einsatzgruppen shootings to confess to Katyn. Yet, this never happened.

For those unwilling to accept claims of forgery about the killing reports the argument has been advanced that these reports do not prove that the killings were ordered by the Nazi hierarchy. It is also argued that Jews were simply killed along with other Soviets as part of general operations.<sup>30</sup> These claims can be easily dismissed by examining Himmler's report to Hitler submitted on December 31, 1942. It deals with killing operations in the Soviet Union for the four month period of August through November 1942. Total bandits killed are just under 10,000 and deserters killed number 140. Under the heading of "Accomplices of guerrilla and guerilla suspects" are 16,553 arrested and 14,257 executed. Under a separate subheading for "Jews executed" is 363,211.<sup>31</sup> Thus, the anti-Jewish nature of those operations is indisputable. The fact that the report is from Himmler to Hitler, the number two man in the Third Reich to the number one, proves that the killings were official Nazi policy, and not carried out by rogue elements.

The Einsatzgruppen were special killing squads formed for the purpose of exterminating Jews and other categories of people considered to be undesirable. They were divided into Einsatzgruppen A, B, C and D and were additionally divided into sub-groups. They became active almost immediately after Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. Regulations issued for them on July 17, 1941 dealing with prisoner of war camps state that they must discover "all important officials of the state and the party". These officials are then listed. They include political commissars, revolutionaries, agitators and "All Jews."<sup>32</sup> Thus, Jews were identified for liquidation regardless of their political or military status.

Even the regular army was to be a part of the killings. In a secret memo entitled "Conduct of Troops in the Eastern Territories" issued by the High Command it is stated that "the soldier must have full understanding for the necessity of a severe but just revenge on subhuman Jewry. The army has to aim at another purpose, i.e. the annihilation of revolts in [the] Hinterland which, as experience proves, have always been caused by Jews".<sup>33</sup> Colonel-General Herman Hoths in an order dated November 17, 1941, stated that "[s]elf preservation demands that they [Jews] be eradicated."<sup>34</sup> A monthly report by the Commander of the 70th Infantry Division states that "the complete extermination of this alien element is being carried out."<sup>35</sup>

Jews were to be killed even though in the beginning they did not pose any more of a threat to the Germans than any other segment of the population. Operational Situation Report (OSR) 31 by Einsatzgruppe B of July 23, 1941 states: "Up to now, Jewry has shown restraint. The harsh measures against the Jews and, in particular, the executions have increased the anti German attitude

considerably." The liquidation of 7,629 Jews was reported. In OSR 67 the Einsatzgruppen reported on August 29 that "3,105 more Jews and 34 Communist were liquidated. No terror and sabotage groups were discovered."<sup>36</sup> A revealing report is from the Wehrmacht on December 2, 1941 which states that "it cannot be claimed that the Jews as such present any kind of danger for the German Wehrmacht. The troops and the German Administration have been satisfied with the work output of the Jews, who are of course motivated by no emotion except fear". However, the report goes on to state that "about 150,000 to 200,000 Jews may have been executed" in a particular section of the Ukraine.<sup>37</sup>

The Wehrmacht report highlighted the conflicting goals that segments of the German command had with the higher political leadership. It states that Jews had carried out almost all of the work in the skilled trades and their "elimination was therefore bound to have profound economic consequences, including even direct effects on the military economy. . ." Clearly, there were those who wanted to use the Jews as a labor pool. A letter from the Reich Commissioner for the East to the Minister for Occupied Eastern Territories queries:

"I should like to be informed whether your inquiry of 31 October is to be regarded as a directive to liquidate all Jews in the East? Shall this take place without regard to age and sex and economic interests. . ."

"Of course the cleansing of the East of Jews is a necessary task; its solution, however, must be harmonized with the necessities of war production."

The "Top Secret" reply states: "Economic considerations should fundamentally remain unconsidered in the settlement of the problem".<sup>38</sup> However, in some cases the killings could be harmonized with labor needs. A report by Einsatzgruppe A on its activities in the Baltics and White Russia discusses the "mopping up" in accordance "with the basic orders to complete removal if possible, of Jewry." The "goal has been substantially attained. . .as a result of the execution up to the present time of 229,052 Jews". Nevertheless 34,500 were retained for labor purposes.<sup>39</sup>

On July 31, 1942 the Commissioner General for White Ruthenia reported that "we have liquidated in the last ten weeks about 55,000 Jews in White Ruthenia. In the territory Minsk-Land [county] Jewry has been completely eliminated, without endangering the manpower commitment."<sup>40</sup>

German economic exigencies could sometimes be achieved by killing through the seizure of Jewish property. A report by Security Division 454 states: "About 34,000 reported, including women and children. After they had been made to give up their clothing and valuables, all were killed; this took several days".<sup>41</sup> Einsatzgruppe B reported the seizure of more than two million rubles along with the liquidation of 37,180 Jews.<sup>42</sup>

The rapidity of these actions can be seen from some of the reports. For example, Einsatzgruppe C reported on September 11, 1941 that "[i]n Kamenets-Podolsk 23,600 Jews were shot in three days. . .", and on October 2 reported the execution of "33,771 Jews in Kiev on September 29 and 30, 1941."<sup>43</sup>

Not all of the killings were by conventional means. A report from the Waffen SS in the Ukraine states: "The driving of women and children into the marshes did not have the expected success, because the marshes were not so deep that one could sink."<sup>44</sup>

One of the aspects of these reports is the matter of fact manner in which all of this killing is reported coupled with the attempt to keep an accurate count. For example, Einsatzgruppe D's report for October 1-15, 1941 states: "The districts... were cleansed of Jews. 4,091 Jews and 46 Communists were executed during the time span covered by the report, bringing the total to 40,699."<sup>45</sup> Perhaps the most detailed report was given by Karl Jager, a leader of Einsatzgruppe A in Lithuania. Killings are broken down by men, women and children with dates and cities. The dates that Jews arrive at the burial pits and the number killed are recorded. Total killed was 137,346.<sup>46</sup>

One of the well known Nazi techniques in occupied territories was to incite the local population against the Jews in order to localize the killings where possible. The efficacy of these attempts varied. For example, a report by Einsatzgruppe A on activities in the Baltics states that in Lithuania "it was not easy at first to set in motion an extensive pogrom against Jews." The Security Police are identified as the agency "to set in motion these self-cleansing movements. . ." Problems arose in Riga, Latvia but in the end "[i]t was possible. . .to set in motion a pogrom against Jews also in Riga. During this pogrom all synagogues were destroyed and about 400 Jews were killed." However, it is acknowledged that "the Jewish problem in the East could not be solved by pogroms alone. . .the cleansing activities of the Security Police had to aim at complete annihilation of the Jews".<sup>47</sup>

The killings were carried out in a manner intended to deceive the victims into believing that they would be resettled. A report distributed by the chief of the Reich Main Security Office noted:

"It is attempted to purge the East land [Ostland] as completely as possible of Jews. Executions by shooting are carried out everywhere in such a manner as not to attract public attention. The public and even the remaining Jews are mostly of the opinion that the Jews have only been transferred to a different domicile."<sup>48</sup>

One of the best statements of Nazi policy in the Soviet occupied territories was a secret verdict handed down by an SS court in the trial of an individual who was not authorized to engage in the killings, but had done so anyway. The court stated:

"The accused shall not be punished because of the actions against the Jews as such. The Jews have to be exterminated and none of the Jews that were killed is any great loss. Although the accused should have recognized that the extermination of the Jews was the duty of the kommandos which have been especially set up for this purpose [i.e. the Einsatzgruppen] , he should be excused for considering himself to have the authority to take part in the extermination of Jewry himself.

The court was only annoyed by the fact that he had taken photos of these killings in disobedience to strict orders not to do so.<sup>48a</sup>

The preceding was a selection of the many reports dealing with the killing activities. Ronald Headland, who examined all of these reports and has written a standard history of the Einsatzgruppen, added the totals for a minimum of 1,152,731 Jews killed by December 31, 1942. However, he agrees with the estimate of Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg that the total open air shootings exceed 1.3 million.<sup>49</sup> Some of these killings took place in Eastern Poland and are not part of the Soviet Union totals.

The total number of Jews killed in the Soviet Union is not known. Part of the problem in ascertaining the total is determining the geographic area. The pre 1939 area of the Soviet Union which contained the Ukraine and White Russia appears to have lost 1 million Jews. The 1926 Soviet census showed about 2 million in these areas. The Baltics and Bessarabia, which came under Soviet control in 1939, appear to

have lost about 500,000 Jews.<sup>50</sup> However, the actual number will probably never be known. Nevertheless, the killing reports leave enough of a paper trail to prove exactly what were the Nazis' intentions towards the Jews and that the "Final Solution" was a killing policy.

## Labor Needs

As was just shown, one of the issues which arose with regard to Soviet Jews was the labor problem. Some German administrators saw the Jews as a valuable labor pool. Holocaust denier Carlo Mattogno has argued that Germany's labor needs for Jewish manpower cast doubt on whether the Nazis would massacre the Jews.<sup>51</sup> This argument comes up every now and again.

Ulrich Herbert, probably the world's foremost expert on Germany's foreign labor usage during World War II, has documented nearly six million foreign workers in Germany on September 30, 1944. None of them were Jewish. Herbert notes that it was Germany's policy to exterminate the Jews as opposed to the foreign workers who were brought into the Reich.<sup>52</sup> At one point 1,000 Polish workers were brought to Berlin to replace German Jews.<sup>53</sup> Hitler had personally countermanded an order to bring 73,000 Polish Jews into Germany's pre-1938 borders for armaments labor production.<sup>54</sup>

Some Jewish labor was used in the German occupied territories — but only reluctantly. Mattogno cited the Korherr report which stated that as of December 31, 1942 there were 185,000 Jewish workers in those areas known as the Reich, which included much of the occupied territories and most notably Posen, Poland which had 95,000 Jewish laborers. However, these Jews were slated to be replaced. In a memo dated November 26, 1942 Fritz Sauckel, Germany's Plenipotentiary General for manpower, stated that Jews employed in Reich territory would be replaced by Poles.<sup>55</sup>

In September 1941 a letter from the German Armed Forces High Command in the Soviet occupied territories stated that:

"Papers which confirm to the Jews that they are employed for armed forces purposes, will not be issued by military headquarters under any circumstances.

"Excepted from this is solely the employment of Jews in specially set-up labor columns which are only to be assigned under German supervision."<sup>56</sup>

German General von Ginant had stated in September 1942 that the occupied portion of Poland known as the General Government had 300,000 Jewish laborers and 700,000 Poles. He noted that their removal would cause problems with Germany's war effort.<sup>57</sup> Recall, however, that two months earlier Himmler had stated that all of the occupied territories were to be purged of Jews.<sup>58</sup> Himmler's response to von Ginant was as follows:

"... I have given directions to proceed unrelentingly against all those who believe that they have to

oppose the step [of Jewish evacuation] with so called armament interests but who in reality only wish to support the Jews and their business.

"The Jews who are in actual armament firms, that is in weapon production shops, motor car workshops, etc., are gradually to be taken out. . . "We will then strive to substitute Poles for these Jewish workers, and to reduce most of these to a few large Jewish concentration camp factories if possible in the East of the General Government. Of course, there too, the Jews shall some day disappear in accordance with the Fuhrer's wishes."59

The Korherr Report's failure to mention Jews working in the General Government is due to the success in removing them from labor. Nevertheless, in January 1943 Himmler was complaining that there were 32,000 Jews left in the armaments industry in Warsaw. He wanted the Jews transferred to concentration camps.60 A "Secret" memo dated March 26, 1943 from the office of the German Plenipotentiary for Manpower entitled "Removal of Jews" states:

"At the end of February [1943, Himmler] and the Reich Minister for Armaments and Munitions for reasons concerning the security of the State, removed from their places of work all Jews who were still working freely and not in camps and either transferred them to a labor corps or collected them for removal [Fortschaffung]

"... I request you to report to me, as of 31 March 1943, to what extent Jews have been removed from employment and replacement through other forms of labor has become necessary."61

By mid-1944 there were some Jews working in German Security Police Prisons. A "Top Secret" memo was issued shortly after the Hungarian action had ended. The memo anticipates the problem of the prison being liberated by Allied Troops. The memo states:

"Should the situation develop suddenly in such a way that is impossible to evacuate the prisoners, the prison inmates are to be liquidated and their bodies disposed of as far as possible (burning, blowing up the building, etc.). If necessary, Jews still employed in the armament industry or on other work are to be dealt with in the same way. [italics in original]

"The liberation of prisoners or Jews by the enemy. . . must be avoided under all circumstances nor may they fall into their hands alive."62

Although Jewish labor would have been a valuable asset to the German war effort, the Final Solution took precedence even over the needs of the military. In October 1942 an Associated Press correspondent in Sweden reported the continuation of death transports even though there were a lack of trains in Germany.63 Even Himmler, second in authority in the Third Reich next to Hitler, gave priority to the "Final Solution". He was cabled by an SS and Police leader in Poland's General Government in December 1942 about the forth coming lack of transport for Jews for the period from December 25, 1942 to January 15, 1943. He is warned: "This step most seriously endangers the plan for the deportation of Jews in the entirety." Himmler is urged to contact the authorities of the Army's Supreme Command and the Transportation Ministry "to obtain the placing of at least three pairs of trains at the disposal of this mission of highest importance. . ." Himmler contacted the head of the German Transport Ministry on January 23, 1943 and stated that the "deportation of the Jews was a precondition for bringing peace and quiet to the General District of Bialystok and the Russian territories." This also

included deportation of Jews from Western Europe.

"If I wish to finish things up quickly, I must have more trains for transports. I well know what dire straits the railroads are in and what demands are always being made on them. Nevertheless, I am forced to appeal to you: help me and supply me the trains."

Himmler got the trains.<sup>64</sup> However, it can be seen that even though the railways were in such "dire straits", the second most powerful man in Germany — with, of course, Hitler's assent — was willing to imperil the German war effort to transport Jews to death camps.

In a memo issued in early 1942, Himmler informed the Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories that "no measures should be taken to prevent measures directed at the elimination of the Jews." In a separate section of this memo entitled "Economic Activities" it is stated: "Measures designed to achieve the annihilation of the Jews should be adopted regardless of economic considerations."<sup>65</sup> Probably the clearest and most important statement on these matters came from Poland's Governor General, Hans Frank. In a conference on December 9, 1942 he stated:

"Not unimportant labor reserves have been taken from us when we lost

our old trustworthy Jews. It is clear that the labor situation is made more difficult when, in the middle of the war effort, the order is given to prepare all Jews for annihilation [alle Juden sind der Vernichtung anheim zu stellen]. . . The directive for the annihilation of the Jews comes from higher sources. [Die Weisung der Judenvernichtung kommt von höherer Stelle]. . . the taking away of the Jews has led to tremendous difficulties in the labor field."<sup>66</sup>

Frank goes on to note that the State Secretary of Transportation was complaining that a large construction project had come to a standstill because the Jews who had been working on it were taken away. Frank complains that "[n]ow the order provides that the armament Jews also are to be taken away". This will make the situation "even worse".

Frank is not only openly acknowledging orders for the extermination of the Jews [Judenvernichtung], but that this policy is to be carried out regardless of the adverse impact it will have on the German war effort. The reason for this official German attitude was discussed by Goebbels. He wrote that Hitler wanted to get all of the Jews out of Berlin. The argument that the Jews could serve as valuable labor was not taken seriously. Such arguments were seen as an excuse to protect the Jews.<sup>67</sup> The fact that high ranking officials such as Frank had a different view did not change official German policy on this matter.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

### CHAPTER 3

#### HUNGARIAN DEMOGRAPHICS

Sanning's account (pp. 138-143) of what happened to Hungary's Jews relies mainly on Arthur Butz. Therefore, both accounts will be analyzed. Sanning stressed that while Hungary's Jews had problems before October 1944, it was in that month that the principal danger was manifested. This was essentially the version given by Butz. However, the reader of Sanning's version might be puzzled because Sanning never states why it is important that the position of Hungarian Jews deteriorates in October, not earlier.

The problem has to do with the deportation of Hungary's Jews in May-July, 1944. Both Butz and Sanning relied on the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Butz argued that the deportations never took place, and that the evidence supporting deportations was a forgery. Sanning never discussed the deportations beginning in May. As was noted earlier, Sanning tried to avoid the usual denier conspiracy theories. Both Butz and Sanning were essentially arguing that if the persecution began in October, and not earlier, then the deportations could not have begun in May 1944. In fact, however, a reading of the Red Cross's report belies both authors. The report does mention that the replacement of the Hungarian Government in October 1944 "by one in bondage to Germany, provoked a violent crises, executions, robberies, deportations, forced labour, imprisonment, such was the lot of the Jewish population. . ." However, the report clearly states that the persecution began in March, when Germany moved into Hungary, not October:

"[W]hen German pressure was reasserted from March 1944 onwards, the position of the Jews became critical. The replacement in October 1944, of Horthy's Government by one in bondage to Germany,

provoked a violent crisis. . ."

"On March 18, 1944 Hitler summoned the Regent, Admiral Horthy, to his headquarters. He [Hitler] expressed his indignation that "in Hungary very nearly a million Jews were able to live in freedom and without restriction . . . German troops had begun the occupation of Hungary in order to prevent her from abandoning her alliance with Germany. . Emigration of the Jews was straightaway suspended, and the persecutions began".<sup>1</sup> (italics added).

Thus, Butz's and Sanning's own source identifies March 1944, not October, as the beginning of the persecutions. In fact, the report also notes that on July 5, 1944 the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) appealed to Horthy on behalf of the Jews. Horthy, who was in no position to oppose Hitler, replied on August 12: "It is unfortunately not within my power to prevent inhuman acts which no one condemns more severely than my people. . .".

The fate of Hungary's Jews was probably better known at the time it was taking place than any other phase of the "Final Solution". The world press reported on the deportations extensively when they began in mid-May. On May 18 The New York Times reported from Istanbul:

"The first act in a program of mass extermination of Jews in Hungary is over, and 80,000 Jews of the Carpathian Provinces have already disappeared. They have been sent to murder camps [i.e. Auschwitz] in Poland.

"The humiliation suffered by Hungarian Jews is indescribable. It is far worse than anything suffered in neighboring Rumania. . ."

"Thousands of non-Jewish Hungarians throughout the country are risking their lives in order to save Jewish lives. . ."

On April 23, 1944 Edmund Veessenmayer, Germany's Plenipotentiary to Hungary, sent out a secret memo that negotiations about the Jewish deportations had started. "They call for a daily shipment of 3,000 Jews, mainly from the Carpathian area, beginning on 15 May. If transportation facilities permit, there will later on also be simultaneous shipments from other ghettos. Auschwitz is designated as receiving station".<sup>2</sup> The actual deportations, however, far exceeded the 3,000 daily because Jews were shipped from all areas, as anticipated by Veessenmayer, not only Carpathia. On May 26, the Counselor of the German Legation in Hungary, von Thadden, reported that 12,000 - 14,000 Jews were being sent daily into Poland, and that the number had reached 116,000 by May 24th. On the previous day he had written that it was expected that the total amount of Jews to be seized would reach one million or more

and "about one-third of them fit for work and to be received. . .in Upper Silesia,"<sup>3</sup> the geographic area of Poland where Auschwitz was located.

Veesenmayer made periodic reports about the deportations. In his final report of July 11 he states that a total of 437,402 Jews had been deported by July 9.<sup>4</sup> An additional 27,000 Jews were deported on a forced foot march from Hungary to Germany in November 1944.<sup>5</sup>

All of the relevant correspondence during this period was published in Randolph Braham's two volume *The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry*. Braham reprinted the original correspondence presented at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. Butz reproduced many excerpts from the press dealing with the deportations and gave a summary of the relevant Veesenmayer reports. He then claimed that the Veesenmayer reports were forgeries and that the deportations never took place. Butz did accept, however, as valid the forced march deportations from November 1944.<sup>6</sup> It is fair to say that Butz's whole thesis that the German documents which prove the Holocaust are forgeries stands or falls on his theory that the Veesenmayer memos are forgeries.

After Butz's book appeared, Braham published, in 1981, a two volume narrative on the fate of Hungary's Jews entitled *The Politics of Genocide*. In 1994 a second edition was published. Braham discovered that in addition to Veesenmayer's figures on the deportations, Laszlo Ferenczy, the Hungarian official in charge of ghettoization and concentration of Jews, also kept a list of the deportations through July 1944. His figures were 434,351, or about 3,000 less than Veesenmayer's.<sup>7</sup> In addition, Braham examined the actual Hungarian train transport lists which, though incomplete, give a breakdown of the dates, origin of transports and number of deportees.<sup>8</sup>

Butz would probably claim that all this additional evidence is a forgery manufactured for the express purpose of discrediting his book. His argument, as we have seen, was based on the false notion that the Red Cross report dated the major persecution of Jews from October 1944, not earlier. Curiously, Butz cited the following excerpt from Volume 3 of the report to prove his point. "[T]hreatened with extermination, the Jews were, in the last resort, generally deported in the most inhuman manner, shut up in concentration camps, subjected to forced labour or put to death," and the Germans "aimed more or less openly at their extermination."<sup>9</sup> However, Butz interpreted the lack of specificity in the report about the deportations occurring prior to October 1944 as evidence that they did not take place, or that they were minimal. He contrasted this with the relevant portions from Volume I of the Red Cross report, which he reproduced in full, that mention a decision made in October 1944 to send 60,000 Jews to Germany. He writes: "To repeat, there was a certain amount going on prior to October 1944, including deportations, but the Report asserts unambiguously that the events beginning in October 1944 were the major ones for Hungarian Jews ... The Report is fully precise about the "deportations" and "forced labor" measures that were instituted in October 1944."<sup>10</sup> He then argued that the deportations could not "have happened and received world wide publicity during the war and at the later trials without the ICRC delegation in Budapest learning of it." Such an event "could not have failed to be noticed by the Red Cross delegation. . ."<sup>11</sup> Butz's problem is that in arguing that the Red Cross did not specifically mention the deportations referred to in the world press and Veesenmayer's reports he relied on and quoted extensively from Volumes 1 and 3 of the report. However, this was a three volume report. On page 271 of Volume 2 we read:

"In March 1944, when the situation on the Eastern front became more and more threatening, Germany

went ahead with the military occupation of Hungary, which was followed on October 15 of the same year, by the setting up of the "Arrowhead Cross" (Croix flechées) regime. These events inaugurated a period of political persecution, during which more than 15,000 political prisoners and several hundred thousand Jews were deported." (italics added).

Thus, Butz's major source for refuting the deportation of Hungary's Jews prior to October 1944 in fact confirms that these deportations took place. Sanning, who relied almost exclusively on Butz, writes (p. 140): "There were certain events before October 1944, including deportations, which were too unimportant for the IRC report to bother mentioning the figures. . ." An examination of Sanning's bibliography and footnotes reveals that he never actually read the Red Cross report. Rather, he used the excerpted versions reproduced by Butz. In fact, it is now known that the International Committee of the Red Cross was kept constantly informed of the deportations while they were taking place.<sup>12</sup> On July 18, 1944 the ICRC in a communiqué announced that the deportations had stopped.<sup>13</sup>

An additional piece of information concerning these deportations is instructive. During the deportations from Nagyvarad, a location from which thousands of Jews were deported in May and June 1944, the Germans made a propaganda film which contrasted the brutality of the Hungarian Gendarmes toward the Jews with the humanitarian behavior of the Germans. The film was shown in several countries under the sponsorship of the German authorities in July 1944.<sup>14</sup> In the following month Goebbels released a statement through Germany's Central Information Service that 430,000 Hungarian-Jews had been deported up until July 9. "The Jews are taken over at the Hungarian frontier and up to this point the carrying into effect of the provisions of the anti-Jewish measures. . .,"<sup>15</sup> If these deportations did not take place, why did Germany make a propaganda film about them and why did Goebbels announce that 430,000 Jews had been deported? The question may arise as to why Butz would go out on a limb and claim that perhaps the best known deportations of World War II did not take place. Why not simply say that the Hungarians ended up in the Soviet Union as he had with the Polish Jews and other deportees? The problem is that in May 1944 the Soviets were already in Eastern Poland and the Germans were in retreat in the Soviet Union. It would have been impossible for the Germans to resettle hundreds of thousands of Jews on Soviet territory in mid-1944. Butz could not offer any credible explanation of what happened to these Jews. As was noted earlier, Veessenmayer's telegram of April 23 identified Auschwitz as the destination site for Hungary's Jews. However, Auschwitz registration records for May 15 through August 12 show only about 26,000 Hungarian Jews registered in Auschwitz while about 20,000 were not registered but classified as in transit to other concentration camps.<sup>16</sup> As was noted earlier, Jews killed immediately upon arrival at Auschwitz were not registered. On July 12 camp records show a total of 92,208 registered prisoners in Auschwitz, including non-Jews.<sup>17</sup> There is reason, however, to suspect that Butz did in fact know that these deportations took place. A German document dated August 15, 1944 on the amount of prisoners in all German concentration camps states that 90,000 Jews had arrived as a result of the Hungarian action. An additional 522,000 mostly non-Jewish other arrivals were also being interned.<sup>18</sup> The 90,000 number appears to be twice as high as the actual number.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, the important point here is that Butz was familiar with the document. He had cited it with regard to some point he was making while not revealing the 90,000 number.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, he could not argue that it was a forgery. The fact that so many Hungarian Jews were arriving in the concentration camps should have alerted Butz

that the deportations had, in fact, taken place. His dilemma, however, was obvious. If more than

430,000 were deported from Hungary, but only 90,000 were arriving in the concentration camps, what happened to the remainder?

Butz had argued that claims about Auschwitz formed "the central part of the extermination legend. . ." Since these claims were "false, there is no reason why the reader should believe any other part of [the Holocaust] even if the evidence might appear relatively decent at first glance." Auschwitz was "a fabrication constructed of perjury, forgery, distortion of fact and misrepresentation of documents."<sup>21</sup> In light of the irrefutable evidence, even by Butz's own sources, that the Hungarian deportations took place, Butz should be judged by his own standards. If Butz's theories about forgery and conspiracy concerning the Hungarian deportations are false, then all of his claims about forgery and conspiracy are also false.

### Destination of Hungary's Jews

Although Butz argued that the Hungarian deportations did not take place, not all deniers are willing to accept the argument. For one thing, there is so much evidence that the deportations actually did occur that it is simply not sustainable to argue otherwise. The quandary for deniers is to explain what actually happened to the Jews. This inability explains why, until recently, no denier ever gave an alternative explanation. However, other deniers, such as Sanning, have never advanced Butz's arguments. Rather, they have tended to ignore the issue altogether, realizing that denying the deportations tends to undermine their credibility.

In 1995 denier Carlo Mattogno broke with denier tradition and gave an alternate version of what happened to Hungary's Jews. Mattogno acknowledged that the deportations mentioned in reports by Veessenmayer (437,402) and Ferenczy (434,351) did in fact take place. However, Mattogno argued that the Jews did not necessarily end up in Auschwitz. He did not mention Arthur Butz.<sup>22</sup> Mattogno has written frequently for the denier *Journal of Historical Review*. However, his essay was never published nor acknowledged in the *JHR*. The reason for this will become obvious. Nevertheless, Mattogno's thesis needs to be examined because it does offer deniers a "fall back" position when confronted with the vast evidence of the deportations. The fact that Mattogno's thesis repudiates one of the major foundations of Butz's book — and in effect challenges Butz's credibility — will not necessarily prevent deniers from arguing both points. That is, there were no deportations, but if there were the Jews did not end up in Auschwitz. As will be seen in Chapter 9, advancing diametrically opposing arguments on the gas chambers has not stopped deniers from doing it anyway.

Mattogno's general thesis is that the Hungarian Jews were used for labor outside of Auschwitz. A principal piece of evidence for this assertion is a memo of May 29, 1944 by Laszlo Ferenczy, the official in charge of ghettoization and concentration of Hungarian Jews prior to their deportation.

"The German Security Police proposes, and it is their clear intent, that the Jews bring with themselves provisions for at least five days for the duration of their transport — since upon their arrival

at Auschwitz, after selection has taken place, they are sent immediately [azonnna] on trains [vonatokon] to the various work locations."

Mattogno then goes on to write: "This report underlines that, from the beginning of these deportations until midnight of 28 May 1944, there were 184,049 Hungarian Jews deported in 58 trains and they all went through Auschwitz."<sup>23</sup> Thus, Mattogno has done what no denier before him had dared. He has traced every single deported Hungarian Jew up to May 28 directly to Auschwitz. However, Auschwitz registration records only show approximately 4,500 registered in the camp from May 17 to May 28 while about 2,000 were held as non-registered prisoners.<sup>24</sup>

Mattogno is not able to give any details about the so called labor and where these "laborers" eventually ended up. Ferenczy later told a Hungarian court that he had asked permission from the German authorities to visit Auschwitz "to have a look around and to find out how the Jews were actually selected and detailed for work". The request was granted but then denied. "From this I clearly saw that the widespread rumors according to which the Jews could not work were executed in the Auschwitz crematoria, evidently must have had some foundation."<sup>25</sup> In fact, the Ferenczy memo cited by Mattogno does not specify any geographic area where these Jews were supposed to be shipped for labor.

German foreign labor statistics from the period show that the Hungarian Jews could not possibly have been in Germany. The figures show slightly more than 24,000 Hungarian laborers in Germany on September 30, 1944, none of whom were Jewish.<sup>26</sup> This is actually a decrease of 3,000 from the amount of Hungarian laborers in Germany in November 1943,<sup>27</sup> six months before the deportations began. As was noted in the prior chapter, the policy of the German government was not to bring Jews into Germany proper. An exception was finally made, due to the war exigencies of the collapsing Third Reich, with the November 1944 deportations. Records of the Hungarian deputy police commissioner show 7,800 Jews crossed the frontier. Another 10,000 "disappeared".<sup>28</sup>

Mattogno attempted show that the Jews were somewhere in the occupied Eastern territories, but could not give a location. He cited an official from the Reich Foreign Ministry who stated that 437,000 Jews had been "taken to the Eastern territories to be used for work".<sup>29</sup> Once again, no geographic location is given. Moreover, "Eastern territories" was a term used to denote the occupied Soviet territories, which had been re conquered by the Soviet forces and therefore could not have been used for labor purposes by the Germans. Mattogno also misquoted German official Eberhard von Thadden to the effect that one-third of the Jews deported to Auschwitz up to May 24 were conscripted for labor.<sup>30</sup> Even assuming that (1) von Thadden was quoted correctly and (2) von Thadden was actually correct, this still leaves two-thirds of 116,000 Jews deported to that date unaccounted for.

Veesenmayer wrote nine memos from May 23 to July 6 detailing the total Jews deported ranging from 110,000 to 423,000. The destination for all of these transports was listed as the "Reich".<sup>31</sup> Auschwitz was located in that part of the German occupied Poland known as the Reich.

Mattogno ignored nearly all of the key evidence on the Hungarian Jewish labor issue. An examination of this evidence shows that few Hungarian Jews were used for labor when compared to the total deported.

The issue of using Hungarian Jews for labor had arisen before the deportations began. Germany's Plenipotentiary to Hungary, Veessenmayer, mentioned the possibility of using 100,000 Hungarian Jews for labor in German occupied territories. However, the memo also states that 150,000 Jewish workers would be exempted from the deportations because they were essential to military work taking place in Hungary.<sup>32</sup> This was the major problem as far as using the deported Jews for labor. The Hungarian transports had relatively few young men. Most able bodied men were retained in Hungary.<sup>33</sup>

The problem of using Hungarian Jews for labor could be seen from the minutes of the meeting of the conferences held while the deportations were taking place. On May 26, 1944 Fritz Schmelter, Central Department Manager for the Ministry of Armaments, stated:

"For fighter construction we were offered only children, women and old men with whom very little can be done. . . Unless the next transports bring men of an age fit for work the whole action will not have much success."<sup>34</sup>

At the time of the May 26 meeting nearly 150,000 Hungarian Jews had been deported. Yet this meeting makes clear that none had been conscripted for labor because of their unsuitability. This explains why the chief of the construction division of the Economic-Administrative Main Office did not believe the 100,000 promised Jews would arrive.<sup>35</sup>

On June 9, 1944 Schmelter announced that he could get 10,000 to 20,000 Jewish women. However, little interest was shown because of the problems of guarding and housing so many people. Only 520 women were selected for heavy labor who were not considered suitable for the work.<sup>36</sup>

In a post war trial Schmelter testified that 100,000 Jewish workers had been delivered from Hungary.<sup>37</sup> However, when he was asked whether he knew the dates and number of arrivals he admitted that he did not "know whether all of them arrived."<sup>38</sup> In fact, the minutes of a meeting on June 26 — a time when more than 350,000 Hungarian Jews had already been deported — show Schmelter saying that up until that time only 12,000 female concentration camp inmates had been demanded. "I request that these people should be ordered in batches of 500."<sup>39</sup> These 12,000 were the only Jews Schmelter could give direct testimony about at trial.<sup>40</sup>

Xaver Dorsch, Deputy Chief of the Todt Organization which handled Reich Construction Projects, had direct knowledge about Hungarian Jews being used for labor in the City of Muehldorf. These Jews had arrived in the middle or end of June 1944.<sup>41</sup> By mid June 326,000 Jews had been deported while over 381,000 had been deported by the end of June.<sup>42</sup> Yet, it was only at these late dates that Dorsch could identify Jewish labor transports. Where were the rest of the Hungarian Jews? A particularly revealing letter is dated June 30, 1944 from Ernst Kaltenbrunner, head of Reich Main Security. He discusses a shipment of 12,000 Hungarian Jews who will arrive in Vienna in the next few days.

"According to previous experience it is estimated that 30 percent of the transport will consist of Jews able to work. . . who can be utilized for the work in question, whereby it shall be understood that they are subject to be removed at any time. . . Women unable to work and children of these Jews who are all

kept in readiness for special action [Sonderaktion] and therefore one day will be removed again. . ."43

The Auschwitz camp records show that from May 29 to August 13, 1944 about 20,000 Hungarian Jews were transferred out of the camp to other destinations. Many of these were non-registered prisoners who were apparently being held for the purpose of being transferred out.<sup>44</sup> It would appear that these are the Hungarian Jews who were being used for labor. The aforementioned German labor Chief Xaver Dorsch spoke of construction taking place at Kaufering, an auxiliary camp of the Dachau Concentration Camp.<sup>45</sup> Auschwitz camp records show 1,300 Hungarian Jews being transferred to Kaufering on July 26, 1944.<sup>46</sup> Auschwitz camp commandant Rudolph Hoess later wrote that in 1944 tens of thousands of Jews were moved from Auschwitz to be used in the arms industry.<sup>47</sup> In addition to the above information we have direct knowledge of 6,200 Hungarian Jews from the May-July 1944 transports used for labor in Serbia.<sup>48</sup> Germany appears to have had more success with Jewish labor seized from Hungary in November 1944. The highest estimate places the number at 50,000.<sup>49</sup> These were probably from the 150,000 mentioned by Veessenmayer who were originally retained in Hungary.<sup>50</sup>

Mattogno had to ignore all of this evidence because the highest number of Hungarian Jews mentioned for labor was 100,000. Mattogno was careful to avoid citing this number because even if accurate — which it was not — this still left more than three fourths of the Jews unaccounted for. Thus, he faced the same dilemma which all deniers have. Butz had "solved" the problem by simply declaring that the deportations never took place. Mattogno did, however, share one thing in common with Butz. Recall that Butz was aware of a German report on August 15, 1944 showing 90,000 Hungarian Jews in the concentration camps<sup>51</sup> — probably twice as many as the actual number. Mattogno was also aware of the report since he had cited it in an earlier article which did not deal specifically with Hungary's Jews.<sup>52</sup> However, he avoided any mention of the report when dealing specifically with the demographics of Hungarian Jewry. Like Butz, the reason for Mattogno's failure to confront this report was obvious: if 437,000 Hungarian Jews were deported, but only 90,000 arrived in the concentration camps, what happened to the remainder?

## Auschwitz Photos

One of the arguments that deniers have come up with to "prove" that Hungarian Jews were not gassed and cremated are two photos taken of the Auschwitz complex during the time of the deportations. Deniers claim that since these photos do not show any activity in the camp, the exterminations could not have taken place. The photos were discovered in 1979.

Although this argument has a great deal of appeal to deniers, it ignores the fact that these were still photos taken by the Allied forces from an airplane at a particular point in time. Deniers act as if these two photos represent around the clock surveillance of the camp. Fortunately for deniers, there was no continuous photographing of Auschwitz during the Hungarian operation from mid-May to mid-July 1944. Nevertheless, neither of these photos represent what deniers would have us believe.

The best known of these photos was taken on June 26, 1944. It shows the whole Auschwitz complex

which consisted of three main camps: the Birkenau camp where the gas chambers and crematoria were located, the Auschwitz main camp, and Monowitz area of the camp where industrial production occurred.<sup>53</sup>

The Birkenau area of the camp shows no activity. However, on this particular day there were no arrivals from Hungary.

A list of the Hungarian transports uncovered by Randolph Braham shows that no trains left Hungary from June 17 to June 24. Transports resumed on June 25.<sup>54</sup> However, it took three or four days for a train to reach Auschwitz from Hungary.<sup>55</sup> Auschwitz registration records show no Hungarian Jews were registered from June 20 to June 27.<sup>56</sup> The accuracy of this information is also verified by reports from Veessenmayer and Ferenczy. In a report on June 13 Veessenmayer stated that Hungarian Jews were to be concentrated in Hungary from June 17 to June 24 and transported from June 25 to June 28.<sup>57</sup> A report by Ferenczy says the same thing.<sup>58</sup> Understandably, deniers have totally

ignored this information. On the other hand, if the photo did show activity in the Birkenau camp deniers would no doubt claim they were forgeries because of the aforementioned information.

The other photo is from May 31, a date when there were transports arriving from Hungary. Neither the transports nor the gassings occurred when the photo was taken. However, there is a very significant piece of information on the photo. Smoke is shown rising from a pit near Crematorium V.<sup>59</sup> As will be seen in Chapter 6 on the section dealing with Auschwitz commandant Rudolph Hoess, this photo, discovered in

1979, is confirmation of what Hoess wrote more than 30 years before its discovery. He stated that pits behind Crematorium #5 were used for burning bodies.<sup>60</sup> This photo is totally consistent with Hoess's observation. Moreover, a recent photographic enhancement of this photo by the supervisor of cartographic applications and image processing at Caltech/NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena shows prisoners being marched into Krema V.<sup>61</sup> The issue of photos will be comprehensively analyzed in chapter 10 on body disposal where it will be shown on the basis of a more recent comprehensive analysis of these photos (see Appendix IV) that they confirm all aspects of the eyewitness testimony about what was occurring at Auschwitz during this period of time.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

### CHAPTER 4

#### AUSCHWITZ MEMOIRS

One of the interesting facets of Sanning's book is that he never addressed what happened to the Netherlands' Jews. He had attempted to explain away the disappearance of Jews from countries with much smaller Jewish populations (i.e. Scandinavian countries) than the Netherlands. Why ignore the more than 100,000 Jews deported from the Netherlands? The most probable reason is that he could not offer his usual justifications because Arthur Butz had conceded their deportation. Moreover, Butz also acknowledged that many of the more than 100,000 deportees had actually gone to Auschwitz.

Initially, Butz's concession seems curious. He had already stated that no Jews, or very few at most, had been deported from Hungary. Why not simply claim that either (1) no deportations had taken place from the Netherlands or (2) any deportees were "resettled" in conquered Soviet territory? Butz, however, had a good reason for acknowledging the deportations to Auschwitz. He believed that he could disprove the fact that many Jews who had arrived at Auschwitz were not registered because they were immediately murdered upon arrival, thereby not necessitating any registration procedure.

Butz reasoned, correctly for once, that if all Jews being carried on train transports could be accounted for through Auschwitz registration numbers, then that would constitute the final proof that no Jews were selected for gassing upon their arrival at Auschwitz. For example, it is known from Auschwitz registration records that about 404,000 Jews and non-Jews were registered in the camp during the four and one-half years of its existence.<sup>1</sup> If it could be shown that all trains arriving at Auschwitz during these four and one-half years carried about 400,000 people, then this would mean nobody was gassed upon arrival.

There does not appear to be at present a comprehensive listing of all train transports to Auschwitz.

However, in the case of the Netherlands we do have some important information. Butz used information published by the Netherlands Red Cross, in Dutch, which traced certain transports of Jews from the Netherlands directly to Auschwitz registration records.<sup>2</sup> Butz was not the first writer on the subject to notice the significance of such information. Gerald Reitlinger had mentioned it in 1953.<sup>3</sup> However, Butz is the first writer to attempt to comprehensively analyze this issue. Ironically, Butz may be said to have "pioneered" this research.

The Red Cross data used by Butz traced 6,233 male deportees and 4,842 female deportees. However, at the time of this report in 1953 the Red Cross only had registration data for the males for all transports occurring from July 15, 1942 to August 17, 1942. The eleven transports had a total of 5,389 males. Only 4,586 received registration numbers. Thus 805 males, or 15 percent of the eleven transports did not receive a registration number. At this point, one might expect Butz to simply ignore the issue by not calling attention to the transports. However, Butz, ever the inventor of explanations, came up with one of the rationalizations for which he has become known. He stated that when boys age 15 and lower are subtracted from the deficit, the difference between male deportees and male registrations becomes much smaller. Boys age 15 and lower account for 674 of the male deportees.

Butz's thesis would only work if children at Auschwitz did not receive registration numbers. How did Butz know that children did not receive registration numbers? He didn't. Like everything else in his book he simply assumed it because it was the only way he could make the numbers he was looking at fit his thesis that no Jews were selected for gassing upon their arrival at Auschwitz.

In fact, children at Auschwitz were registered along with the adults.<sup>4</sup> The recently published Death Books from Auschwitz show a total of 2,586 children under 10 with registration numbers who died from 1941 to 1943.<sup>5</sup> A cursory look at the death registers show at least five children, six and under, with the last name of Adler who had registration numbers.<sup>6</sup> It is obvious that Butz never bothered to consult the Auschwitz State Museum about this issue. Butz should have taken seriously the statement by Germany's General Commissar in occupied Holland, made one month before the deportations began, that the Nazis were aiming at the total destruction of the Jews.<sup>7</sup> He also should have noticed those portions of the Red Cross report which spoke of "gas chambers" (Gaskamer) for the deportees.<sup>8</sup>

We are now in a position to extend Butz's research to all of the Jews who were deported from Holland. The Red Cross listed other transports from Holland, from August 24 to December 12, 1942, which carried about 38,500 deportees to Auschwitz.<sup>9</sup> However, it had no information about registration numbers. Then, the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation traced the origin and destination of 102,863 deported Jews. There were a total of 102 transports. Sixty-seven of these transports arrived at Auschwitz. The total number of Jews in Auschwitz transports was 60,085.<sup>10</sup>

The registration records for prisoners interned at Auschwitz have been compiled under the auspices of Auschwitz State Museum. These records are based on camp documents which were not destroyed by the Camp authorities. The information appears in a day by day account of Auschwitz which was originally published in German. In 1990 the tome was translated into English and published as the Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-1945 by camp historian Danuta Czech. From the Auschwitz Chronicle, we can trace the registration records of the Dutch Jews who were deported there. First, we can complete the original data examined by Butz for the 11,075 Dutch men and women deported in thirteen transports to Auschwitz from July 15 to August 14, 1942. As was already shown, the first eleven transports of men show that only 4,586 of the 5,389 men received registration numbers. Of the remaining 844 men transported on August 21 and 24, 642 received numbers.<sup>11</sup> Thus, 5,228 of the 6,233 male deportees received numbers. The Registration numbers for the 4,842 female deportees

show that only 2,444 were registered, leaving 50% missing.<sup>12</sup> This means that of Butz's total sample of 11,075 deportees, 7,672 received registration numbers while 31% of the total are missing.

Appendix I extends Butz's analysis to the remaining 54 Dutch transports to Auschwitz from August 28, 1942 to September 3, 1944. The date of deportation and number of people deported are taken from the Netherlands State Institute and Red Cross while the date of arrival and number registered are drawn from the Auschwitz Chronicle. As can be seen, of the 49,010 Jews deported to Auschwitz in these 54 transports only 9,754 received registration numbers. This means that of the total 67 transports to Auschwitz comprising 60,085 Jews, 17,426 received a registration number.

The data requires some further comment. The Red Cross notes that of the 27,503 deportees from August 28, 1942 to December 12, 1942, 6,078 men were seized for labor purposes before the transports reached Auschwitz. These are listed in the fifth column. The report also notes that the number of survivors was 207.<sup>13</sup> When the 6,078 are added to the 3,611 registrations from this period - August 28 to December 12, 1942 - we find that only 9,689 are accounted for, or 65% are missing.

Three of the transports are missing. However, it seems almost certain that an unidentified transport arriving November 18, 1942 for which 30 registration numbers were given was the November 16 transport of 761 persons.<sup>14</sup> No information is available on the 1,645 deportees from November 15, 1943 and June 3, 1944. They were probably all liquidated upon arrival.

Perhaps just as revealing as the Auschwitz deportations are the ones that took place to Sobibor. The Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation traced 19 transports of 34,313 Jews to Sobibor from March to July 1943. All of these Jews simply disappeared. Sobibor — along with Belzec, Chelmno and Treblinka — was a pure extermination camp. The only prisoners who were held in those camps were there to help dispose of murdered victims.

Johann Kremer

One of the best German witnesses to emerge from Auschwitz was Johann Kremer, a medical doctor who worked with the camp authorities. Kremer kept a diary of his daily experiences at Auschwitz which began in August 1942 and ended in 1943. He had been keeping a diary since age 15.

The problem for deniers has been his references to 14 "special actions" from September 2 to November 8, 1942 recorded in his diary. Kremer does not state specifically in his diary what these special actions are. However, it is clear from the context that they are gassings of prisoners.

French writer Robert Faurisson, Europe's best known denier and the successor to Paul Rassinier, argues that the special actions have nothing to do with gas chambers. As proof, he cites the first reference made to a special action on September 2. Faurisson's translation, which is accurate, reads as follows:

"2 September 1942: This morning, at 3 o'clock, I was present outside for the first time at a special action. Compared to that, Dante's Inferno appears to me almost like a comedy. It is not without reason

that Auschwitz is called the camp of the annihilation." (italics added).<sup>15</sup>

Faurisson noted that in the English language translation the word "outside" was omitted. The purpose for this omission, according to Faurisson, was to deceive the reader into thinking that the special action meant gassing. Since the special action was taking place outside, it could not have been taking place in a gas chamber. One of the editors of the English language edition was Danuta Czech.<sup>16</sup> Although it was certainly an error to omit the word outside, she corrected this omission when she published the *Auschwitz Chronicle*.<sup>17</sup>

At his trial in Warsaw, Poland in 1947 Kremer explained that what had taken place was "the action of gassing people. These mass murders took place in small cottages situated outside the Birkenau camp in a wood"<sup>18</sup> (italics added). Birkenau was one of the three principal camps in Auschwitz, the others being Auschwitz I, the main camp, and

Monowitz, a manufacturing facility. Kremer was describing what has been known among Holocaust historians: that most of the gassings which took place at Auschwitz in 1942 were in two cottages outside the camp.

Robert Faurisson and all deniers reject any post-war testimony as the product of coercion. They prefer to rely on contemporaneous documents, such as a diary - that is, unless they claim it to be a forgery.

The author showed the original German entry for September 2 to three native German speakers, all college educated in the United States. They stated that Kremer's explanation of the German word "outside" [Draussen] as being outside of the camp is not inconsistent with the entry itself.<sup>19</sup> Even Faurisson admitted this possibility. "Without doubt that detail is not very clear, and perhaps it meant "out of the camp itself", but one must not conceal that possibility."<sup>20</sup>

Kremer's diary provides useful information about the Dutch deportees. For example, on September 5 he is present at two special actions, one from Holland. As is noted in Appendix I to this book, on September 5 a group of more than 500<sup>21</sup> arrived at Auschwitz but only 53 were registered.

However, it is two other "special actions" concerning the Dutch which cause Faurisson to discredit his own thesis. The first one takes place on October 12, 1942 when Kremer states: "Horrible scenes in front the last bunker!" In order to show that this special action could not be a gassing, Faurisson states that the "last bunker could only be the bunker of barracks #11" which was located at the end of the main camp - Auschwitz I - and was an execution block<sup>22</sup> not used for gassing in 1942 (but it was used for gassing in 1941 as will be discussed in chapters 6 and 9). In fact, Kremer explained in 1947 that last bunker was a reference to one of the two bunkers where gassing took place immediately outside of Auschwitz II, not block 11,<sup>23</sup> Faurisson had reproduced Kremer's testimony in this respect but refused to accept it.

However, it is the interaction of Kremer's October 12 and October 18 entries which begins to cause Faurisson problems. Kremer's October 18 entry describes the eleventh special action at which he is present. "Terrible scenes when three women begged to have their bare lives spared." Kremer explained in his post-war testimony that the three women were shot when they refused to enter the gas chamber.<sup>24</sup> Faurisson rejects the gas chamber testimony but concedes that the women were shot. He

can hardly do otherwise considering the nature of this entry. However, in his October 12 entry Kremer notes that the special action on that date includes 1,600 people from Holland where he witnessed "[h]orrible scenes in front of the last bunker!" Faurisson states that these two entries involved Block 11 where "persons condemned to death were transported into a concentration camp to be executed there."<sup>25</sup>

Faurisson's problem is as follows: if the three women on October 18 were shot as part of a special action, then what about the special action against the 1,600 people from Holland on October 12 ? Faurisson had indirectly conceded that these special actions meant killing in the case of the three women, but did not directly address the issue as far as Kremer's 1,600 Dutch were concerned even though Faurisson stated that "last bunker" in the October 12 entry meant Block 11. To confront the issue of these 1,600 Dutch directly would mean that Faurisson would have to concede that mass murder was taking place at Auschwitz - though by shooting, not gassing. Yet Faurisson states that this transport was taken to Block 11 - which can only mean that they are slated to be killed.

In fact, the October 12 special action appears to be aimed at the Dutch contingent which arrived on October 11 and involved about 800 Dutch (see Appendix I) while the October 18 special action involved over 1,000 Dutch (see Appendix I).

Kremer's entries of October 13 and 17 tend to discredit Faurisson's thesis of Block 11 as the place where special actions are occurring. Kremer writes that he was present at a punishment and executions on these dates. Punishments and executions normally took place at Block 11, as Faurisson noted. These executions were normally shootings or hangings of registered prisoners for infractions of camp rules, not gassings of unregistered arrivals (with one or two exceptions in 1941). However, Kremer's October 13 and 17 entries say nothing about the executions being a special action. This means that the special actions were something other than normal executions. The fact that these non-special action executions took place between the tenth special action on October 12 and eleventh special action on October 18 should resolve the issue in favor of Kremer's post-war explanations. Having indirectly admitted that the special actions of October 12 and 18 were killings, Faurisson came up with yet another definition of the term. The "special actions", were "easy to understand". They had to do with the typhus epidemic raging at Auschwitz. They involved SS volunteers cleaning "the railroad cars at the arrival of each convoy." Such a cleaning and disinfecting was needed to prevent the outbreak of diseases. Faurisson's explanation should be considered absurd in light of Kremer's actual entries. In fact, nowhere in the diary does Kremer equate special action with typhus. The October 12 entry proves this:

"Preventive typhus vaccination; after that, in the evening, a strong general reaction (fever). Despite this, that night, I was present at still another special action on people coming from Holland (1,600 individuals). Terrifying scenes in front of the last bunker (Hössler)! It was the tenth special action".<sup>26</sup>

This entry irrefutably de links typhus from the special actions. As can be seen, the typhus vaccination and special action take place at different times of the day. Faurisson omitted this first sentence when he reproduced the October 12 entry because he knew it would invalidate his special action equals typhus argument. Faurisson also omitted Kremer's parenthetical reference to Hössler. Franz Hössler was heavily involved in the murder of Jews at Auschwitz and was executed for his crimes after the war. Moreover, Kremer's entry of September 1 further separates typhus from special actions. The entry

reads: "In the afternoon was present at the gassing of a block with [Z]yklon B against lice." Zyklon B was a hydrocyanic acid used for delousing clothing of lice as well as murdering people in gas chambers (see the discussion in Chapter 9). These delousing gassings were carried out, as acknowledged by Faurisson, to prevent the spread of typhus. Yet, nothing is said about a special action. If the special actions really were related to typhus, it would have been reflected in this entry. In 1985 Faurisson would come up with yet another explanation for "special action" in attempting to explain its meaning in Kremer's diary. He now claimed that it meant deportations from Holland.<sup>27</sup> However, some months later he would once again try to link special actions to typhus.<sup>28</sup>

Faurisson also claimed that at the 1960 trial at Munster, Germany Kremer attempted to retract entries from his diary, but the source cited by Faurisson only mentions that he "disputed the explanations" read to him by the court.<sup>29</sup> Faurisson did not mention what was the source of this dispute. However, we can be certain that Kremer's protestations had nothing to do with gassings because in the 1964 Frankfurt trial, at which Kremer was not a defendant, he continued to describe the gassing procedures in a manner consistent with his 1947 testimony in Poland.<sup>30</sup> Faurisson had attempted to portray Kremer as a victim "in the hysterical atmosphere of this famous witch trail" in 1964.<sup>31</sup> However, Kremer's testimony about his diary was consistent in the three trials in which he gave testimony in 1947, 1960 and 1964. Moreover, in 1964 Kremer was an 80 year old pensioner who had already served 10 years in prison and was beyond the reach of the law. A journalist who covered the trial wrote: "Kremer can afford to speak the unadorned truth. Nothing can happen to him anymore."<sup>32</sup>

## The Typhus Myth

One of the issues that arises in Kremer's diary was the typhus problem at Auschwitz during 1942. The issue of typhus is central to deniers for the building of the crematoria at Auschwitz. Beginning in 1942 the Auschwitz authorities embarked on a massive crematoria building campaign. By 1943, there were 52 ovens in Auschwitz to burn dead bodies. These facts are not disputed by deniers. The issue is why the authorities embarked on this building campaign.

In 1941 Auschwitz had one double muffle furnace or two ovens. According to the builders, these two ovens combined could burn between 30 and 36 bodies in a 10 hour period but could function longer.<sup>33</sup> Two additional double muffle furnaces were built in 1941 and the Spring of 1942 making a total of six ovens. In June 1943, after these installations had been in operation for nearly two years, the head of the Central Construction Office reported that all six could burn 340 bodies in a 24 hour period.<sup>34</sup> Reducing this number to 150 per day for down time and possible overstatement means that about 4500 bodies per month could be cremated.

Himmler decided in 1942 to greatly expand the capacity of the camp. According to deniers, this expansion, coupled with massive outbreaks of typhus, forced the camp authorities into a building campaign which culminated in 52 ovens housed in five crematoria buildings.<sup>35</sup> The total burning capacity of the 52 ovens is disputed. A report from the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office states that 4,756 corpses could be burned in a 24 hour period.<sup>36</sup> Deniers have not totally agreed among themselves as to the burning capacity but appear to have settled on about 1,000 per day, or 30,000 per month.<sup>37</sup> This issue will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 10.

Holocaust historians are unanimous in stating that each crematorium had a homicidal gas chamber. Deniers claim there were no homicidal gas chambers.

It can readily be seen why typhus deaths are essential to the deniers' claims. The absence of many thousands of people, indeed hundreds of thousands, dying from typhus would mean that the camp authorities would have no justification for embarking on such massive crematoria building measures unless they were planning an extermination campaign. As was noted earlier, camp records show that slightly more than 400,000 were registered in the camp during its 4-1/2 year existence. However, the maximum amount held at one time, based on camp records, appears to be 92,208 in July 1944.<sup>38</sup> A secret resistance organization within the camp showed a total of 135,468 prisoners in August 1944.<sup>39</sup> The first of the new crematoria buildings became Operational in March 1943 while the last started in June 1943. This means, according to denier figures, (30,000 per month) that the camp had the capacity to cremate in a year four times the maximum number held in the camp at its peak occupancy, according to camp authorities, or more than 2 and 1/2 times the maximum occupancy level according to the camp resistance.

It cannot be disputed that typhus was a major problem at Auschwitz in the summer of 1942, though the disease was never as serious a problem after that period. Typhus is mentioned in nearly all of the personal memoirs written about the camp. The real issue is how many people were actually dying from the disease, and whether these deaths necessitated the building of so many ovens.

Contracting typhus need not mean automatic death. Lucie Adelsberger, a Jewish prisoner and camp doctor got typhus, was quarantined, and resumed her duties after recovery.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, Ella Lingens-Reiner, a non-Jewish German medical doctor at Auschwitz, who was also a prisoner, contracted typhus and survived.<sup>41</sup> One of the early Auschwitz memoirs, written in 1947, recounts an episode with camp doctor Joseph Mengele, later to become known as the "angel of death" for his medical experiments. Mengele was disturbed about a typhus epidemic. The former prisoner wrote: "Alas, typhus epidemics did rage in the camp, but at this time we had comparatively few victims. The same day he [Mengele] sent us a large quantity of serum and directed mass vaccinations."<sup>42</sup> Kremer also mentions being vaccinated against typhus in his diary entry of September 14, 1942. Petro Mirchuk, a Ukrainian prisoner, wrote that a delousing in August 1942, the worst month of the epidemic, "eliminated the epidemic and the billions of fleas and lice ceased to exist."<sup>43</sup>

Thus, it can be seen that people could recover from typhus and that the camp authorities did have some means to combat the disease. But how many actually died from typhus? The first indication came from an unlikely source. In 1992 Mark Weber, who edits the denier publication *Journal of Historical Review*, wrote an article about the Auschwitz death registers uncovered in Moscow in 1989.<sup>44</sup>

Weber's purpose for writing the article was to show that registered elderly people, the young and those unable to work died in the camp. Holocaust historians have written that such people were often killed as soon as they arrived at Auschwitz and therefore did not receive a registration number. However, the death certificates were only issued to registered inmates. Therefore, Weber concluded that the historians were wrong. Weber believed that he had now disproved the view that what has been known as "selections" for the gas chambers were made of people who arrived at Auschwitz. As shall be seen, however, he actually proved the opposite.

Weber had set up a straw man. Nobody has ever claimed that every single person in the above

categories was killed immediately upon arrival. Kazimierz Smolen was a Polish inmate at Auschwitz for 4-1/2 years and subsequently became a camp historian with the Auschwitz State Museum. He is one of the world's foremost authorities on Auschwitz. In 1967 he wrote that "[a]ll prisoners, arriving at Auschwitz up to 1942 were registered there without directly undergoing any selection."<sup>45</sup> This means that there would be registered young, elderly and those unable to work in the camp to whom death certificates could be issued. It is also known that in 1943 and 1944 approximately 15,000 Jews in five transports from Theresienstadt, a Nazi show ghetto in Czechoslovakia, were all registered without undergoing selection. However, they were later murdered.<sup>46</sup>

Weber unintentionally had taken the first step in discrediting the death from typhus thesis. He reproduced the death certificates of 29 inmates. However, only three of those certificates show typhus as a cause of death. Most interesting are some of the other certificates. Three had "heart failure" for a 14 year old boy, a three year old and 40 year old. People this age do not usually die of heart failure, and this should have alerted Weber as to the true nature of the certificates he was reading.

In 1995 the three volume Death Books from Auschwitz was published. The information contained in these volumes is based on the Auschwitz death registers which were sent to Moscow after the camp's liberation by the Soviet army in 1945. The registers were discovered in 1989 and cover the period from August 1941 to December 1943. However, they are incomplete. No information is available for 1944 and some books are missing for the period 1941-1943. The registers contain death certificates for 68,864 prisoners and the signatures of the doctors who signed them. Auschwitz historian Dr. Franciszek Piper examined the highest numbers on the death certificates for 1942 and 1943 and other camp documents to arrive at 100,000 registered deaths for 1942 and 1943.<sup>47</sup> Dr. Thadeus Paczula, a former Auschwitz inmate, was in the camp from 1940. He also kept the death registers for registered inmates. He testified that for the two years following the summer of 1942, about 130,000 names were entered into the death registers.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, even though the death registers are incomplete they afford the first opportunity to see what was killing registered camp inmates. A breakdown by cause of death shows 1,637 typhus deaths and 423 enteritis with typhus deaths.<sup>49</sup> Thus a total of 2,060 of the 68,864 registered deaths were from typhus.

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of the death books is what the death certificates claim was killing people. Many of the causes deal with various forms of heart failure such as "heart attack", "heart muscle degeneration," "heart and circulatory collapse" etc. There are over 25,000 deaths listed which relate to some kind of heart problem. Other causes deal with general physical weakness, tuberculosis, pleurisy [dealing with lung problems], gastroenteritis, pneumonia, etc. People 50 and under account for more than 59,000 of the deaths. Those 40 and under account for more than 44,000 deaths.<sup>50</sup> While all of these deaths would be possible for people who had typhus but were not treated, it is limply not possible for people of the ages listed on the death certificates to have died from the stated causes. Young people, with rare exceptions, do not die of heart failure. In some cases children were said to have died from "decrepitude", an affliction of the aged.<sup>51</sup>

How then can the death certificates be explained if the stated causes do not conform to physical reality? The answer can only be that camp authorities were engaged in a massive killing campaign of registered prisoners. Part of this has to do with typhus. Wieslaw Kielar, a Polish prisoner, was one of the people charged with making up the death certificates which were signed by camp doctors. He writes that the method for getting rid of diseased prisoners was to kill them. His memoirs were written in 1972, seventeen years before the discovery of the death books. He described the falsification of the death certificates.

"My work consisted of writing out death certificates. The description of the illness for which the prisoner had died also applied to those who had been murdered in the camp. Shot, killed by injection, gas chamber. Each one had to have his case history — a fictitious one, of course. That was what the camp authorities demanded, and that was what I was ordered to do. I must admit that, to begin with, I wrote "heart failure" in the case of prisoners who I knew had been shot. Later, though, I decided that there had been too many of these heart failures... In the case of a man who had been shot, for instance, I wrote diarrhea. . . In brief it was nothing but a barefaced falsification of the death records, an obliteration of all traces of mass murders that had been committed on defenseless prisoners".<sup>52</sup>

Kielar's description is born out by the death certificates of 168 prisoners who were shot on May 27, 1942 but whose cause of death was listed as "heart attack".<sup>53</sup>

Ella Lingens-Reiner, the non-Jewish German doctor referred to earlier, wrote in 1948 that typhus patients were killed by phenol injection. "The result was that we, the prisoner-doctors, simply disguised typhus as 'influenza' in our lists."<sup>54</sup> The death certificates show 1,194 deaths from influenza.<sup>55</sup>

Pery Broad, an SS private first class assigned to Auschwitz, made a similar observation in his memoirs which were written shortly after the war. He writes that the death certificates

"were written by a medically trained prisoner whose job in the hospital it was to concoct such reports in the case of each prisoner who had died in camp, whatever the cause. All the countless victims, those who. . . had been shot in Block 11 [the execution block referred to earlier], or the sick who had phenol injected into their hearts, the victims of starvation or of tortures, they all had regrettably lost their lives, according to the [sic] Deaths Book by succumbing to some ordinary disease. . .,"<sup>56</sup>

Jenny Schaner, an Austrian prisoner who spent 2-1/2 years in Auschwitz testified at the Auschwitz trials in Germany in the mid 1960s about the death book entries she made:

"Most of the recorded causes of death were fictitious. Thus, for example, we were never allowed to enter "shot while escaping" in the book; I had to write "heart failure". And "cardiac weakness" was the cause listed instead of malnutrition."<sup>563</sup>

Even though deniers reject most post-war memoirs as fraudulent, the above observations by four witnesses who were there conform exactly to the death certificates located many years after these accounts were written. Unless one is willing to believe that heart failures and other unlikely causes were killing thousands of people not at risk for such diseases, then the only choice is to acknowledge the accuracy of the above memoirs that mass murder was taking place at Auschwitz.

The Netherlands Red Cross had access in the early 1950's to about

500 death certificates and also noted the incriminating nature of so many deaths from heart failure. Arthur Butz argued that typhus can cause heart failure and that this could account for those certificates.<sup>57</sup> However, as noted above, the recently discovered death books show about 2,000 certificates listing typhus as the cause of death. Clearly, then, the camp authorities were listing typhus as cause of death for those dying from the disease. The aforementioned memoirs by a Polish Prisoner, German doctor, SS guard and testimony by an Austrian prisoner - all attested to years before the discovery of the death books - should resolve any doubt about the nature of the causes of death. The previously noted 168 prisoners whose shootings were called "heart attacks" show the homicidal nature of these "heart attacks". (It might also be noted that phenol injections and poison gas also cause heart failure.)

The death certificates also totally discredit the idea that camp authorities were building the crematoria because of typhus deaths. If these authorities needed to justify the building of the crematoria because of such deaths then it would stand to reason that those certificates would list typhus as the cause of death. The fact that only around 2,000 certificates list typhus as the cause of death means that the camp authorities did not need to inflate the real number. This is because the crematoria were being built to carry out mass murder, not to protect the camp against typhus. Understandably, however, camp doctors were not willing to sign death certificates which listed gassing, shooting or phenol injection as the cause of death. Phenol injections were made by many of these doctors. However, signing a typhus death certificate would not be incriminating because it was common knowledge that the disease was a problem at Auschwitz.

A word is also in order about Dr. Johann Kremer. He is one of 28 doctors who signed death certificates. Over a three month period he signed 10,250 such certificates. Only two other doctors signed more death certificates. Interestingly, Kremer makes no mention in his diary of signing any death certificates.<sup>58</sup>

## Auschwitz Totals

For many years after the war the number of people murdered at Auschwitz was subject to different figures. However, Auschwitz historian Dr. Franciszek Piper has done the most complete demographic analysis of deportations to the camp to date. He finds that 1.3 million people, including many non-Jews, were deported there of whom 200,000 survived.<sup>59</sup> As was noted earlier, only about 400,000 received registration numbers.

In addition to the Dutch deportations discussed earlier, it is possible to directly trace, on the basis of transport records, Jews from Salonika, Greece. Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg examined attempts by the railroad authorities to collect the fare on the transport of about 46,000 Jews from Salonika in the Spring of 1943.<sup>60</sup> Auschwitz historian Danuta Czech also examined various materials, including train tickets printed in German and Greek, and concluded that 48,533 Jews arrived at Auschwitz from Salonika from March 20 to June 8, 1943. However, only 11,074 were registered.<sup>61</sup> (See Appendix II)

## Other Countries

The demographic portion of this study ends here. However, we have not accounted for all of the murdered Jews. Others killed are as follows: 62 Austria, 60,000; Belgium, 25,000; Czechoslovakia, 200,000; Germany, 130,000; Greece, 65,000; Italy, 7,500; Rumania, 270,000 and Yugoslavia, 60,000. There were additionally about 75,000 French Jews whose deportations can be accounted for directly. Their names and deportation dates were compiled by Serge Klarsfeld. Most of these deportees were sent to Auschwitz and are missing from the registration records.<sup>63</sup>

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART II: TESTIMONIES

### CHAPTER 5

#### VICTIM TESTIMONY

One of the most contentious aspects of Holocaust denial is that of eyewitness testimony. Such testimony is often easy to criticize because eyewitnesses may be mistaken as to certain factual circumstances of incidents they witness. Anybody familiar with the John F. Kennedy assassination is acutely aware of the problems which surround eyewitness testimony. There were 178 eyewitnesses who gave testimony to the Warren Commission about what they saw and heard in Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963. Forty-nine heard shots from the Book Depository, 21 from the now well known Grassy Knoll, 30 heard shots from other sources, while 78 did not know where the shots came from. Only four witnesses heard shots from more than one direction.<sup>1</sup>

By applying the techniques of Holocaust denial to the Kennedy assassination it could be argued that since there was so much contradiction as to the source of the shots, President Kennedy was not really shot at all. The important thing to keep in mind is that while witnesses may make errors as to certain

factual occurrences of an event, they are often correct as to the occurrence of the event itself. Thus, even though there was a wide divergence of opinion among the witnesses as to the source of the shots, nobody would seriously claim that they did not see Kennedy being shot.

Perhaps one of the best illustrations is Walter Sanning. As will be recalled from Chapter 1, Sanning cited three eyewitnesses each of whom claimed to see the Soviets deport one million Jews from Poland. However, since each of these witnesses saw the deportations at a different time, they are cumulatively stating three million Jews were deported — a physical impossibility. As was noted in Chapter 1, the total amount of Jews deported was between 300,000 and 400,000. Were these three witnesses lying? No. They were all correct as to the central event they witnessed. They were just incorrect as to the dimensions of what they witnessed. However, if one wanted to apply the argumentative techniques of Holocaust denial, it could be argued that no deportations took place. This should be kept in mind when the testimony of eyewitnesses to the Holocaust is examined.

As for the Holocaust, there is much unreliable, as well as reliable, testimony. Do some people lie? Yes. Do some people exaggerate? Yes. Holocaust historians have not avoided this issue. The late Holocaust historian Lucy Dawidowicz wrote:

"Many thousands of oral histories by survivors recounting their experiences exist in libraries and archives around the world. Their quality and usefulness vary significantly according to the informant's memory, grasp of events, insights and of course accuracy. . . The longer the time lapsed [between the event and the testimony] the less likely that the informant has retained freshness of recollection. The transcribed testimonies I have examined have been full of errors in dates, names of participants, and places, and there are evident misunderstandings of the events themselves. To the unwary researcher some of the accounts can be more hazard than help."<sup>2</sup>

Holocaust denier Mark Weber misquoted a statement from the archives director for Holocaust testimony in Israel, which contains the testimonies of survivors, that over one-half of the 20,000 testimonies are unreliable.<sup>3</sup> Weber, however, failed to draw the necessary corollary from his own misquotation: that while many thousands are unreliable, many thousands are reliable. Moreover, Weber did not reveal that the director, Shmuel Krakowski, angrily denied making any such statement. He wrote: "I said there are some — fortunately very few — testimonies to be inaccurate."<sup>4</sup>

When examining eyewitness testimony it is necessary to see if some common theme pervades the differing accounts. Deniers never do this. They just assume that contradictions mean that the event never occurred. One of the best examples was a review of two different survivor accounts of the gas chambers and crematoria appearing in a denier journal. The reviewer was examining discrepancies between the account of the Vrba-Wetzler report, to be discussed later, and a Sonderkommando who helped to burn the bodies of gassed victims. The reviewer notes that whereas one account says the four crematoria, containing 46 ovens, were ready by February 1943, the other account said they were ready by July 1943. One account says several men poured Zyklon B poison gas pellets — which were used to murder Jews and others — into the chamber while the other account says two men poured in the pellets. One account says it took three minutes to kill the people with the gas while the other account said it took ten minutes. There were also differences in the amount of furnaces used to dispose of the bodies and the amount of time it took to burn the bodies.<sup>5</sup>

Any prosecutor or judge examining these statements would see a common thread running through these two accounts even though they differed as to details. Yet, it is precisely as to these types of events where we are likely to find much contradictory testimony. Eyewitnesses to the amount of people who could be gassed in the gas chamber of the structure known as Crematorium I have given the amount of 600, 700, 900 and 1,000.<sup>6</sup> There was also a wide divergence of testimony as to how many people could be cremated in a 24 hour period. Depending upon the source, the numbers may range from 3,000 to 25,000. This later figure is certainly unlikely. Does this then mean that nobody was cremated? Anybody who walks into a theater and attempts to guess how many seats it contains will immediately recognize the problem.

How then can we evaluate eyewitness testimony? One method, as already noted, is to examine the common characteristics of eyewitness testimony. Do the accounts tend to corroborate one another as to central events even if certain details differ? Particularly important is the context in which such testimony is given. Deniers argue that there has been much false testimony about witches and UFOs. However, while UFOs and witches have never been proven, we know that the Nazis and concentration camps were real. We also know from statements of Nazi leaders that they intended to murder Europe's Jews. The documentary evidence cited in Chapter 2 from reports by the Einsatzgruppen, Security Police and Germany Army offer the best contemporaneous documentation as to Nazi intentions.

Another method of evaluating victim testimony is whether it is corroborated in its essential details by the perpetrators of the crime. Do the perpetrators deny their crimes? Or do the perpetrators deny their individual responsibility but acknowledge that the crime occurred? This aspect will be examined in the next chapter. Thus, does the cumulative weight of statements by German leaders, documents on killing, the physical disappearance of Jews from all over Europe and postwar admissions by the perpetrators make victim testimony more or less credible?

Another important method is whether there is some documentary or physical evidence which makes an eyewitness credible. For example, Wieslaw Kielar was a prisoner at Auschwitz for more than four years. He writes in his memoirs that he was at the camp for more than three years before he actually witnessed people being led to a gas chamber. He writes that he was able to observe these events from a place he was hiding so that he could not be seen.<sup>7</sup> Is Kielar credible? As will be recalled from Chapter 4, Kielar had written that he falsified death certificates to read "heart failure" for prisoners who were being murdered. Seventeen years after Kielar's memoirs were published the supporting documentation for this statement was found in the Moscow archives with the discovery of the death certificates. Thus, we know that Kielar is a credible source of information. Moreover, Kielar did not claim to have continuously witnessed gassing events. He appears to have only seen it once. Only a Sonderkommando — a prisoner who removed bodies from the gas chambers to the crematoria — could claim to have witnessed these events on a continuous basis.

Ella Lingens-Reiner, the German doctor at Auschwitz mentioned in the previous chapter, wrote that while at Auschwitz she dismissed reports of the gas chambers as "ugly legends". However, one day she saw one lorry after another "crammed to the bursting point with people and saw the lorries disappear in the direction of the crematorium". She saw chimney smoke 15 minutes later. She writes that now she knew it was true.<sup>8</sup> Is Lingens-Reiner credible? As will be recalled from the last chapter, she also wrote that doctors' lists for the cause of death of murdered prisoners were being falsified to read "influenza". This was confirmed more than 40 years later by the death certificates. Lingens-Reiner, however, never claimed to have actually witnessed a gassing. But seeing the lorry disappear led her to the only conclusion.

Most of the Auschwitz memoirs discuss what has come to be known as selections. There were two types of selections. The first were prisoners who were selected to be killed upon arrival at the camp. Such selections are also referred to in the literature as "selections on the ramp" — the ramp where the trains were unloaded. These were discussed in Chapter 4 in connection with the Netherlands and Kremer's diary. The second type of selection took place within the camp among the registered prisoners. Many were selected to be killed because they were sick. It is this second type of selection with which many prisoners were familiar. Kielar wrote that to put an end to the typhus epidemic the camp authorities, in a single day, sent several thousand infected women to the gas chamber.<sup>9</sup> Lingens-Reiner described a similar incident where in one day Dr. Mengele had the 1,500 worst cases of typhus sent to the gas chambers. She also noted that from the end of August 1943 until February 1944 about 500-800 women were selected for the gas chambers every four weeks.<sup>10</sup> She testified to this at the Auschwitz trials in Germany in 1964.<sup>11</sup> Similar testimony was given by Ludwig Worl, a non-Jewish German prisoner in the camp, who described the selection of sick prisoners and children for gassing. The children had previously been put into Worl's care.<sup>12</sup>

Arthur Butz disputed the above view of selections. Butz criticized Dr. Elie Cohen, an Auschwitz prisoner, for his description of these selections as meaning gassing. He notes that "Cohen does not report having seen any gas chambers." Butz's opinion is that the prisoners Cohen was talking about were shipped from the main camp, Auschwitz I, to Birkenau, Auschwitz II. He also states that the Auschwitz I hospital "showed a serious concern, on the part of the Germans, for the recovery of inmates, including Jews, who had fallen ill."<sup>13</sup> Butz might have taken note of the fact, which he acknowledges, that Cohen's family was also shipped to Auschwitz "which he never saw again."<sup>14</sup>

Butz's attempt to shift sick inmates from Auschwitz I to Birkenau, also known as Auschwitz II, is more of his unsubstantiated wishful thinking. For one thing, Lingens-Reiner was a doctor in Birkenau, but she also noted the disappearance of prisoners after selection for the gas chambers. Where would Butz have these prisoners go after they left Birkenau?

Doctors at Auschwitz were in a particularly good position to testify as to the selections. Lucie Adelsberger was also a doctor in Birkenau. She wrote that the sick were often selected for killing.<sup>15</sup> Doctor Louis Micheels worked in the hospital and discusses the "selections" in his memoirs.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, they are discussed by Benjamin Jacobs who was a dentist at Auschwitz.<sup>17</sup> Dr. Marco Nahon, another prisoner, discussed selections made by Joseph Mengele.<sup>18</sup> Dr. Gisella Perl discussed selections before and after registration and Dr. Mengele's part in the selection process.<sup>19</sup> Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, a Jewish prisoner, worked with Mengele and observed his methods first hand.<sup>20</sup>

The selection process was very well known among the prisoners and appears in nearly all of the Auschwitz memoirs. Petro Mirchuk, the non-Jewish Ukrainian prisoner mentioned in Chapter 4, wrote of both types of selections — those before and after registration. Mirchuk does not appear to have personally witnessed a gassing. He writes that he received much information from a Sonderkommando about gassing activities. Mirchuk did know about the Hungarian transports. He writes that the Hungarian Jews did not resist their annihilation. This is an observation that one is not likely to see by Jewish writers. However, one could attack Mirchuk because he writes that 4-1/2 million people died in Auschwitz. Such numbers are common in the literature because nobody knew the real numbers until recently. He also writes that he was imprisoned in Auschwitz from 1941 to May 1945.<sup>21</sup> In fact, Auschwitz was shut down in January 1945. However, he was most probably shipped to another camp from Auschwitz as were many survivors prior to Germany's surrender in May 1945.

Similar accounts of the selection process can be found by Sewereyna Szmaglewska<sup>22</sup> from Russia, Errikus Selvillias<sup>23</sup> from Greece, Pelagia Lewinska,<sup>24</sup> Isabella Leimer,<sup>25</sup> Carl Rosenberg,<sup>26</sup> Olga Lengyel<sup>27</sup> and Mira Kimmelman.<sup>28</sup> Margarita Glas-Larrson mentions German camp Dr Werner Rohde as taking part in the selections.<sup>29</sup> It might also be mentioned that all of the Auschwitz memoirs talk about the constant hunger of camp inmates. Yet, we know that the camp authorities did not have such problems. Dr Johann Kremer, discussed in Chapter 4, often recorded how well he ate at the camp.<sup>30</sup> He appears not to have noticed, or ignored, the starving camp inmates.

All of the Auschwitz memoirs have a common thread. They all saw fellow inmates disappear. Butz cannot explain what happened to those who disappeared. Moreover, the corroborating documentary evidence for all these witnesses are the Auschwitz death certificates, discussed in Chapter 4, which show thousands of registered prisoners dying from unlikely causes.

Denier Wilhelm Staglich has challenged some of the testimony given by wartime prisoners. One of the witnesses he attacked is Madame Vaillant-Couturier who was a member of France's Constituent Assembly when she testified at the war crimes trials in 1946 about her experiences at Auschwitz. She spoke about the selection of sick prisoners for gassing.<sup>31</sup> She also spoke of gassing in a red brick building during the Hungarian operation in mid-1944.<sup>32</sup> She had been a journalist which led Staglich to write that "[f]antasy, exaggeration, and mendacity are more prevalent in this profession than in any other. . ." and such dishonesty was characteristic of her testimony.<sup>33</sup> Specifically, he challenged her credibility because other witnesses placed the gassings in the chambers of the crematoria.<sup>34</sup> But in fact surviving photos of the crematoria — taken before their destruction — show that they were brick structures.<sup>35</sup>

Vaillant-Couturier also testified as to the burning of corpses in pits using gasoline because the crematoria could not handle the disposal of such a large amount of bodies.<sup>36</sup> Using burning pits has been testified to by a number of witnesses.<sup>37</sup> As will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter 10, there is a great deal of photographic evidence which supports the use of burning pits at Auschwitz (see also Appendix IV). However, Staglich found this testimony lacking because, he argued, that Germany could not, in 1944, "afford to squander gasoline by using it to burn corpses."<sup>38</sup> However, Staglich never bothered to explain how Germany could find the necessary transport from May-July 1944 to deport 437,000 Jews from Hungary at a time when it was losing the war and desperately needed the transport for military objectives. Moreover, as was noted in Chapter 2, the Germans were even willing to threaten their own war effort by diverting valuable Jewish labor to death camps. Using gasoline would have been a minor sacrifice by comparison.

Vaillant-Couturier also testified about gas chambers disguised as baths and gold teeth pulled from the mouths of gassed victims.<sup>39</sup> As will be seen later, many other witnesses gave similar testimony.

Vaillant-Couturier was a particularly compelling witness. However, like so many witnesses, she erred when discussing the crematoria. She stated that at Auschwitz there were eight crematories from 1944 onward.<sup>40</sup> She did not say what she meant by crematories. Did she mean eight ovens? Or did she mean buildings which housed ovens? Many witnesses had problems in this area because they had never actually been inside any of the crematoria. In fact, Auschwitz I and Birkenau had five crematoria which housed a total of 52 ovens. The Auschwitz I complex, which held six ovens, was discontinued in July 1943. Thus 46 ovens, eight of which were not operational (see Chapter 10), in four crematoria plus burning pits were used for body disposal in 1944.<sup>41</sup>

## Witnesses

Most of the prisoners did not have the opportunity to actually witness the gassings at a close range. However, in all of the accounts discussed previously the gassings were well known among the whole camp population. They all noticed the smoke from the crematoria and burning pits. They knew that most of the people being brought to the camp were not registered. They knew that fellow inmates were disappearing after "selections". Some prisoners, however, had the opportunity to view these activities at a closer range.

At this point an overview of the structures used for gassing would be useful. The first gassings were conducted on Soviet POWs in Block 11 in the Fall of 1941. Shortly thereafter the operation was moved to a gas chamber in Crematorium I in the main camp, known as Auschwitz I. Gassings lasted there until the fall of 1942. In the spring of 1942 a gas chamber was established in the woods near Birkenau in a vacated cottage. In mid 1942 a second cottage, not far from the first, was also converted into a gas chamber. These cottages were known as Bunkers I and II, or the Red Bunker and the White Bunker respectively. Most of the gassing operations were moved to Birkenau, known as Auschwitz II, in 1943 with the completion of the four crematoria and their 46 ovens. Each crematorium had gassing facilities. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 9.42

Prisoners who removed the bodies from the crematoria gas chambers to the ovens were known as Sonderkommandos. One of the Sonderkommandos was the French doctor, Paul Bendel. Staglich attacked Bendel because he had written that corpses burning in the pits could be reduced to ashes in an hour and that prisoners had to use fat from the funeral pyre to make the corpses burn faster.<sup>43</sup> Staglich does not state on what scientific evidence he based his conclusions. As will be shown in Chapter 10, this is a scientifically valid method to accelerate body burnings. Such pit burnings were testified to by many others.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, a Belgian military account from the year 1871 records that it took 50 to 60 minutes to consume the dead bodies of 200 to 300 soldiers burned in a pit using kerosene.<sup>45</sup>

What is particularly interesting is that Staglich virtually ignored Bendel's description of the gassing procedures.

"A double railroad line took the deportees to the very door of the twin crematoria, I and II"

[ Crematoria II and III in most of the literature]

"The group of those condemned to death walked down a wide stone staircase into a big underground room that served as a cloakroom. They were told that everyone had to have a bath and then be disinfected... In the middle of these rooms, coming down from the ceiling, were two ducts, protected by metal grilles over their outer openings they had hinged lids through which the gas was dropped."

"Then the corpses were taken out by the men of the work detail, where the sixteen ovens were located.

Their total capacity was about two thousand corpses per 24 hour period. The twin crematoria in and IV [Crematoria IV and V in most of the literature], commonly called "the forest cremas" (they were located in an attractive little clearing), were of more modest dimensions; their eight ovens had a capacity of a thousand corpses".

Bendel goes on to note that after the gassing a dentist pulled out the victims' gold teeth.<sup>46</sup> Bendel's description of the railroad line leading to Crematoria II and III was correct and similar to a description accepted by Staglich.<sup>47</sup> Bendel's description of the crematoria had some inaccuracies. Crematoria II and III [referred to by Bendel as Crematoria I and II] <sup>48</sup> each had 15 ovens for a total of 30 ovens. There were eight ovens each in Birkenau III and IV (also known as Crematoria IV and V in most literature),<sup>49</sup> However, Bendel was substantively correct that there were about twice as many ovens in I and II [II and III] than III and IV [IV and V]. Also, III and IV were located near a forest. Similarly, camp records show the crematoria capacity of I and II to be approximately twice that of III and IV.<sup>50</sup>

Bendel also mentions a day in June 1944 when the day shift of a 150 man squad to which he belonged had to handle a gassing of people from the Lodz Ghetto.<sup>51</sup> The people from the Lodz Ghetto did not actually begin to arrive until August.<sup>52</sup> Bendel may have confused the dates or he may have confused the Lodz transport with the Hungarians, who were arriving in Auschwitz hi June 1944. However, what is particularly noteworthy is his mention of 150 men. A camp labor deployment list for August 29, 1944 shows 110 prisoners on the day shift assigned to Bendel's crematoria.<sup>53</sup> Thus, Bendel was substantially correct in his memoirs even though he did make some errors.

Andre Lettich, another French doctor whose memoirs appeared in 1946, described the gassing in the two cottages discussed earlier. He described how victims were told they were going to enter showers. The showers turned out to be gas chambers. The gas was dropped in by Corporal Moll and "after a few moments complete silence reigned."<sup>54</sup> Otto Moll was executed after the war. Lettich's account about phony showers agrees with a number of others, including Bendel's. Like Bendel, he notes that the gold was extracted from the teeth of the dead victims. However, we can fault Lettich with his statement that "[u]p to the end of January 1943 there were no crematory ovens at Birkenau."<sup>55</sup> In fact there were no ovens in Birkenau until March 1943. There were six ovens in the Auschwitz main camp.

The aforementioned Otto Moll comes up again in the testimony of Sonderkommando Szlama Dragon. Moll took Dragon and others to one of the cottages to remove dead bodies after a gassing. Dragon states that on the door to the gas chamber were the words "Zum Baden"<sup>56</sup> [to the baths]. However, Lettich stated that above the entrance was written "Brausebad" [Showers]. Thus, Dragon confirms, as do the other witnesses, the attempt to deceive the victims as to the nature of structure they were entering.

Dragon testified similarly to the gassing procedures when the gas chambers in the crematoria were used in place of the cottages. Otto Moll was still directing the people into the gas chambers, telling them that they were going to take showers. First they went to an undressing room. Then they went to the gas chambers. After the gassings, the dentists would pull out gold teeth.<sup>57</sup>

Henryk Tauber, another Sonderkommando, testified to the gassings. He went into detail about the physical layout of the structure. He then noted that in the crematoria the fake showers were installed in the fall of 1943. "No water pipe led to the showers and therefore not a drop of water ever flowed from them."<sup>58</sup> Tauber's credibility is substantially enhanced because he correctly identified four openings on

the roof of Crematorium II where the gas was poured in.<sup>59</sup> This was later confirmed by aerial photos taken of the camp in 1944 and released in 1979.<sup>60</sup> Michael Kula, a prisoner assigned to the metal shop testified that the "metal — working shop made the fake showers intended for the gas chambers.. ." <sup>61</sup>

Miklos Nyiszli was a Hungarian doctor who arrived at Auschwitz in May 1944. His memoirs were written in 1946. He worked with Dr. Mengele and therefore witnessed the death process firsthand. He also writes of extracting gold teeth from the dead victims. He states that there were four crematoria, each with 15 ovens which could cremate several thousand people per day. He also states that the burning pits could cremate five or six thousand per day.<sup>62</sup> He discussed the fact that the chambers of the crematoria said "baths," thus attempting to deceive

the victims.<sup>63</sup>

Nyiszli was correct as to the amount of crematoria in operation. However, only two of the four crematoria had fifteen ovens each. His estimate of the crematoria burning capacity is similar to that of official camp estimates. His discussion of gold teeth extraction and burning pits agrees with other witnesses. Additionally, Nyiszli noted that about 15,000 deportees brought from Theresienstadt had all been admitted to the camp.<sup>64</sup> As was noted in Chapter 4, this is now confirmed by camp records.<sup>65</sup> However, Nyiszli stated that they had lived in the camp for two years before "their extermination." In fact this is incorrect because the first of these transports arrived in September 1943 and the last arrived on May 17, 1944.

Staglich questioned the authenticity of Nyiszli's memoirs. He noted that in two of the published German versions one spoke of "fifteen ovens... recessed in a red brick wall" while another said "fifteen ovens were veneered with red brick."<sup>66</sup> Anytime a work is translated these types of discrepancies may appear. Nyiszli's memoirs were written in Hungarian. They were also translated into French, which caused Paul Rassinier to challenge their authenticity because they differed from the German, according to him, on "numerous basic points." Rassinier claimed that the French translation stated that 10,000 bodies a day could be cremated, while the German version said 20,000; one translation spoke about a target at 40 to 50 meters while another said 20-30 meters; one version mentioned pretty rugs, while another said Persian rugs. However, Rassinier was unable to cite any substantive differences. Staglich wrote that the German version appeared in a "weekly tabloid".<sup>67</sup> The actual number of cremated bodies per day Nyiszli mentions is 10,000. As will be seen in Chapter 10 this number is not out of line for the Hungarian transports.

Butz mentioned Rassinier's "strenuous subsequent efforts to contact Nyiszli and determine whether or not he actually existed, the only person who seemed to unquestionably exist was translator Kremer."<sup>68</sup> Rassinier's alleged attempts to contact Nyiszli are indeed strange. As was noted earlier, two French doctors, Paul Bendel and Andre Lettich, had published their Auschwitz memoirs in 1946. Both accounts are similar to Nyiszli's. Yet, Rassinier does not record any effort on his part in his writings to contact these two witnesses who lived in the same country and spoke the same language as Rassinier.<sup>69</sup> In fact, it was known at the time the English language edition of Nyiszli's memoirs was published in 1960 that he had died because the copyright was held by N. Margareta Nyiszli. This could very well have been known to Rassinier because the work in which he claims to have attempted to contact Nyiszli was, according to Butz, published in French in 1962.<sup>70</sup>

Butz stated that Nyiszli's writings had committed "the basic witness disqualifying act; they claim gratuitous regular beatings of initially healthy prisoners by the SS; it is known that this is not the case."<sup>71</sup> How Butz knew this is not explained. He had obviously failed to consult numerous other

memoirs available at the time of his book — and cited earlier in this work — which mention the same thing. Staglich had a problem with Nyiszli's account of the dead bodies because while it agreed with one SS man, Pery Broad, it disagreed with the observations of Rudolph Hoess, the camp commandant.<sup>72</sup> Therefore, all of them were obviously lying about the state of the dead bodies in the gas chambers.

One of the most troublesome witnesses for deniers is Kazimierz Smolen. As noted in the last chapter, he spent 4-1/2 years in the camp and became a camp historian with the Auschwitz State Museum after the war. He was a "recorder" in the Political Section of Auschwitz and was privy to much information. However, he does not appear to have personally witnessed any gassings. His own account of the camp, written as an academic, as opposed to a survivor, recounts the essential testimony and writings of all other survivors.<sup>73</sup> However, one denier found Smolen's account of the killing of Russian POWs in post war testimony in 1947 lacking because of his statement that these prisoners "were either killed with a shot in the neck, or gassed in Block 11." This testimony is supposedly "vague and laconic." But the author goes on to use Smolen's testimony in an attempt to discredit another account<sup>74</sup> - a common denier tactic.

As can be seen, the accounts by the eyewitnesses who were closest to the events all describe phony showers and baths and the pulling of gold teeth. How credible is this testimony? In the 1980s French researcher Jean - Claude Pressac examined an inventory of equipment for the morgue of Crematorium III which included showers not connected to water pipes.<sup>75</sup> This will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 9. Deniers have never been able to explain why phony showers were in a crematorium's morgue. The gold and silver teeth are detailed in a delivery list from the German Reich Bank to the Prussian State Mint in 1944 which lists more than 120,000 gross kilograms of gold and silver teeth.<sup>76</sup> A memo with the heading of "Jewish Action" by the prison warden in occupied Minsk states that prior to the "action" against Russian and German Jews, the gold fillings, crowns and bridges were pulled out of the victims mouths. The meaning of the word "action" becomes clear when the report states that "516 German and Russian Jews have been finished off [erledigt]."<sup>77</sup> After the war, precious objects looted from victims were discovered by the occupying military government in a German salt mine. Among the items were 385 pounds of gold and silver teeth fillings.<sup>78</sup> A report from 1944 by the Auschwitz camp resistance states that from May 16 to May 31, 1944, 88 pounds of gold and white metal were removed from the false teeth of Hungarian Jews.<sup>79</sup> The most revealing document is the completion report for Crematorium II from March 1943. It states that in the basement of Crematorium II, where "two corpse cellars" are located, is a gold processing room.<sup>80</sup>

### Sonderkommando Manuscripts

After Auschwitz was liberated, manuscripts buried on the grounds were discovered from 1945 to 1970. These are contemporaneous documents written by Sonderkommandos who knew they were doomed. Three of the manuscripts are signed and one is anonymous. They were all translated from Yiddish and French into English in 1992.<sup>81</sup> They all detail the crimes which were taking place at Auschwitz. Substantively, they are in accordance with the eyewitness accounts already examined.

These accounts present problems for deniers because, like the Kremer diary discussed in Chapter 4, they are detailing events while they lived them. Arthur Butz never addressed these documents, but would in all likelihood dismiss them as forgeries. Staglich argued that they were forgeries. He paraphrased an account in one of the manuscripts as describing SS guard Otto Moll of being "in the habit of placing four people in a row and then felling them all with a single bullet. . . Those who ducked were cast into a bonfire. . .".<sup>82</sup> The actual passage states that Moll "aligned four persons, one behind the other in a straight line and with one series of shots transfixed them all. Should anybody turn the head aside [Moll] threw him alive into the flaming grave of dead men."<sup>83</sup> Note that the account talks about a series of shots, not a single bullet. Also the account says they were transfixed — that is to be held motionless with terror. Staglich also assured his readers, in connection with these accounts, that the Polish Ministry of the Interior had a team of experts who specialized in fabricating documents.<sup>84</sup> Yet, he would also have us believe that these "experts" would be clumsy enough to fabricate a document stating that four people could be "felled" with one shot.

Staglich claimed that the origin of these documents could be adduced from an incident described in one of the accounts about a Polish girl, who while in the gas chamber with other Poles and Jews, urged the Sonderkommando to avenge "the guiltless." The Poles sang the Polish national anthem and the Jews Hatikva, "[t]hen they sang the Internationale" —<sup>85</sup> the communist anthem. Staglich claimed that this proved the documents were communist forgeries.<sup>86</sup> However, this is the only reference in all of the manuscripts which can be considered pro -communist — and the manuscript does not even mention communism in connection with this incident or any other. If the communist forgers really wanted to reap any political benefit from these manuscripts one might have expected to see a number of pro -communist references. Moreover, since Stalin was alive when some of these manuscripts were discovered, the communist forgers should have found a way to include him in a favorable light. Yet, neither Stalin nor communism are mentioned in the manuscripts.

Robert Faurisson would later challenge these documents because of the role played by Bernard Mark, who translated one of the documents from the original Yiddish. Mark was a well known for distorting documents he edited in order to give a pro communist and pro-Stalin slant. He had done this when editing other Jewish historiography.<sup>87</sup> Therefore, one would expect such references in these texts, but they are not there. The Auschwitz State Museum was apparently aware of Mark's reputation because it would not publish the texts until it had his translation verified by Dr. Roman Pytel, an oriental philologist.<sup>88</sup>

The veracity of the Sonderkommando diaries is shown from direct information we have about one of them — Chaim Herman. His manuscript is dated November 6, 1944. He writes that he left Drancy, France on March 2, 1943 with 1,132 others. They arrived in Auschwitz on March 4. Only 100 were admitted while the rest were gassed.<sup>89</sup>

The names and deportation dates of all French Jews are available. These lists show that one Chaim Herman was part of convoy number 49 which left Drancy on March 2, 1943. There were a total of 1,000 named Jews in the convoy, of whom 119 received registration numbers upon their arrival on March 4. Chaim Herman received registration number 106,113.<sup>90</sup>

First Escapees' Report

The first comprehensive analysis of Auschwitz was written by two prisoners who escaped from the camp on April 7, 1944. They were Walter Rosenberg and Alfred Wetzler. Rosenberg would change his name to Rudolph Vrba during the escape. The essentials of the Vrba-Wetzler report were released to the public in July 1944.

The report is based on information the two authors collected from other prisoners and Sonderkommandos, along with their own experiences, while they were in Auschwitz. Briefly summarized, "[i]t described the extermination mechanism that was used in Auschwitz-Birkenau in unflinching detail."<sup>91</sup> The authors described the actual gassing procedures which they never personally observed, but learned about from other prisoners with first hand knowledge.

"[T]he unfortunate victims are brought into hall [B] where they are told to undress. To complete the fiction that they are going to bathe, each person receives a towel and a small piece of soap by two men clad in white coats. Then they are crowded into the gas chamber (C) in such numbers that there is, of course, only standing room. To compress this crowd into the narrow space, shots are often fired to insure those already at the far end to huddle still closer together. When everybody is inside, the heavy doors are closed. Then there is a short pause, presumably to allow the room temperature to rise to a certain level, after which SS men with gas masks climb on the roof, open the traps, and shake down a preparation in powder form out of tin cans labeled "cyklon" "for use against vermin... After three minutes everyone in the chamber is dead."<sup>92</sup>

The question arises as to the overall accuracy of the report. Obviously deniers have repeatedly attacked the report. Butz, as might be expected, suggested that Vrba and Wetzler did not even author the report.<sup>93</sup> However, the essentials of the report were published by the New York Times on July 3, 1944.<sup>94</sup> The report was passed along to the American War Refugee Board. Over the years the report has been referred to as the War Refugee Board Report or the Auschwitz Protocols.

Deniers have been quick to point to certain inaccuracies in the report.<sup>95</sup> Like many descriptions of the events under consideration there were some technical inaccuracies. However, deniers have had a difficult time refuting the above description of the gassing because it is consistent with other testimony given after the war and it describes the gassing process thoroughly. Therefore, the inaccuracies and verifiable information in the report must be examined to determine its overall probative value. Deniers never discuss those aspects of the report which are correct.

The report incorrectly stated that up to the time of the escape 1,765,000 people had been killed in Auschwitz. The escape occurred before the Hungarian operation of May-July 1944. The actual number killed at the time of the escape was about one-third of the amount stated in the report. However, as noted earlier, nearly all estimates of the amount killed at Auschwitz were incorrect. As noted in Chapter 4, the best available demographic evidence places the total killed during the camp's 4-1/2 year existence at about 1.1 million.

The report incorrectly states that the furnace capacity of one of the crematorium's was nine furnaces with four openings. In fact, there were five three muffle furnaces (each muffle representing an oven or opening) in the structure being described. However, the report did correctly state that the burning

capacity of the furnaces in Crematoria II and III were twice that of Crematoria IV and V. This is because II and III, as noted earlier, had a total of 30 ovens while IV and V had a total of 16 ovens. This information is consistent with the report by Head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office which placed the cremation capacity of II and III at slightly less than twice the capacity of IV and V.<sup>96</sup>

The report states that a waiting room and gas chamber are below the furnace room. The "waiting room" is apparently the undressing room. Floor plans which have since become available for Crematoria II and III show the furnaces on the top floor covering an area of about 4000 sq. feet and the dressing room and gas chamber under ground covering an area of 4219 sq. feet and 2264 sq. feet respectively.<sup>97</sup> A letter from the Chief of Central Construction Management on January 29, 1943 refers to a "gassing cellar" in Crematorium II.<sup>98</sup> A series of engineering reports for Crematoria II and III from the same period refer to an "undressing room" and "undressing cellar".<sup>99</sup>

The report incorrectly states that there were three openings on the roof for the insertion of gas into the gas chamber which housed Crematorium II. A photograph of the camp taken in August 1944 shows four openings for insertion of gas into the gas chamber.<sup>100</sup> However, an earlier photo of the Crematorium II believed to have been taken in February 1943, before it became operational, shows three openings.<sup>100\*</sup> The fourth opening was probably added later on. It is possible that Vrba and Wetzler were only familiar with this earlier view of the building. The report incorrectly states that at the inauguration of the first crematorium to be operational in March 1943, 8,000 Jews from Cracow were killed. However, camp records for March 13, 1943 do show 2,000 Jews arriving from Cracow. Only 508 received a registration number.<sup>101</sup>

Staglich complained that there was no way of checking population figures in the report.<sup>102</sup> In fact, we can cross check much of the data in the report. The report listed convoys of arrivals and their approximate registration numbers. We will not examine all of the numbers. The interested reader can cross check Vrba-Wetzler's numbers with those in the Auschwitz Chronicle. Some of the more salient examples will be examined here.

The report states that corresponding with registration numbers 109,000-119,000 "[a]t the beginning of March 1943, 45,000 Jews arrived from Salonika, 10,000 of them came into the camp. . ." Appendix II of this study shows the arrival of 46,733 Jews from Salonika for the period of March 20 to June 1943. Only 11,704 were registered. The registration numbers for Salonikan Jews on March 20 begins 109,371.<sup>103</sup>

The report states that during the week following September 7, 1943 Jews arrived from Theresienstadt, none of whom were killed. The registration numbers ran, according to the report, from 148,000 to 152,000. Camp records show all 5,000 Jews from Theresienstadt being admitted on September 8, 1943. Registration numbers for the men went from 146,694-148,986 and for the women 58,471-61,183.<sup>104</sup> Vrba and Wetzler may not have been aware that men and women were under a different registration system.

The report states that in May 1942, 1,300 Slovak Jews were transferred to Auschwitz from Majdanek who received registration numbers ranging from 36,000 to 37,300. Camp records show 1,000 Jews transferred from Majdanek on May 22, 1942. They received registration numbers 36,132-37,131. Staglich stated that the report alleged that these Jews were "gassed and burnt in the birchwoods". Staglich wondered why they would be transferred to Auschwitz to be killed since Majdanek allegedly had gas chambers.<sup>105</sup> In fact, the report never says that these Jews were gassed and burnt. Staglich had confused the Slovak Jews from Majdanek with other Slovak Jews who, the report states, were gassed in

the birch forests. (As will be recalled, two bunkers were used for gassing in the forest in 1942.) Moreover, Majdanek could not have been used to gas people in May 1942 because the gassings did not begin there until September or October 1942.<sup>106</sup>

The report states that between July and September 1942 a typhus epidemic raged in the camp. Some 15,000 to 20,000 died during this time. "[I]n the early stages many were killed by phenol injections, and later on others were gassed wholesale." The Auschwitz Death Books, discussed in Chapter 4, show about 19,000 deaths for July, August and September 1942.<sup>107</sup> As will be recalled from Chapter 4, four individuals familiar with these events all stated that sick prisoners were being killed by the authorities and the death certificates falsified to conceal this fact. Also recall that the death certificates themselves tend to confirm these observations.

The report appears to be the first place where the word "Sonderbehandlung", (special treatment) is discussed. As will be recalled from Chapter 1, "special treatment" was a code word used for killing. The report notes that the abbreviation "SB" is used. Dr. Lingens-Reiner, the German camp doctor referred to earlier, wrote that the authorities kept index cards of gassed prisoners which stated "SB".<sup>108</sup> These cards have disappeared. However, as was noted in Chapter 1, a memo from August 1942 states that permission was given for a truck to go to Dessau Chemical Works, where poison gas was made to, "load material for special treatment."<sup>109</sup> Also, a report for October 8, 1944 on prisoner strength in the women's camp for Birkenau states that on October 7 there were 38,782 prisoners. A total of eight arrived bringing the total to 38,800. The report then speaks of 2,394 decreases to bring the total down to 36,406. These decreases consist of seven natural deaths, eight releases, 1,150 transfers and 1,229 under the heading of "SB".<sup>110</sup> Since this "SB" could not mean natural death, release or transfer, it can only mean that these prisoners were killed.

A camp report dated March 8, 1943 deals with prisoner arrivals on March 5 and 7. It states that on March 5 a total of 1,128 Jews arrived from Berlin and 1,405 Jews arrived from Breslau. A total of 389 arrivals from Berlin were admitted to the camp while the remainder, women and children, were given "special treatment". Auschwitz registration records for March 6 show 389 men and 96 women registered from this transport. The Breslau transport, according to the memo, saw 406 men and 190 women admitted while the remainder received "special treatment". Auschwitz registration records show 406 men and 190 women registered.

The report also states that on March 7, 690 prisoners arrived from Berlin of whom 243 were admitted to the camp while the rest — 30 men and 417 women and children — were given "special treatment". Auschwitz registration records for March 7 show 243 arrivals from Berlin receiving a registration number.<sup>111</sup> Therefore, in all three of these transports the prisoners given "special treatment" disappear after arriving at Auschwitz.

## Second Escapees' Report

Two other Jewish prisoners escaped on May 27, 1944, seven weeks after the Vrba-Wetzler escape. These two prisoners, Arnost Rosin and Czeslaw Mordowicz, also issued a report.<sup>112</sup> Unfortunately, their report is often overlooked in the literature, and when it is mentioned its contents are ignored. Their report is much shorter than Vrba-Wetzler and did not have the same impact. Nevertheless, the

report furnishes valuable additional evidence in order to test the probative value of eyewitness accounts.

Rosin and Mordowicz escaped during the Hungarian operation. They reported that 14,000 or 15,000 Jews arrived daily. Only 10 percent were admitted to the camp, "the balance were immediately gassed and burned". As was noted in Chapter 3, a document from Germany's Plenipotentiary in Hungary confirms that more than 437,000 Jews were deported from Hungary from mid-May to mid-July 1944. Auschwitz camp records show only about 46,000 Hungarian Jews in the camp. Also, as will be recalled, the Counselor of the German legation in Hungary reported, on May 26, 1944, that 12,000-14,000 Jews were being deported daily from Hungary.

Mordowicz and Rosen reported that up to the time they escaped, the Hungarian transports came from the cities of Munkacs, Nagyszollos, Nyiregyhaza, Ungvar, Huszt, Kassau, Beregszasz and Marmarossziget. An incomplete list of the transport dates and cities, based on 1944 railway records, confirms that these places, and others, are where Hungarian Jews were transported from up to May 27.<sup>113</sup>

The report states that since the middle of May 1944 a new numbering system for registering prisoners was inaugurated. The numbers were now preceded by the letter "A". Camp records show that such a system was started for registering male prisoners beginning on May 16.<sup>114</sup>

The report states that on May 23, 1944, 3,000 Jews reached Birkenau from Theresienstadt. None were killed upon arrival. Camp records show 2,499 Jews arriving from Theresienstadt on May 19. All were registered upon arrival.<sup>115</sup>

The report states that Hungarian Jews who were not killed were not included in the camp enrollment. The report is partially correct. As was noted in Chapter 3 about 20,000 of the 46,000 Hungarian Jews who were not immediately killed upon arrival did not receive registration numbers. Rather, they were classified as "in transit" to other camps.

The report appears to be the first one to discuss "Block 10", which was used to conduct medical experiments. Block 10 is well known for the experiments conducted by Dr. Clauberg.<sup>116</sup>

In what may be the most important part of the report, the role of "Special Commandos" is discussed. Their number is increased from 600 to 800. The report also mentions the "Clearing Commando", whose size increases from 150 to 700. The report does not state what is the exact function of the "Special" and "Clearing Commandos". However, since these commandos are discussed within the context of the gassings it is certain that these are the Sonderkommandos, mentioned in all the literature, who moved bodies from the crematoria gas chambers to the ovens and burning pits. A camp labor deployment list from August 29, 1944 shows 874 prisoners in a Special Squad assigned to the four crematoria in Birkenau.<sup>117</sup> Such a large number of prisoners assigned to the crematoria can only be explained by the fact that these structures were very busy at certain times and this in turn is consistent with mass killings perpetrated by the camp authorities.

The report states that during the time they were in the camp during the Hungarian operation one of the four crematoria was not functioning and was being repaired. Also, the report states there were burning pits which made the "exterminating capacity. . . almost unlimited." This is consistent with other reports of a breakdown in Crematoria IV and V and burning pits to handle the excess bodies.<sup>118</sup> The burning pits identified by Mordowicz and Rosin are visible on an aerial photo of the camp taken on May 31,

1944 and are discussed in the report in Appendix IV of this study.

Both the Vrba-Wetzler and Rosin-Mordowicz reports are good faith attempts to relate the general situation that existed in Auschwitz during the time these prisoners were in the camp, even though there are inaccuracies in both reports. For one thing, as was noted, both reports mention Jews from Theresienstadt who were not killed upon arrival. A report which intentionally sought to deceive its audience would not mention this. Also, the authors of both reports are very careful not to give information which cannot be verified. For example, in the second report it is stated that Himmler was said to have visited Birkenau on May 15 or 16th 1944. However, the visit was not reported as fact. The report only states that such a visit "could be true". In fact, Himmler did not visit the camp at this time.

Deniers like Bute, Staglich and others had also been critical of the Vrba-Wetzler report because in 1963 Vrba wrote a book in which he contradicted some portions of the original report. Nevertheless, the book was written without Wetzler, and the report itself is closer to the events than the book. Moreover, as has been shown, the substantive provisions of both reports are corroborated by other evidence.

#### Other Eyewitnesses

Most narratives of eyewitness accounts discuss Auschwitz because the camp is still standing and it is the best known of all the camps. More importantly, however, Auschwitz did have prisoners who survived. The camps of Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor and Treblinka were straight killing centers from which few survived.

Nevertheless, there is still important testimony to come from the other camps. Most of the testimony, along with other evidence, has been analyzed and recorded by Holocaust historian Yitzhak Arad.<sup>119</sup> Only a very small amount of the evidence will be discussed here.

Like all eyewitness accounts, those describing places like Belzec, Sobibor or Treblinka will suffer from the problems previously discussed. Since these camps and all the records dealing with them were destroyed, as was noted in Chapter 1, we do not have as much corroborating evidence as with Auschwitz. Nevertheless, as Arad shows, and as will be shown in the following chapter, the essentials of the victim testimony is corroborated by the perpetrators of the crime. Moreover, the Korherr Report and other demographic evidence discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 of this study support the overall testimony that the victims were murdered because they disappeared after reaching the killing centers.

Some of the problems can be seen from an entry of Zygmunt Klukowski, a non-Jewish medical doctor, in his diary on April 8, 1942:

"We know for sure that every day two trains, consisting of twenty cars each, come to Belzec... After being unloaded on separate tracks, all Jews are forced behind barbed wire-enclosures. Some are killed with electricity some with poison gasses, and the bodies are burned."<sup>120</sup>

Klukowski is recording a contemporaneous account of the

disappearance of Jews. However, the Jews were not being killed with electricity. Yet, this was widely believed to be the case at the time.<sup>121</sup> Deniers will argue that since Jews were not being killed by electricity then it follows that they were not being killed by gas. Of course, this is a much easier argument to make than explaining where the Jews Klukowski saw being shipped out were being sent to.

Some witnesses were not certain as to the precise method being used to kill people in the camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka. They believed that the people entering the gas chambers at these camps were being killed by steam when in fact the method used was carbon monoxide. Yet, this is the type of error one who witnessed these events could logically make. Deniers claim that if there is a uncertainty as to whether steam or carbon monoxide was used, then there must be doubt as to whether the central event occurred.<sup>122</sup> By analogy, one could argue that since there was conflict in testimony as to the number of crematoria and ovens in Birkenau and how many broke down that it would be reasonable to assume that no crematoria or ovens existed. Yet, the ruins of these structures are still visible in Birkenau and no one, even deniers, claims they never existed.<sup>123</sup>

Among the published victim accounts translated into English about Treblinka are those of Samuel Willenberg,<sup>124</sup> Jankiel Wiernik<sup>125</sup> and others in a volume edited in 1979.<sup>126</sup> However, probably the most important witnesses were two individuals who were never actually in Treblinka. Franciszek Zabecki worked with the Polish railroad which transported Jews to Treblinka. He viewed these deportations first hand. What is particularly noteworthy in his account, as far as Holocaust denial is concerned, is that the transports he witnessed stopped at Treblinka. They were not shipped any further.<sup>127</sup> Yet, Treblinka only kept very few prisoners for work details. His testimony was very important in the post-war trial that took place in Dusseldorf, Germany.<sup>128</sup> Similarly, Stefan Kirsz, a Polish locomotive driver at the Belzec station, described what he witnessed near the camp. He stated that the train cars were emptied of Jews at Belzec. "I saw that in addition to the living, corpses were taken out..."<sup>129</sup> However, there was no transport out of Belzec.

ohn C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

## PART II: TESTIMONIES

### CHAPTER 6

#### PERPETRATOR TESTIMONY

The admissions made by the perpetrators of the Holocaust have always been especially troublesome for deniers. It is one thing to attack victim credibility, but quite another to try to explain why someone would admit to a crime. Predictably, it has been claimed that innocent

Germans were forced to admit to crimes they did not commit through torture and other nefarious means.<sup>1</sup> Although there were probably some

German defendants who were mistreated (i.e. Rudolph Hoess to be discussed later) there is no evidence of widespread attempts to force confessions out of defendants. As will be seen, many of the major defendants denied any involvement in mass murder. Deniers argue this both ways. If a defendant denies participation or knowledge of mass murder, then that is proof it did not occur. Yet, if someone admits to crimes, then they were forced to do so.<sup>2</sup>

Butz also invented another reason why perpetrators confessed. They thought that "the Allies were not completely serious about carrying out executions and long prison sentences." Therefore, they would say whatever was necessary at the time in hope of setting the record straight at a future date.<sup>3</sup> As usual,

he presented no evidence for this assertion. The biggest name of the defendants on trial before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg was Herman Goring. Hitler, Himmler and Goebbels had all committed suicide. Goring was head of the Luftwaffe (German Air Force). He had issued an order on July 31, 1941 to the head of Reich Main Security to take measures to carry out the "intended final solution of the Jewish question."<sup>4</sup> At the trial Goring denied that this meant killing. He said that Reich policy was emigration, not extermination.<sup>5</sup> This is what subsequent deniers would claim, and they probably got the idea from Goring. However, Goring was not asked to explain why, if emigration was Reich policy, Germany suspended Jewish emigration from the Reich shortly after this document was issued.

One of Goring's very friendly biographer's, denier David Irving, writes that Goring heard rumors of mass killings in the East in the winter of 1941/42. Irving writes:

"Pathetic transports of Jews deported from the West had clogged the railroad lines into Poland and eastern Europe and his papers would show him several times that spring [1942] discussing "transport bottlenecks in Upper Silesia" with Hitler."<sup>6</sup>

As will be recalled, Upper Silesia is the area of Poland where Auschwitz was located. Where did Goring think that the millions of Jews under German control were being sent?

Goring would have been the obvious candidate from whom to extract a false confession. Yet, his testimony runs on for hundreds of pages and he continually argued with the prosecution. He was anything but a compliant witness. Goring even went so far as to claim that Hitler did not know about the extermination of the Jews.<sup>7</sup> This is probably where David Irving got the idea that would form a central thesis in a book he wrote in 1977 — that Hitler did not know about the mass killings (see Chapter 8 of this study). According to Butz, Goring was a credible witness because "his testimony appears to be the approximate truth as he saw it."<sup>8</sup>

There were, however, a couple of significant slips in Goring's testimony. When asked how it was that he did not know about mass murders he replied: "This is also explained by the fact that Himmler kept all these matters very secret. We [Goring and Hitler] were never given figures or any other details."<sup>9</sup> Thus, Goring informed the court that he knew Himmler was carrying out these policies, but keeping the figures "very secret."

The other, and more significant, slip occurred early in his testimony. Butz had claimed that Goring "never conceded the existence of a program of extermination of Jews. . ." <sup>10</sup> In fact, when Goring was informed that the indictment stated that the destruction of the Jews was a part of planning aggressive wars, he replied that "the destruction of the Jewish race was not planned in advance."<sup>11</sup> Not the "alleged destruction" but "the destruction". So Goring admitted to the destruction, but that it was not planned in advance. Thus, Goring might be said to fall into what is known as the functionalist school of Holocaust thought — that is, those who do not believe there was a long range plan to exterminate the Jews but that the policy evolved as Germany headed towards war.

What is probably correct is that Goring was not "in the loop" as to the extermination. That is, he was not kept informed on a continual basis as to these policies, and he may not have wanted direct

knowledge. However, he certainly knew of the overall policy. Goring followed a familiar pattern in the post-war trials. He attempted to distance himself as far away from these events as possible. However, the key point is that Goring never flatly denied the exterminations. He never stated: "Those things did not happen because I would have known of them." Indeed, his failure to make such a blanket declaration is perhaps the best evidence of his knowledge.

The next most significant Nazi on trial was Joachim von Ribbentrop, Germany's Foreign Minister. He also denied any knowledge or involvement in the exterminations. However, under cross examination he was read a document prepared by Hitler's translator on a meeting that von Ribbentrop and Hitler had with Hungary's regent, Miklos Horthy, in April 1943. Part of the document reads: "The Foreign Minister declared that the Jews were either to be exterminated or sent to concentration camps. There was no other solution."<sup>12</sup> Von Ribbentrop denied saying "it in those words". The more significant part of the document being read to von Ribbentrop was Hitler's statement at this meeting, cited earlier in Chapter 1 of this study, that Jews who did not want to work "would be shot. If they could not work they would have in perish. They had to be treated like tuberculosis bacilli. . ." Von Ribbentrop acknowledged that this is what Hitler said. This made von Ribbentrop "very grieved."<sup>13</sup> Thus, like Goring, von Ribbentrop attempted to distance himself as far from these events as possible.

In a last ditch attempt to salvage the Fuhrer, von Ribbentrop claimed that this was the first time Hitler "had used expressions in connection with the Jewish problem which I could no longer understand."<sup>14</sup> He would thus have us believe that he was unaware of four public speeches made by Hitler in 1942 which referred to the extermination of the

Jews. 15

The next significant defendant was Ernst Kaltenbrunner, head of Reich Main Security. A number of high level Nazis had testified as to Kaltenbrunner's role and knowledge in the extermination of the Jews.<sup>16</sup> Kaltenbrunner denied everything. His denials drew praise from Staglich because Kaltenbrunner "stubbornly refused to admit knowing anything about such a [extermination] plan."<sup>17</sup> Denier Mark Weber also favorably cites Kaltenbrunner's denials.<sup>18</sup>

Kaltenbrunner's actual denials read quite differently. He only claimed that he personally had nothing to do with the exterminations. He said he first learned of the exterminations in Auschwitz in 1944 and protested to Himmler. He claimed to have written a number of memos to Himmler, none of which has ever been located, in protest against these exterminations. He even went so far as to claim that Himmler stopped murdering Jews in October 1944 because of his intervention.<sup>19</sup> However, he later stated that after listening to foreign broadcasts in 1943 he came to the conclusion that the reports of the destruction were true. "I immediately went to see Hitler, and the next day Himmler, and complained to both of them saying that I would not for one single minute support any such action."<sup>20</sup>

In fact, however, we know that Kaltenbrunner was in "the loop". A memo to Kaltenbrunner from Himmler's adjutant in 1943, cited earlier in Chapter 1, cites foreign press reports "on the accelerated extermination [Ausrottung] of the Jews in Occupied Europe".<sup>21</sup> Thus, he was receiving his information directly from Himmler, not foreign broadcasts. This document was not available to the prosecution at Nuremberg. However, it would have made no difference since Kaltenbrunner would have denied it just as he denied everything else. In this respect one is almost forced to agree with Arthur Butz that "Kaltenbrunner's story was complete nonsense..."<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, both Butz and Staglich were willing to favorably quote Kaltenbrunner's testimony

concerning the meaning of the words "special treatment." They noted that he had defined the words as referring to putting released political prisoners in luxury hotels. On the basis of this statement both authors concluded that "special treatment" could mean something favorable when it was used in connection with the Jews.<sup>23</sup> However, Kaltenbrunner only said this when he was read the contents of a conversation he had with an SS officer, attached to Himmler, where "special treatment" was mentioned. He was simply trying to cover for himself in so far as the conversation says nothing about luxury hotels. However, before Kaltenbrunner was presented with this document he was asked if he knew what was meant by the term "special treatment." He replied that it was "an order from Himmler — I am referring to Himmler's order of 1941, therefore also an order from Hitler — that executions should be carried out without legal procedure."<sup>24</sup>

The next important witness was Hans Frank, Germany's Governor General in Poland. Frank was in a more difficult position than the other defendants because the prosecution had his diaries. These diaries were quoted a number of times in Chapter 1 to show the homicidal nature of Nazi policy towards Poland's Jews.

Frank is perhaps best known for a statement he made at his trial that: "A thousand years will pass and still this guilt of Germany will not have been erased." Staglich has argued that the quote about a thousand years of guilt is taken out of context because when Frank's full statement is read it reveals that he is only saying this because of testimony he heard at the trials, especially that of Auschwitz camp commander Rudolph Hoess. Frank stated he had never installed an extermination camp, or promoted the existence of such camps:

"[B]ut if Adolf Hitler personally laid that dreadful responsibility on his people, then it is mine too, for we have fought against Jewry for years, and we have indulged in the most horrible utterances — my own diary bears witness against me. Therefore, it is no more than my duty to answer your question in this connection with 'yes'. A thousand years will pass and still this guilt of Germany will not have been erased."<sup>25</sup>

Staglich argued that Frank was not stating as fact that these things happened because he said "if Adolf Hitler. . ." <sup>26</sup> But in fact Frank was obviously trying to cover for Hitler since he referred to him as "this outstandingly great man."<sup>27</sup> As for Frank's diary statement that the Jews "must be done away with" and finding a method "which will lead somehow to their annihilation", Staglich argued that such remarks "do not contain a shred of evidence as to how the alleged murder plan was carried out." Staglich attempted to explain away these references to mass murder by approvingly citing another author who described Frank as "a braggart who loved to pose as a big shot and tough guy."<sup>28</sup> Staglich did not explain Frank's speech of December 9, 1942, cited in Chapter 2, that a labor shortage was being created by orders from higher authorities to exterminate the Jews.<sup>29</sup>

Frank's testimony shows that he was doing what many other defendants were doing: trying to distance himself from these events as far as possible. He even used Kaltenbrunner's argument about approaching Himmler and Hitler as to whether Jews were really being exterminated as the foreign press and broadcasts were reporting. However, they both denied any knowledge of such events. Himmler had supposedly said at Cracow that the Jews were not being exterminated but brought to the East.<sup>30</sup> Frank, however, did not explain where in the East they were supposedly brought. Nor did he mention

Himmler's Posen speech of October 4, 1943, cited in Chapter 1, where he spoke of the "extermination of the Jewish people."

Another noted defendant was Julius Streicher. A notorious sadist and pornographer, he was the most vile Jew hater in Nazi-Germany after Hitler and Goebbels. He is best known for editing the German newspaper *Der Sturmer*, which constantly called for annihilating Jews.<sup>31</sup> Under cross examination, a number of the articles calling for mass murder were quoted to him. However, even Streicher denied knowing anything about Nazi genocide. He even went so far as to say that no editorial ever appeared in his paper without quoting the Old Testament "or from Jewish historical works of recent times."<sup>32</sup> As for Hitler, Streicher said the following: "Mass killings were the last acts of will of a great man of history who was probably desperate because he saw that he would not win."<sup>33</sup>

Among the more interesting testimonies given before the International Military Tribunal was that of Konrad Morgen, a member of the SS whose job was to investigate corruption. His inquiries led him to Auschwitz where he learned of people being exterminated. He defined extermination camp as one where gas was used for killing.<sup>34</sup> The problem with Morgan's testimony, as deniers are quick to point out, is that he constantly described the place in Auschwitz where the killings were taking place as Monowitz. In fact, Monowitz was the industrial area of Auschwitz which was used to manufacture rubber for Germany's war effort. The gassings took place in the Birkenau section of the camp.

Morgan's testimony reveals that he did not know the geography of the camp. He never claimed to have witnessed a gassing. However, his testimony shows that witnesses were not being coached. He continually referred to Monowitz but was never corrected by the prosecution.

What is particularly noteworthy about the testimonies of Goring, von Ribbentrop, Kaltenbrunner and Frank is that not one of these defendants ever denied outright that the extermination of the Jews took place. Also, none of them claimed to know anything about a resettlement plan for Jews. Sometimes one might mention in general resettlement in the East, but no specifics of such a plan or direct knowledge of any massive resettlement was ever mentioned. This in itself is highly revealing because no such plan could have possibly existed without the knowledge of these four men. Yet, it would have made an excellent defense.

The most revealing witness in this respect was Alfred Rosenberg. Although best known as Nazi Germany's chief race theorist, he was also Commissioner for the Occupied Eastern Territories. More than anyone else, he would have known of any resettlement plan because such resettlement would have to be in the occupied Soviet territories he governed. Like Goring, Rosenberg was not a compliant witness. He denied any knowledge of an order to exterminate all Jews.<sup>35</sup> Yet, nowhere in his contentious testimony does he ever discuss a resettlement plan. Deniers who claim that Jews were being evacuated to the East will not find any support for this thesis at Nuremberg.

Rudolph Hoess

Perhaps the testimony most vehemently contested by deniers is that of Rudolph Hoess, who was the

Commandant of Auschwitz for most of the camp's existence. Hoess's memoirs detail the mass murder taking place in the gas chambers of Auschwitz.

Deniers claim that Hoess was forced to write these memoirs, if indeed he wrote them at all. They say he was beaten by the British when he was captured. We know about Hoess's abuse at the hands of his British captors because he mentions this in his memoirs.

"During the first interrogation they beat me to obtain evidence. I do not know what was in the transcript, or what I said, even though I signed it, because they gave me liquor and beat me with a whip. It was too much even for me to bear."<sup>36</sup>

It appears that his harsh treatment was caused by Jewish sergeants in the arresting party whose parents had died at Auschwitz. One Jewish sergeant claimed that Hoess "admitted without a trace of remorse that he had been responsible for around two million deaths. . ." Yet, this same sergeant spoke about Hoess's letters to his wife. "Sometimes a lump came to my throat. There were two different men in that one man. One was brutal with no regard for human life. The other was soft and affectionate."<sup>37</sup>

Hoess was turned over to the International Military Tribunal to testify at the trials because Kaltenbrunner's defense attorney wanted Hoess as a witness. Hoess writes that compared to where he had been before, "imprisonment with the IMT was like staying in a health spa." He was then handed over to the Poles to stand trial in Cracow, Poland. He describes his first weeks in prison as "quite tolerable", but the attitude of the guards changed for the worse. Both he and Polish prisoners were mistreated. The prosecutor's office intervened and things changed. "I have to openly confess I never would have expected to be treated so decently and so kindly in a Polish prison as I have been since the intervention of the prosecutor's office."<sup>38</sup> Hoess's surprise no doubt stemmed from the fact that about 300,000 Poles, most of them Jews, perished at Auschwitz.

Hoess's memoirs are divided into two parts, which have been relied on and cited by countless historians since they were first released in 1958. The first part is entitled, "The Final Solution of the Jewish Question." Here he details how the extermination machinery developed at Auschwitz. It should be pointed out that his account is in substantive agreement with victim testimony examined earlier. He is also in substantive agreement with Dr. Johann Kremer, discussed in Chapter 4, and the memoirs of Pery Broad, an SS guard at Auschwitz whose writings will be discussed later. "The Final Solution of the Jewish Question" is dated November 1946.

The second part of his memoirs deals with his rise through the Nazi hierarchy and some of the administrative problems he had at Auschwitz. It is here that he reveals an original order in 1941 that "[a]ll Jews without exception are to be destroyed."<sup>39</sup> There is a separate chapter on gassings but not as much detail is given here as in the "The Final Solution of the Jewish Question." This second part is dated February

1947.

How credible are Hoess's memoirs? In addition to being in accord with other testimony, there is also independent corroborating evidence for key points he makes which will now be examined.

Hoess stated that the first gassing at Auschwitz took place in Block 11, the execution block, in the fall of 1941. Russian prisoners were gassed. However, it was found that Block 11 was not suitable for such operations and the procedure was moved to the morgue in the crematorium of the main camp in 1941. Hoess gives the impression that Block 11 was only used for one or two gassings. About 900 Russians were gassed in the crematorium's morgue soon after the Block 11 gassing. The gassing was carried out using Zyklon B gas pellets, which release a hydrocyanic poison.<sup>40</sup> The exact date of the first gassing of September 3, 1941 was given at his trial.

In 1994 Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research conducted tests on Block 11 and the Crematorium I morgue for traces of hydrocyanic poison. The test showed positive results (see Appendix III). Thus, even though there were only one or two gassings in Block 11, there is still enough residue to confirm that hydrocyanic acid was used there.

Hoess specifically mentioned the Russian POWs as the first victims in the Fall of 1941. There is considerable data from camp records for the Fall of 1941 which suggests that Russian POWs were being murdered en masse. A card index of Russian prisoners for 1941 shows 9,997 were brought into the camp and 7343 are listed in the morgue register (not to be confused with the Auschwitz Death Books examined in Chapter 4) for the four months from October 1941 through January 1942.<sup>41</sup> Thus, these prisoners had an astounding 73 percent mortality rate for a four month period.

Hoess stated that burning pits behind Crematorium V had to be dug to handle the gassed bodies.<sup>42</sup> Other testimony affirms the use of burning pits near the crematoria for body disposal.<sup>43</sup> An aerial photo of the camp taken on May 31, 1944, during the Hungarian operation, shows smoke rising from an area near Crematorium V and prisoners being marched into that facility.<sup>44</sup> The issue will be dealt with thoroughly in Chapter 10.

Hoess wrote that the bodies of gassed prisoners were at first buried and then dug up. More than 100,000 bodies were burned in the outdoors "continuously — all day and night. By the end of November [1942] all the mass graves were cleared."<sup>45</sup> In what may be the first reference to Auschwitz in an American newspaper, the New York Times referred on November 25, 1942 to reports that the Germans in Poland were "carrying out the slaughter of Jews" which included "accounts of trainloads of adults and children taken to great crematoriums at [sic] Oswiecim, near Cracow."<sup>46</sup> Oswiecim was the Polish name for Auschwitz. This report of "great crematoriums" is consistent with the mass burnings referred to by Hoess. At the time of the report there were only six ovens - the number would increase to 52- so the outdoor burnings would be consistent with "great crematoriums."

Hoess wrote that gold teeth had to be extracted from the victims.<sup>47</sup> As was noted in Chapter 5, this is corroborated not only by other testimony but documents from the period. As was noted in Chapter 3, Hoess wrote that tens of thousands of Jews were being shipped out of Auschwitz in 1944 to work in the arms industry. Auschwitz camp records show 20,000 Hungarian Jews shipped out to other camps in May through August 1944.<sup>48</sup>

Finally, Hoess gave the number killed as 1,130,000. This contradicted testimony he had given earlier of 2.5 million.<sup>49</sup> Hoess wrote: "I regard a total of 2.5 million as far too high. Even Auschwitz had limits to its destructive capabilities."<sup>50</sup> For years most, but not all, historians used the number of 2 million or higher. However, as was noted in Chapter 4, a thorough demographic study now places the total at 1.1 million. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum accepts the figure of 1.1 million.<sup>51</sup>

Hoess also wrote in this regard that "[f]igures given by former prisoners are figments of their imagination and have no foundation in fact." This statement was also directed against the Russian and Polish governments which were giving out figures of four million killed at Auschwitz.<sup>52</sup> Hoess's figure of 1.1 million constitutes the definitive proof that he could not have been forced to write these memoirs. If he was being pressured, the Poles would have certainly forced him to use the four million number and not have allowed him to openly criticize others on this point.

## Pery Broad

Pery Broad was an SS man at Auschwitz who wrote what he witnessed while at the camp. His camp memoirs were written independently of Hoess's, and there is no evidence to suggest that either one knew of what the other was writing. In many respects Broad's memoirs are more thorough than Hoess's in matters dealing with Auschwitz. They are more personalized than Hoess's. However, unlike Hoess, Broad did not reveal his own involvement in these matters. Broad would later be sentenced to a four year prison term.

Broad gives a comprehensive overview of the miserable conditions which existed in the camp i.e. torture, illness, hunger and general deprivation. His numbers on the total killed were erroneous. He states that two or three million Jews were killed at Auschwitz.<sup>53</sup> However, this was widely believed to be the case at the time. He also writes that during the Hungarian operation three of the four crematoria broke down and bodies were burned outdoors.<sup>54</sup> This conflicts with Hoess's account of only one crematorium completely broken down during the Hungarian operation (Crematorium IV) while another broke down off and on (Crematorium V). However, like Hoess and other witnesses,<sup>55</sup> he confirms the use of burning pits.

Broad was able to correctly identify the number of ovens in Crematoria II and III at 15 each. He does not give the number of ovens for Crematoria IV and V, but correctly notes that there were less.<sup>56</sup> He mistakenly says that in the two larger crematoria 4,000 people could be killed at one time.<sup>57</sup> The actual number was about 2000 in each crematorium or 4000 in total. However, he does correctly state that the halls of the two larger crematoria (II and III) — which were used as an undressing room and gas chamber — were underground while the two other crematoria halls (IV and V) were on ground level.<sup>58</sup>

He discusses the true meaning of "special treatment" as killing. He notes in this respect that the papers held in the camp dealing with "special treatment" and "special detention" were removed from the dossiers. Elsewhere he also notes that camp papers and records dealing with the mass murder were destroyed.<sup>59</sup> This account essentially agrees with Hoess who stated that Himmler had given orders that all documents relating to the mass murders be destroyed.<sup>60</sup>

He also confirms Hoess's and others' testimonies about the two bunkers which were used for gassing before the new crematoria, with their gas chambers, were built in 1943.<sup>61</sup> Like others mentioned in Chapter 5, Broad notes that there was an attempt to deceive the potential victims with signs reading "To disinfection".<sup>62</sup> As will be recalled, others described the signs as saying "to baths". Broad mentions, as do so many others, that gold teeth were pulled from the victims.<sup>63</sup> Broad also confirms a point made by Dr. Johann Kremer (see Chapter 4) that the SS men involved in the killings got extra rations and liquor.<sup>64</sup>

In his memoirs Broad refers to "six covered air shafts" on the roof of the crematorium's mortuary.<sup>65</sup> He must have been referring to the vents on the crematoria which were used to insert Zyklon B. As was noted in Chapter 5, an aerial photo of the camp shows four vents, not six. However, in Broad's testimony given in 1946 he states that six shafts were on the roof of Crematorium I, in the main camp in 1942, before the new Birkenau crematoria were built. The four openings were in Crematorium II in Birkenau. He testified that through the six holes "after the tins had been opened, the gas was poured in".<sup>66</sup> In his memoirs he did not identify which crematorium had the six holes.

At the Auschwitz trials in Frankfurt, Germany, which lasted from 1963 to 1965, Broad also gave testimony which substantively confirmed his memoirs.<sup>67</sup> An abbreviated version of his memoirs was read into the court record.<sup>68</sup> However, testimony was also given against Broad at the trials. He was a defendant at the Frankfurt trials but not at the immediate post-war trials.

Broad's memoirs are particularly troublesome for deniers because, like Dr. Johann Kremer who also testified at Frankfurt, Broad was repeating testimony he had given at another trial.

Broad had testified in a 1946 trial — at which he was not a defendant - about some of the mechanics of gassing. He noted that the poison used was Zyklon B. He agreed with the following description read to him: "The boxes are filled with small pellets which look like blue peas. As soon as the box is opened the contents are shaken out through an aperture in the roof... " After four minutes everybody was dead.

He stated that during the Hungarian operation about 10,000 per day were gassed.<sup>69</sup> He erred when he stated that the Hungarian operation took place in March and April 1944. It took place in May, June and July of 1944.

Staglich challenged Broad's memoirs because a typewritten copy was presented to the court which had not been published. Staglich stated that they were in no way authenticated. Two witnesses did testify as to the memoirs authenticity. Staglich referred to them as "presumably German-speaking Jews of the type let loose at one time on German prisoners of war in order to 'effect' incriminating statements from them, in one way or another. . ." <sup>70</sup> He quotes the following account: "After some hesitation Broad admits that he is the sole author of this report, but he says that he cannot stand by everything in it because some of the things he wrote were based on hearsay." Staglich then reaches the conclusion that the Broad report is — what else? — a forgery because he does not like some of the German words used.<sup>71</sup>

Broad was on trial in 1964 and it is not surprising that he might try to distance himself from his own writings given their incriminatory nature. Staglich, himself a judge, should have encountered this during his tenure on the bench. Sometimes defendants do try to dissociate themselves from previous statements. Nevertheless, at no time during the trial did Broad state that he did not write the memoirs. Thus, in both his 1946 and 1964 court testimonies he affirmed the facts presented in his memoirs.<sup>72</sup>

Broad was sentenced to four years in prison. He had been out of prison a number of years before Staglich wrote his book. Yet, Staglich gives no indication as to whether he ever attempted to contact Broad to learn the "truth" about these memoirs and Broad's testimony.

Kurt Gerstein was a disinfection officer with the SS who recorded his experiences. He appears to have deserted the SS and sought out the Allies in April 1945.<sup>73</sup> He then wrote an account of the mass murder he had witnessed at Belzec and Treblinka. His confessions appear to be the earliest of the post-war writings since they are dated April 26, 1945 — two weeks before the European war officially ended. Although his confessions are considerably shorter than those of Hoess, Broad and the memoirs of victims, they have been the subject of two denier books.

The first book was written by Carlo Mattogno in Italian and published in Italy in 1985. The book was unavailable for this study. However, it was favorably reviewed in a denier publication. Therefore, the review will be used to represent Mattogno's views.<sup>74</sup>

The second book, and the better known among deniers, is Henri Roques's *The "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein*, published by the Institute for Historical Review, the world's largest publisher and distributor of denier materials. Mattogno can definitely be identified as a denier from other writings. However, it cannot be completely ascertained on the basis of Roques's book as to whether he is actually a Holocaust denier.

It is important to point out that both authors accept the authenticity of the Gerstein report which was submitted at Nuremberg and is labeled as document PS-1553.<sup>75</sup> They do question other versions of the report. Therefore, the Nuremberg version will be used here.<sup>76</sup>

The report has been challenged for some striking impossibilities. Gerstein states that 25 million people were gassed, a figure which includes Jews and non-Jews.<sup>77</sup> He also wrote that 700 to 800 Jews could be killed in a gas chamber of about 270 square feet. Historians have relied on his memoirs as to the general truth of what he witnessed but not 25 million people gassed or 700 to 800 people killed in an area of 270 square feet. Deniers claim that these two statements show that he lied about everything.

He gives an account of personally witnessing the process of gassing Jews. His descriptions are very graphic. Some of his memoir is strikingly familiar. For example he saw a sign saying "To the bath and inhalations." He also observed the removal of gold teeth from murder victims.

Gerstein's position as a disinfection officer has not been questioned. There are invoices with his signature on them ordering Zyklon B 78 which was used for delousing clothing as well as killing people. Therefore, in his position as a disinfection officer he would have had occasion to visit the camps where Jews were being killed because their clothing had to be disinfected before being sent to ethnic Germans.<sup>79</sup>

The issue of whether Gerstein was a credible witness turns on whether he told anybody about the mass murder he witnessed during the war while he was personally witnessing these things. This would be a contemporaneous account as opposed to a post-war memoir which he wrote while he was in captivity. In his memoirs Gerstein mentions Dr. Otto Dibilus who is identified by Mattogno as a Catholic bishop. Gerstein also mentions Baron von Otter of the Swedish Legation. During his interrogation he also mentioned a Dr. Hochstrasser.

Mattogno writes that Bishop Dibilus and Dr. Hochstrasser stated that they were told during the war by Gerstein of what he had seen. They stated that the information they received was passed along to

intermediate Roman Catholic hierarchy in Switzerland and Sweden. Mattogno writes that he was not able to find any report confirming what these two had stated. The case of Sweden's Baron von Otter has always received the most attention. Gerstein stated that he met von Otter on a train and told him what he had witnessed. Gerstein also stated that he saw von Otter twice again and that von Otter stated that he had sent a report to the Swedish government. Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in 1949, confirmed receiving a written report from von Otter in August 1945<sup>80</sup> about his 1942 meeting with Gerstein. Von Otter states that after hearing Gerstein's account he made an oral report to his superiors,<sup>81</sup> but does not mention a post-war written report. It is not known whether the person to whom von Otter passed the information made a written report. The Swedish archives do not appear to yield an answer.

Historian Walter Laqueur investigated this issue. A Mr. Soederblum, who was the person to whom von Otter reported during the war, stated that "we judged it too risky to pass information from one belligerent country to another." Eric Boheman, a government spokesman, believed that there were some documents in the archives. Laqueur then was able to obtain access to von Otter's papers and found a letter, dated July 25, 1945, written to a member of the Swedish legation in London. Laqueur gives the following summary of the letter:

"It relates the story of meeting with Kurt Gerstein in late August 1942 and the report about the "corpse factory" of Belzec (a literal translation from the Swedish). There are details about transport conditions, technical procedure, the reaction of the SS guards and the Jewish victims, the collection of jewelry, gold teeth and other valuables. Gerstein also showed von Otter documents referring to the purchase of cyanide gas."

"Gerstein visited von Otter again half a year after their first meeting in order to inquire what use the Swedes made of his information."<sup>82</sup>

Thus von Otter's post-war written account, ignored by Roques, confirms Gerstein's revelations.

Gerstein also mentioned a Dr. Pfannenstiel, a Professor of Hygiene, as witnessing the events in Belzec. Pfannenstiel has confirmed the fact, in 1950, that he witnessed the gassing operations with Gerstein.<sup>83</sup> Ten years later he gave similar testimony.<sup>84</sup>

Thus, three individuals to whom Gerstein states he told of these events during the war all confirm his account. The one individual whom Gerstein states was there with him, Dr. Pfannenstiel, confirms the gassings. Why would all of these individuals lie? Admissions like those of Pfannenstiel are always explained away by deniers on the basis that these individuals said what they were told in order to avoid prosecution. However, that does not explain why a Swedish diplomat (von Otter), a Catholic bishop (Dibilius) and Dr. Hochstrasser would lie about what Gerstein was telling them during the war.

As noted in Chapter 1, Operation Reinhard involved the camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka. Franz Stangl was the overall commander, first in Sobibor then in Treblinka. He was deeply involved in the mass exterminations carried out under the name of Operation Reinhard. He was tried in West Germany. He never denied any of his crimes. In a set of extensive interviews with journalist Gitta Sereny he explained his role and motivations for the mass murder which he supervised. Stangl believed, erroneously, that the reason for the extermination activities he directed was because the Nazi leaders wanted the Jews' money. When asked why cruelty toward the victims was used since they were going to be killed anyway, he replied: "To condition those who actually had to carry out the policies... To make it possible for them to do what they did."<sup>85</sup> (It might be useful to note that those who carried out the mass murder and torture in Cambodia for the Khmer Rouge first practiced on animals.)

Butz had a difficult time attempting to explain Stangl's admission. He sought to rationalize such confessions by arguing that Stangl was old and prone to confess to anything.<sup>86</sup> However, the extent and depth of Sereny's interviews with Stangl suggest otherwise.

Stangl's second in command at Treblinka was Kurt Franz, who also served at Belzec. At trial Franz stated: "I cannot say how many Jews in total were gassed in Treblinka. On average each day a large train arrived, sometimes there were even two."<sup>87</sup> His overall view as to the number exterminated per day is consistent with what is known about Treblinka. About 750,000 to 900,000 died in this camp which operated from July 1942 to the fall of 1943. As will be recalled from Chapter 1, a train transport schedule from March 1943 shows a daily delivery of about 2,000 Jews.<sup>88</sup>

Willi Mentz, known as the "Gunman of Treblinka," described the installation of "new and larger gas chambers," which could hold twice the number of the smaller gas chambers. He stated that there were five or six gas chambers. Mentz also described how he shot people on arrival. "There were men and women of all ages and there were also children."<sup>89</sup>

Herber Mattes, a sergeant at Treblinka, described the "upper camp" in the facility as the place where the gas chambers were located. Like Mentz, he described the building of new gas chambers in 1942. "All together, six gas chambers were active. According to my estimate, about 300 people could enter each gas chamber."<sup>90</sup> Mattes's estimate differs from Mentz who believed that the new gas chambers could hold twice the 80 to 100 of the old gas chambers.

Particularly interesting in the case of Treblinka is the testimony of Otto von Horn, who was a guard there. He had given testimony in the 1960s. He gave background testimony about Treblinka at the "Ivan the Terrible" trial in Israel in the 1990s where he described the gassing operations.<sup>91</sup> Von Horn was under no obligation to testify at this late date. Yet, he voluntarily came to Israel to describe what he saw in the camp.

Sergeant Eric Lambert testified about Sobibor. He was involved in building the gas chambers there. The camp commander "gave us exact directives for the construction of the gassing installations. The camp was already in operation, and there was a gassing installation. Probably the old installation was not big enough..."<sup>92</sup>

Erich Fuchs, who served at Sobibor, described an initial "test gassing" where "thirty to forty women were gassed in a gas chamber". The engine was turned on "to release exhaust into the chamber so that

the gasses were channeled into the chamber."93

Erich Bauer, known as the "Gasmeister" by prisoners, stated: "I estimate that the number of Jews gassed at Sobibor was about 350,000."94 However, many estimates place the total at 250,000.

The testimony from those involved in the killing at Belzec is very similar. Lieutenant Josef Oberhouser stated that "[t]he gassing of Jews which took place in Belzec camp up till August 1, 1942 can be divided into two phases. . . On average 150 Jews were delivered and killed per transport." Sergeant Karl Sculch described his role in the gassings at Belzec:"... I had to show the Jews the way to the gas chamber. I believe that when I showed the Jews the way they were convinced that they were really going to the baths. After the Jews entered the gas chambers, the doors were closed... Then Hackenholt switched on the engine which supplied the gas."95

The above constitutes a portion of the Operation Reinhard perpetrator testimony. One fact to be noted is that none of these perpetrators ever mentioned any plan to resettle Jews beyond the camps to which they were delivered.

The trials for the Operation Reinhard perpetrators were held mainly in the early and mid 1960's in West Germany. During these trials none of the defendants ever attempted to claim that the mass murders never occurred. Defendants who admitted their participation in the crimes said that they did so under duress. It should also be pointed out that many of the defendants in the Operation Reinhard trials had previously been attached to the T 4 organization which was responsible for carrying out Germany's euthanasia program against the mentally ill and handicapped from 1939 to 1941 which killed 71,000 people.96 Not even deniers claim that the euthanasia program never existed. This raises the question as to why so many euthanasia experts would be attached to Operation Reinhard if it was a resettlement program as deniers allege.

It is worth noting in this respect that deniers have all but ignored the Operation Reinhard trials. Why? The immediate post war trials held in Nuremberg were conducted by the victorious Allied powers. Thus, deniers have claimed that the process was tainted for this reason. However, the Operation Reinhard trials - and the Auschwitz trials held during the same period to be discussed later - were conducted by the independent and democratic West German government. These trials were not popular in Germany. Therefore, it is not possible to make the claim that vengeful victors extracted false confessions from innocent defendants.

Franke – Gricksch

Alfred Franke - Gricksch, an SS Major, wrote a report after he was released by the British in 1948. Shortly after his release he dictated to his wife an account of a meeting that both he and his superior had with Himmler. She typed it and would submit it at the Treblinka trial in 1965. Himmler quoted Hitler as saying:

"I have after much deliberation decided to blot out once and for all the biological basis of Judaism. . . I

am determined, out of a higher responsibility, to translate this recognition of mine into action, whatever the consequences."<sup>97</sup>

Franke-Gricksch was seized by the Russians and is believed to have died in captivity.

## Trials

One of the early trials involving Auschwitz defendants was the so-called Belsen Trial, a reference to the Bergen Belsen concentration camp. Bergen Belsen did not have gas chambers. Nevertheless, many people died there. A number of defendants at this trial were also at Auschwitz. The most prominent defendant at this trial was Joseph Kramer, known as "The Beast of Belsen." He was the commandant of the Birkenau section of Auschwitz where the gassings occurred.

Arthur Butz had latched on to Kramer's initial statement at his trial that there were no gas chambers, executions or cruelty at Auschwitz. Kramer retracted this statement. He said he made it because he had taken an oath of secrecy not to discuss these matters. Butz argued that the original statement is true but that Kramer had no choice but to retract. Butz rationalizes:

"Even if he had felt personally heroic [in denying the gas chambers], there were powerful arguments against such heroism. His family, like all German families of the time, was desperate and needed him. If, despite all this, he persisted in his heroism, his lawyer would not have cooperated... Kramer's defense, therefore, was that he had no personal involvement in the extermination at Birkenau. . . Remember that these proceedings were organized by lawyers seeking favorable verdicts, not by historians seeking the truth about events."<sup>98</sup>

Butz, as usual, did not present a shred of evidence to substantiate these claims. How could Kramer possibly think that he would be set free by admitting that gassings took place while he was a commandant of that portion of the camp where the gas chambers were located? The real reason for Kramer's retraction was that there was too much testimony at the trial about gassing from both perpetrators and victims. There was simply no way he could maintain any credibility in the face of such testimony by claiming that there were no gas chambers or executions. Therefore, he followed a strategy characteristic of many perpetrators. He tried to distance himself from the crimes as much as possible. He denied that he took part in selecting any prisoners — known as "selections on the ramp" for the gas chambers. Rather, he stated that this was done by camp doctors.<sup>99</sup> In some sense this was correct. Camp doctors often made selections of healthy prisoners who could work, while the rest were gassed.

Fritz Klein, an SS medical doctor at Auschwitz, testified about on the ramp selections. Of course, he claimed that he had nothing to do with them. He talked about unfit prisoners: "I have heard, and I know, that part of them were sent to gas chambers and the crematoria." He said that he disapproved of

the gas chambers. The only time he was actually at a gas chamber was when it was not working.<sup>100</sup> Butz would no doubt dismiss such testimony as ludicrous. He would be right, but for the wrong reason. Butz would probably claim that Klein was fabricating the story about gas chambers to tell the prosecution what it wanted to hear. The only real fabrication was that Klein would not admit his full participation.

Similarly Franz Hoessler, a guard at Auschwitz, admitted to being at on the ramp selections only because he had to guard prisoners. "I did not make selections myself, and there were no selections without doctors." Once again Butz might claim that such a prisoner was telling the prosecution what it wanted to hear about gas chambers. In fact, Hoessler had no choice but to attempt to blame someone else. The prosecution informed him, and he knew, that there were many witnesses who identified him as taking part in these selections.<sup>101</sup> Therefore, he could hardly deny his presence at these events, or deny the events took place at all.

The standard defense at this trial by nearly all of the Auschwitz accused was similar to that of the above three. Since there was so much testimony against the defendants, they simply tried to shift the blame onto someone else. The Belsen Trial occurred in late 1945, a time when Butz had claimed that defendants were being forced to give false confessions by the occupying authorities. In fact, one wonders why, if these defendants were being forced into false confessions, they did not all confess to their direct participation in these events. Why did they try to shift the blame onto someone else? The torturers certainly must have been inept. Yet Staglich claimed that both Kramer and Klein "were frequently subjected to inhuman and illegal treatment. . ." <sup>102</sup> and that their statements should not have been allowed at a subsequent trial. He did not offer a shred of evidence that any of these defendants were mistreated.

The Auschwitz trials, which took place from 1963 to 1965 in Frankfurt, Germany, involved twenty defendants and scores of witnesses. The defendants' strategy was very similar to the early postwar trials. The defendants tried to distance themselves from these events and shift the blame onto someone else.

Staglich attempted to explain away the Frankfurt trials in a manner similar to the way Butz tried to explain the Belsen trials. However, Staglich admitted that there may have been some killing with phenol injection but that such killing "had nothing to do with genocide."<sup>103</sup> Staglich was attempting to discredit any testimony about gas chambers since he knew that the presence of such installations would mean a plan of mass extermination. Therefore, he focused on the testimony of Josef Klehr who stated that prisoners were killed with phenol injections. Staglich accepted this testimony and argued that characterizing such actions as murder could be disputed "especially since — as is indubitably clear from the testimony of former inmates — it was undertaken only after medical treatment in the camp infirmary had failed to restore the health and working care of the individual."<sup>104</sup>

Staglich's mode of argumentation is quite familiar in Holocaust denial. He was willing to accept the testimony of former inmates when it served his purpose. However, these same inmates also spoke of gassings throughout the course of the trial. Staglich was not willing to accept the gassing testimony. In fact, Klehr admitted that he drew up a schedule for those under him to insert gas into the chambers. He stated that his superiors told him to do this because so many victims were arriving. Klehr also admitted to being present at on the ramp selections where those unfit for work were sent to gas chambers.<sup>105</sup> Staglich ignored this part of Klehr's testimony.

Staglich had a great deal of trouble with the testimony of Hans Stark because he admitted to pouring

gas into the chamber. Staglich accused Stark of lying because he never said anything about a gas mask which was needed during a gassing operation. However, this does not mean that he did not wear a gas mask. The issue just never came up since Stark was not describing the technical aspects of gassing. Staglich complained that when Stark was asked how the gassed people looked "he was at a loss for an answer."<sup>106</sup> What Stark actually said was that "I didn't look closely; one glimpse was enough for me."<sup>107</sup> Stark's testimony was similar to a statement made in 1959 where he not only discussed the gassing but defined the terms "special treatment" and "special lodging" as meaning execution. He knew this because he worked in the Political Section of Auschwitz.<sup>108</sup>

A defendant who never reached the Frankfurt trial was Richard Baer, the last commandant of Auschwitz. He had died before the proceedings began. This allowed deniers to float a whole series of conspiracy theories that he died under "mysterious circumstances." Staglich quoted non cited French press sources that "Baer adamantly refused to confirm the existence of 'gas chambers' at the camp he once administered."<sup>109</sup> , According to Butz, Baer "insisted that the Auschwitz gas chambers were a myth."<sup>110</sup> The non cited source of this speculation appears to be Paul Rassinier, who wrote that Baer declared that there had never been any gas chambers at Auschwitz while he was in command.<sup>111</sup> He cited no source.

Baer's death was, in fact, a fortuitous event for deniers since it has allowed them to spread conspiracy theories about his death. They could now claim that he would have revealed the "truth". What Baer actually said differs substantially from the deniers' view. After he was arrested he stated:

"I commanded only Camp I at Auschwitz. I had nothing to do with the camps where the gasings took place. I had no influence over them. It was in Camp II, at Birkenau, that the gassing took place. That camp was not under my authority."<sup>112</sup>

Baer was correct in that there were no gas chambers in the Auschwitz main camp while he was commander. They were in Birkenau. The gas chamber in the crematorium of the Auschwitz main camp was abandoned in late 1942 or 1943. Technically, therefore, Staglich, Butz and Rassinier were all correct. However, Baer would not have helped the deniers since he was only stating what was generally known — all the gas chambers in 1944 were outside of the main camp. The gas chamber in the main camp had ceased functioning by 1944.

Although Baer never faced trial, his statement generally follows what was said at Frankfurt. Yes, there were gas chambers. No, I did not have anything to do with them. Most of the twenty defendants followed this strategy. Not one stated that there were no gas chambers. Most of the defendants tried to blame others for what happened at Auschwitz. Moreover, none of the many witnesses denied the existence of gas chambers.<sup>113</sup>

This was a sore spot for Staglich who claimed that the defendants did not have any choice because they were attempting to secure legal advantages for themselves. They admitted to these things "in an attempt to placate the court and the prosecution." The judges neglected their legal duty to ascertain the truth. Defense attorneys succeeded in having their clients falsely confess to crimes. Staglich believed that what was taking place was a "show trial."<sup>114</sup>

Like Arthur Butz before him, Staglich did not present any evidence to substantiate these allegations. Butz had made the argument about defendants making false admissions in the immediate post-war trials in the late 1940s to secure advantage. One would think that since many of these defendants received harsh sentences, the defendants on trial in the 1960s would have seen the futility of such a strategy. Moreover, if the defendants really did not know anything about gas chambers, they could have denied personal knowledge while not rejecting the overall existence of such installations. Yet, this did not happen; probably because there were too many witnesses, including other defendants, who placed them at the scenes of the crime.

Staglich's other problem was that he could no longer claim that the trials were carried out by vengeful victors. The 1940s trials, which took place at Nuremberg and elsewhere, were run by the victorious allied powers. The Frankfurt trial — and other trials in the 1960s dealing with Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka discussed earlier — were being supervised by the independent government of West Germany. Staglich could no longer attack the Allies, so he decided to impugn the legal system of a democratic country of which he was a member. Interestingly, he had no negative comments about Nazi Germany's legal system.

Twenty defendants were on trial at Frankfurt. Three were acquitted and 17 received various prison sentences.<sup>115</sup> Many of the prison sentences had already been served by the time Staglich wrote his book in 1979. An English language edition appeared in 1986 and second edition in 1990. Thus, Staglich had plenty of time to make personal contacts with the defendants to learn the "truth". Yet, nowhere in the latest edition of his book does he state that he ever made contact with any defendant. This may be the most revealing aspect of his book. As a West German judge he certainly could have obtained access to some of the defendants, especially those still in prison. It is highly probable, indeed almost a certainty, that he did in fact contact some of the defendants but did not get the answers he wanted to hear. Therefore, he branded them all as liars.

Thies Christophersen

The inability of deniers to produce a favorable German witness who was at a killing site appeared to change in 1973 with a pamphlet published by Thies Christophersen, who was at Auschwitz in 1944. His pamphlet has been published as *The Auschwitz Lie*. It was first published in English as *Auschwitz: Truth or Lie* in Canada. This particular edition advertises such publications as *Adolf Hitler Was A Genius*, *Hitler: Psychic and Prophet*, *The Hitler We Loved and Why* and other like-minded writings.

According to Christophersen he was stationed in that part of Auschwitz known as Rajsko from January 15, 1944 onwards. Botanical and agricultural research were conducted at Rajsko, which was more than one mile from Birkenau. Thus, Christophersen has placed his own location far enough away from anywhere at Auschwitz which could implicate him in mass murder. Christophersen was never charged with any crimes and therefore did not have to testify, nor did he, at any of the post-war trials of those accused of war crimes. He never really explains this failure.

His pamphlet promoted two denial myths. First, he cited a French publication as quoting Richard Baer that he had never seen any gas chambers at Auschwitz. As was noted earlier, Baer was not lying, if indeed he said this, because the Auschwitz main camp, which Baer commanded, did not have gas

chambers while he was commandant. As was also noted, however, Baer did admit to the existence of gas chambers in Birkenau. Christophersen also stated that those who admitted to crimes did so to secure advantage.<sup>116</sup>

Christophersen wrote: "During all the time I was in Auschwitz I never in the least observed anything that even indicated mass killings in gas chambers." However, the killing occurred in Birkenau and this is where Christophersen becomes vague. He states that he was in Birkenau to make a "selection" of female prisoners to work in Rajsko. He never stated how many times he was in Birkenau and it is possible that he may have only been there once. He stated that one evening he was asked about crematoriums where bodies were burned but did not know about such matters. He then checked a mining camp in Bielitz where there were smoke stacks, but found nothing.

This is where Christophersen's story starts to break down. He does not say he made any inquiries in Birkenau, the logical place to ask such questions since there were four crematoriums and 46 ovens — a fact admitted to by all deniers. Yet, Christophersen stated that he was told that there "was a crematorium in Auschwitz. . ." Here he gives the impression that he is talking about the Auschwitz main camp which had one crematorium and six ovens, not Birkenau with its four crematoria and 46 ovens. Moreover, the crematorium in the main camp had closed down by the time Christophersen arrived at Auschwitz. Once again, he is attempting to place himself as far away from Birkenau as possible.

He also denied the many reports of burning flesh hovering over the camp.<sup>117</sup> In a 1988 trial involving a Holocaust denier who published denial materials, Christophersen even stated that he never saw any smoke over the camp.<sup>118</sup> We know from the Auschwitz Death Books that many registered prisoners died up to the end of 1943. Therefore, there must have been a considerable number of deaths in 1944 in which the bodies were cremated. Why else would 46 ovens be built? Yet, Christophersen saw no smoke!

Christophersen also stated that "[i]t is an absolute certainty that no people were shot at Auschwitz." Even Faurisson has admitted to executions in Block 11, a fact not disputed by other deniers. Yet, Christophersen tells us no one was shot.

Christophersen must have certainly been aware that while he was in Auschwitz the Hungarian deportations took place. He said nothing about the trains that began to arrive in Birkenau in May-July 1944. If his claim was that more than 430,000 Jews were never shipped to Auschwitz, then he could have stated that it never happened. After all, Butz said it never happened. However, Christophersen never addressed the issue of any new arrivals at Birkenau or anywhere else in the camp. Moreover, in October 1944 a revolt took place in the camp which resulted in much gunfire and bloodshed.<sup>119</sup> Yet, Christophersen said nothing about this revolt. He could have addressed the issue if only to deny that it happened. His silence on both of these issues is very revealing.

Christophersen changed his written account in two subsequent trials involving a Holocaust denier. He first stated that he had been at Birkenau 5, 6 or 7 times; then in the second trial it was 20 times.<sup>120</sup> He was asked about his written account where he says nothing about Birkenau but only mentions the Bielitz camp. Christophersen then claimed he never said he was at Bielitz "I only said in the direction of Bielitz". He now claimed that he really drove around Birkenau, not Bielitz.<sup>121</sup> In fact, this is not what he said in his pamphlet.

"... I went in the direction of Bielitz and there found a mining camp in which some inmates also worked. I traveled around the entire camp and examined all five grates and all smoke stacks, but found nothing."<sup>122</sup> (italics added)

Thus, he clearly stated that he was at the Bielitz mining camp, not Birkenau. He wrote the same thing in a 1985 article.<sup>123</sup> He changed his story at the trial because his pamphlet, if it is to be believed, clearly showed that he had no familiarity with Birkenau. He probably calculated at the time of the denier trial, in 1988, that he could not get into trouble if he said he was constantly in Birkenau. Christophersen died in 1997 and we may never know where he went on that day. What we do know is that since these two accounts are diametrically opposed to one another — not merely an inconsistency — he lied in one of those versions.

There are also problems with some of his other information. He quoted the Austrian Jew Dr. Bendikt Kautsky as saying that he never saw any gas chambers while he was in German concentration camps. Christophersen was attempting to give the impression that Kautsky was questioning the existence of gas chambers. Kautsky spent three years in the Monowitz section of Auschwitz, several miles away from Birkenau, and therefore would not have seen a gas chamber. Kautsky did state that he spoke with dozens of inmates who did see these installations.<sup>124</sup>

Christophersen claimed that an article by Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times in 1948 lists 18,700,000 Jews in the world whereas there were less than 16 million before World War II. He identifies Baldwin as "a well known population expert". The article appears in the February 22, 1948 issue. Baldwin was giving a military analysis of the Arab-Israel conflict. In the course of his article he stated that there were 15 to 18 million Jews in the world. He simply made a mistake. Moreover, Baldwin was not a "population expert." Nevertheless, the author personally remembers Hanson's erroneous figures being quoted in all manner in the 1960s by other deniers trying to argue that this was some type of key information to prove that the Nazis never engaged in mass murder of the Jews.

Christophersen quotes a Red Cross Report that it could not verify rumors of gas chambers when it visited the camp. This is captioned as "Suppressed Red Cross Report". In fact, as the Red Cross informed Staglich in a letter dated April 28, 1978: "Our report expressly states that our delegates never got past the camp commandant's office."<sup>125</sup>

There is, however, one particular statement made by Christophersen which allows us to test his credibility as to what he saw. In discussing packages received by inmates he states that only rarely were items withheld.

"These things, however, remained the property of the inmates and were stored in a huge warehouse called "Kanada", where also all possessions of Jews interned at Auschwitz, were kept."<sup>126</sup> (italics added)

The Kanada section of Auschwitz was where the authorities kept items stolen from Jews for the

German war effort. This is common knowledge among historians and is confirmed by a letter from Oswald Pohl, Chief of the SS Economic and Administrative Main Office, dated July 24, 1944, the same time Christophersen was in Auschwitz. The letter states that Jewish property had been confiscated for the benefit of the Reich: "It is impossible to enclose a list because of the vast quantity involved. The valuables accumulate in concentration camps."<sup>127</sup> As will be recalled from Chapter 1, clothing stolen from murdered Jews was shipped to ethnic Germans.<sup>128</sup>

Therefore, Christophersen lied by saying that items held in Kanada were being held for the Jews. Even if one wanted to give Christophersen the benefit of the doubt on the many inaccuracies and questionable statements made in his pamphlet, it is simply inconceivable he could not have known the true nature of the property held in Kanada. Since he had already conceded that he knew of Kanada's existence — a tactical error on his part — he could not admit that these items would not be returned to the Jews because to do so would also be to admit that they no longer needed their property. Dead people would have no use for the items held in Kanada.

In 1985 Christophersen wrote an article claiming that he could not find any eyewitnesses to the gassings. "Instead, people would tell me that they know someone who knew someone else, who talked about it."<sup>129</sup> Yet he makes no mention of trying to contact anyone involved in the post war trials such as those that took place in Frankfurt in the mid 1960s. Did he contact anyone who had been acquitted or had served a sentence? He does not say. One gets the impression that he either did not make a very sincere attempt to contact anyone or that those he did contact did not tell him what he wanted to hear.

Perhaps Christophersen's overall attitude towards the Jews can be gleaned from his statement that the Jews declared war on Germany in 1933.<sup>130</sup> He based this absurdity on an article which appeared in a London newspaper in 1933 and which will be examined in more detail in Chapter 8.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

PART III: IDEOLOGIES

CHAPTER 7

IDEOLOGIES AND

REPRESENTATIONS

Holocaust denial does not exist in a vacuum. That is, the people and institutions who promote denial are not simply disinterested scholars seeking to obtain the truth about a historical event. Everyone who has studied this movement realizes that the ultimate goal of denial is the rehabilitation of Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich. Nazi propagandists have always been faced with Nazi Germany's war crimes as an obstacle to promoting its ideology. Therefore, the best way to promote Nazi ideology is to claim that such crimes never took place.

The neo-Nazi and white supremacist origins of this movement have been thoroughly documented by Deborah Lipstadt. She showed that the rise of the world's principal denier organization and publisher, the Institute for Historical Review, was dominated by individuals sympathetic to Hitler and his ideology. The major original force behind the Institute was Willis Carto, a neo-Nazi and Hitler sympathizer for many years. He was able to gather like minded people around him who shared his ideology.<sup>1</sup> Carto and the Institute broke in 1994 over financial matters. Nevertheless, the Institute continues to exude his ideology.

The deniers who gather around the Institute will often claim that many of those who support their

views are not Nazi sympathizers. In fact, they will point to one individual who is supposedly an independent Jewish film maker as supporting their cause. It may indeed be true that not every single individual involved in Holocaust denial is a Nazi sympathizer or anti-Semite. Nevertheless, an overview of this movement's writings reveals its true character.

Deniers often like to point to Paul Rassinier, generally acknowledged by all parties to be the founder of the movement. Rassinier was interned in the German Concentration Camp of Buchenwald during the war. There were no gas chambers at this camp. Deniers will argue that a former concentration camp inmate would hardly be sympathetic toward Hitler. But no matter what Rassinier's background was, his writings, now promoted by the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), show his true attitudes. For example, shortly after Germany and the Soviet Union invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, the British press published a letter by a Jewish leader, Chaim Weizmann, stating that the Jews would stand by Great Britain and the democracies. According to Rassinier, this constituted "a real declaration of war on Germany by the Jewish world. . ."2 On the other hand, Rassinier dismissed Hitler's earlier threat to exterminate the Jews of Europe as being of "little significance."3 This type of logic pervades Holocaust denial. One Jewish individual speaks for all Jews because they are part of an international movement. Jewish statements constitute severe provocations. Yet Adolf Hitler, the leader of a powerful nation, should not be taken seriously. Thus does a Jewish leader's support for democratic principles become more dangerous than a head of state's threats to exterminate innocent civilians.

The Nazi apologia is hardly unique to Rassinier. Walter Sanning began one of his chapters with a defense of Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union.4 Arthur Butz described Nazi Germany as "a relatively small country, fighting against overwhelming odds for its existence."5

Wilhelm Staglih, however, is the most candid in his views. He states that Hitler's speech of January 30, 1939 - in which he stated that a new war in Europe would result in "the extermination [vernichtung] of the Jewish race in Europe" - was "nothing more than a response to the war threats that were constantly being made by influential Zionists." He approvingly cited the view that this speech was "a sign of Hitler's deep commitment to peace."6 (Yes, Staglih is serious.) The gas chambers are an "invention of Jewish-Bolshevist propaganda."7 Chaim Weizmann, however, is another matter. His letter, referred to above, "was a declaration of war against the Reich in the name of Jewry..." The Jews, therefore, "had to be considered potential enemies of Germany." Considering Weizmann's severe provocation, Staglih finds it "astonishing that all Jews living within the border of Germany at the beginning of the war in 1939 were not arrested and put into concentration camps. No rules of international law would have stood in the way of this."8 The reader should keep in mind that Staglih is a judge and his book is among the most widely promoted of denier materials.

This type of thinking can be traced to the roots of Holocaust denial in America. Probably the earliest denier in America was Austin J. App, an English professor. He opposed America's entry into World War II and began his denial activities soon after the war ended.9

App is best known among deniers for a booklet he wrote in 1973 called *The Six Million Swindle*. He claimed that not only did the Holocaust not occur, but that the Jews were vindictive. "It was Christ, long ago crucified by the brood of vindictive Talmudists [the Talmud is a Jewish book of religious laws], who first warned them against their eye-for-an-eye-ism." He did not mention Christ's Jewish origins.

App was particularly enraged by West German Chancellor Willi Brandt's visit to Israel. Brandt's mother, App tells us, was "reputedly... raped by a Jew." Thus, App was trying to give the impression

that Brandt may be Jewish. (He wasn't.) Brandt was compared unfavorably to "law and order anti-Semitic Nazis." An anti-German hate book written by Theodore Kaufman, to be examined in the next chapter, showed that the Jews — not simply Kaufman himself — "were barbarous enough to have plotted the extermination of a hundred million Germans..."

App relates his visits to Austria and Germany in 1949. He found these countries were "deluged with uncouth looking Eastern Jews. . .they all seemed to engage in black-marketing. . .They lied, cheated and stole..."

As proof that there was no extermination he cited an order by Himmler in October 1944 forbidding all further executions of Jews. He did not explain why it was necessary at this late date to issue such an order. "Jews who spread such vindictive lies [about extermination] ought to strangle themselves in their own guts — and spare the world their venom." Apparently, App believed he was not venomous.

Germany, we are told, wanted to get rid of its Jews because of "their assault on patriotism, on love of the country in which they were virtually guests." That is why Hitler demanded some "12,000-15,000 Marxist-Jewish" subversives be called to account in Mein Kampf. However, he did not order their extermination. Only traitors and subversives were marked for execution by the Nazis. Yet, had not App just stated that the Jews were traitors and subversives? Moreover, App's reference to the 12,000 to 15,000 in Mein Kampf is strange because Hitler stated that this is how many Jews should have been gassed during World War I, the first known Nazi reference to gassing Jews. Hitler wrote Mein Kampf in 1924.<sup>10</sup>

That Holocaust deniers should express views favorable to Hitler and the Nazis is only a logical result of the movement itself. Deniers claim that the Holocaust is a great hoax perpetrated by a vast conspiracy of historians, the media, world governments and, of course, the Jews. All of these entities know the real truth but seek to keep people in the dark. Similarly, Hitler, Goebbels and the whole Nazi movement from its inception in 1919 to its demise in 1945 preached a vast conspiracy of Jews and Communists hell-bent on world domination. The conspiracy was widespread and all encompassing. The Jews controlled the media and had non-Jewish underlings do their bidding. The Nazis promoted the notorious forgery, The Protocols of Zion<sup>11</sup> to prove the extent of the conspiracy.

Deniers appear to have overlooked the similarity between the anti-Jewish conspiracy theories promoted in Nazi Germany and the type of conspiracy theories promoted by the Institute for Historical Review (IHR). In effect, they are really the same conspiracy. The Holocaust conspiracy picks up right after Germany's defeat. Thus, the Holocaust hoax continues the conspiracy Hitler and the Nazis warned about as early as 1919.

The deniers of the IHR are, to be sure, not as open as App. Nevertheless, as will be seen, the spirit of Austin App pervades the IHR and its principal publication, the Journal of Historical Review. One has only to look at the books the IHR distributes, many published by its own Noontide Press, to understand the real agenda of Holocaust denial.<sup>12</sup> The Protocols of Zion, the infamous forgery purporting to expose a Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world is advertised with the question: "Is this really the secret outline of a diabolical Jewish plot to control the world?" The annotated edition first published by the well known 1920s anti-Semite and protocols promoter Victor Marsden is offered. Henry Ford's anti-Semitic 1920s diatribe The International Jew, which embroiled him in a great deal of controversy and regret, is described as "an eye opening survey of the endearingly vexing 'Jewish question'." The Jew-baiting publication Indictment is "[a] panoramic survey of the destructive Jewish role throughout this century..." Behind Communism explains "[t]he Jewish role in Communism from Marx to the

Rosenbergs, from Moscow to Hollywood." Louis Farrakan's Nation of Islam's The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews describes the Jewish responsibility for slavery.<sup>13</sup>

Perhaps the best known of the publications is the violently racist The Turner Diaries which prophesies a race war and mass murder. A description of a fictional bomb attack against a government building was allegedly used by Tim McVeigh to bomb the government building in Oklahoma City and murder 168 people. There are, in addition, many racist books such as The White Man's Bible, The Rising Tide of Color and Racial Realities in Europe.

Publications which admire Hitler and the Third Reich are also promoted. For Those Who Cannot Speak "presents a vigorous" case for the defense "for National Socialist Germany." The 1934 book Germany's Hitler "is an admiring look at the Third Reich, Germany and its Fuhrer, Adolf Hitler..."

This tendency could be seen in the 1977 edition of Butz's Hoax of the Twentieth Century. In the back of the book are advertisements for publications such as The Inequality of the Races by Arthur de Gobineau, widely considered to be the father of modern racism. Other titles are White Man, Think Again! and White America. Prominent advertisement space was given to the publication The Iron Curtain Over America which "brilliantly documents the historic relationship between Communism and Zionism."

As part of the research for this book every article in the Journal of Historical Review (JHR) from its inception in 1980 to the present dealing with Hitler, Nazi Germany and the Holocaust was examined. The Journal has never published an article which has been critical of any of Hitler's anti-Jewish policies. This shows the true agenda of Holocaust denial. If this was not a neo-Nazi movement it would be possible to deny the Holocaust but condemn Hitler's Jewish policies of the 1930s. Yet there is not one example of this in any JHR article.

One of the early techniques employed by the JHR was to use Zionist as a code word for Jews. This tactic has been used by many anti-Semites. Thus, the notorious gutter anti-Semite Austin J. App, in writing for the inaugural issue, spoke of "Jewish publicists" who urge vengeance which serves the "vindictiveness of the Zionists."<sup>14</sup> As will be recalled, when he had written his booklet seven years earlier it was the Jews who were vindictive. The JHR editor stated that if it could be shown that six million Jews were not killed but were a product of "Zionist" imagination it would be a key to avoiding war in the Middle East.<sup>15</sup>

When App died in 1984 he was lionized with a series of accolades from the JHR. He was described as "[o]ne of the titanic figures of postwar revisionist historiography" who was at the "forefront of those courageous scholars" who sought to determine the truth about World War II. "He was a fighter and a champion for the cause of truth" who was smeared and hounded as pro-Nazi, anti-American and anti-Semitic. The truth of these so called "smears" was his writing of the Six Million Swindle, which was only mentioned in the article's bibliography of his writings. The article itself confirmed the truth of the criticism of App by favorably noting that he had won the European Freedom Prize by the neo-Nazi German People's Union.<sup>16</sup> Ignored in this apologia was App's The Curse of Anti-Anti Semitism in which he not only blamed the Jews for Christ's crucifixion but also for bringing down President Nixon. The Jews "rejection of Christ has ranged itself essentially on the side of evil. . .As a consequence any Christian civilization cannot for long tolerate Jewish, that is, Talmudic control of the money and the media."<sup>17</sup> Yet, according to the JHR, characterizing App as anti-Semitic was a smear.

The enthusiastic support for Hitler in the JHR probably reached its zenith with an article by Leon

Degrelle, a former member of the Waffen SS and a long-time Hitler apologist and supporter. He praised Hitler for getting Germany back on its feet. Nowhere in 20th century Europe had a state's authority been so much based on the "freely given approval of the people." Exploitation of the worker was no longer tolerated. As if this was not enough, he went on to make what might be one of the most fantastic statements ever to be made by any pro-Hitler writer. Degrelle declared that Hitler recognized the right of all people, men and women, to vote by secret ballot and voice their opinion. He had little to say about the Jews except that some Socialist deputies in the Reichstag "had arranged for their wives to receive sumptuous fur coats from certain Jewish financiers."<sup>18</sup> Elsewhere, Degrelle explains that Hitler was taken aback by the presence in Vienna of "bearded Jews wearing caftans." Hitler noticed "their invasion of the universities and the legal and medical profession, and their takeover of the newspapers."<sup>19</sup> Neither Degrelle nor Hitler ever appeared to consider that achieving distinctions in the various professions might be the result of hard work.

In an earlier article it can be seen that Degrelle's enthusiasm for Hitler may have stemmed from the fact that Hitler had said: "If I should have a son I would like him to be like Leon." Thus, we are informed that because "Hitler was elected democratically... he could not do what Stalin did: to have firing squads execute the entire military establishment." Hitler's call for racial purity and return power to the people "so infuriated world Jewry that in 1933 it officially declared war on Germany."<sup>20</sup>

Degrelle, who lived in Germany during the time of Hitler, appeared to be unaware that Hitler seized power in a coup and that it was virtually impossible for world Jewry to declare war on Hitler. Nevertheless, this did not prevent the IHR from commissioning Degrelle to "fill the gap" on knowledge about Hitler in a number of forthcoming books. The IHR wanted Degrelle to write the books because he is a "giant historical figure" and since World War II Marxism, Capitalism and Zionism had kept the world in "intellectual darkness." Another reason for choosing Degrelle was because he and Hitler "shared a last supper together." Hitler told Degrelle: "we will all die, but you, Leon, must live. You must live to tell the world the truth." As might be expected, one of the books was to be entitled *Hitler the Democrat*.<sup>21</sup>

Another individual who was deeply touched by the Fuhrer was Florence S. Rost von Tonningen. Her article is a defense of her husband, who collaborated with the Nazis when they occupied Holland. She recounts how Himmler was the best man at her wedding. Their matrimonial vow was the SS oath: "Our honor is loyalty." She tells us that "I still count our meetings with Adolf Hitler as highlights in my life. For us he was a leader who dedicated and sacrificed himself for his people." She considers Hitler to be "the first European". She wanted to solve the Jewish question with a Jewish state because the Dutch Jews opposed Nazism.<sup>22</sup> She does not explain why Jews would oppose Nazism; nor does she say anything about the more than 100,000 Jews deported from the Netherlands who never returned.

Karl Otto Braun, a German diplomat during Hitler's reign, approvingly cited *Mein Kampf* that the annihilation of Germany was a Jewish desire in order to achieve "long range goals of the advocates of Jewish world domination." The Gestapo are called Germany's FBI.<sup>23</sup> The article generally supports Hitler's diplomacy.

Deniers usually avoid discussing Nazi Germany's anti-Jewish laws and policies in the 1930s. Whenever the subject is brought up it is discussed within the context of world Jewry's "declaration of War" in 1933 or Chaim Weizmann's "provocative" 1939 letter affirming Jewish support for the democratic principles of the allied powers. The tactic can best be seen in Ingrid Weckert's article on *Kristallnacht*, the "Night of the Broken Glass," on the anti-Jewish riots which took place in Germany in 1938.

The riots resulted in 236 killed and more than 600 permanently maimed. Destroyed were at least 7,500 Jewish stores, 29 warehouses, 171 houses; 191 synagogues were set on fire and 76 demolished. Jewish community centers and cemetery chapels were destroyed. At least 30,000 Jewish men were thrown into concentration camps.<sup>24</sup> Weckert, however, explains that Nazi Germany did not take any legal measures against the Jews until they declared war on Germany in March of 1933. The National Socialist regime only "sought to diminish Jewish influence and power by strictly legal means." Apparently, Weckert believes that the laws enacted in Nazi Germany which stripped Jews of their legal rights and property were legal. She goes on to discuss high National Socialist ethical standards. In an attempt to distance official Nazi policy from the riots, she suggests that some mysterious dark force was responsible. She tries to exonerate Goebbels from any role because he was a prominent Nazi leader close to Hitler. In fact, however, Holocaust denier David Irving has now confirmed, on the basis of Goebbels diaries and other documentation, that Goebbels was behind the riots.<sup>25</sup>

Following the riots, the German government imposed a one billion mark fine on the Jews for instigating them. In what seems to be the only criticism of Nazi policies towards Jews to appear in the JHR, Weckert says that this fine was unjust. However, she goes on to cite Goring, who was in charge of the commission which levied the fine, as being influenced by the Jewish declaration of war in 1933.<sup>26</sup> Thus, Weckert puts this "unjust" fine within the perspective of Jewish warmongering. In fact, part of the title of Weckert's article is "the Great Anti-German Spectacle". Therefore, it is the Germans, not the Jews, who were the real victims.

Goebbels' responsibility for Kristallnacht did not prevent JHR editor Mark Weber from writing a laudatory article entitled "Goebbels' Place in History" in which he praises the propaganda minister's organizing abilities and honesty. Weber tells us that "[c]ontrary to popular belief, Goebbels was successful as a propagandist not because he was a master of the 'Big Lie' but rather as a result of his fidelity to facts and truth."<sup>27</sup>

Not all deniers are openly pro-Nazi. Rather, they will put Hitler's anti-Jewish policies within some type moral equivalence. Robert Faurisson took this approach when he stated that "between Hitler and the Jews there was an inexpiable war. It is evident that each holds the other responsible." Chaim Weizmann's 1939 letter is cited as an example of the differences. The deadly chain of events "on the part of both sides was to lead to war."<sup>28</sup> Thus, according to Faurisson, both Hitler and the Jews were on a collision path. He does not explain why this occurred, or who started the fight. One would not know of Hitler and the Nazi Party's anti-Semitism from inception in 1919 right up to its seizure of power in 1933. Faurisson is indirectly blaming the Jews for their problems with Hitler. Otherwise, he would explain how this conflict came about. But more importantly is his statement that the policies of both sides led to war. What policies of the Jews could have led to war? Perhaps he will be asked this someday.

Probably the best example of denial's agenda was an article that had nothing to do with the Holocaust, Germany or even the Twentieth Century. It was written under a pseudonym and dealt with the Spanish Inquisition. At first glance, this would seem like an unusual article for the JHR to publish. Yet, the reason becomes apparent. The author deals with the Inquisition's murder and torture of Jews, known as conversos, who converted to Catholicism in Spain. The author argues, correctly, that many of these conversos only converted to avoid torture and murder and that they continued to practice Judaism. The general thrust of the article is a defense of the Inquisition because many Jews were not sincere converts. The "grim reputation of the Spanish Inquisition is largely undeserved. Its cruelty and arbitrariness have been greatly exaggerated over the centuries largely as a result of anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish propaganda."<sup>29</sup> It does not take much imagination to guess who is the source of this "anti-

Catholic" propaganda, even though they are not mentioned directly.

## Jews and Communism

One of the recurring themes in denial propaganda is the Jewish role in Communism. The reason for the charge is obvious: Hitler and Nazi propaganda were always denouncing the Jews as communists. Moreover, it serves as a form of justification for Hitler's anti-Jewish laws in the 1930s. Thus, Robert Williams tells us that for "nearly half a century Zionist agents had been indoctrinating the seven or eight million Jews in Russia with Marxism. The Soviets were themselves a Jewish innovation."<sup>30</sup> Anyone with even a vague knowledge of Zionism knows that the movement had nothing to do with Communism. Even those Zionists who were Socialists were not aligned with the Communists. The Bolsheviks and Zionists were opposed to one another. The Soviet government in later years would often use anti-Zionism as a cover for its own anti-Semitism.

German General Otto Ernst Remer, who put down a coup against Hitler, confidently declared in an interview with the JHR that "the Soviet leadership under Lenin was paid for by the Jews" who spent \$220 million. "Among the Soviet leaders at that time, 97 percent were Jews."<sup>31</sup> Another JHR writer declared that hostility toward Jews in Europe is caused by the fact that the early Soviet government was "largely dominated by Jews."<sup>32</sup>

Mark Weber finds substantial Jewish involvement in the Bolshevik Revolution. He even cites a Jewish author — a favorite technique of Holocaust deniers — who declares that the Jews of the entire world supported Soviet power. Weber's general tone is that the Jews bear most of the responsibility for the catastrophe which engulfed Russia.<sup>33</sup> But using this technique anybody can prove anything. The case of Theodore Kaufman, a Jewish advertising agent who will be examined in the next chapter, is instructive in this regard. He produced a whole series of quotations from prominent German thinkers going back to before the Nazis seized power to show that Germans were an inherently warlike and dangerous people. His book appeared in 1941 but, unlike Hitler, nobody ever took Kaufman seriously.

The most prominent Jewish Bolshevik was Leon Trotsky, whose real name was Bronstein. Historian of the Russian Revolution, Richard Pipes, has noted that Bolshevik Jews, such as Trotsky and others, had long ceased to identify themselves with anything Jewish. Jews also became victims of communist oppression and purges. Pipes cites the famous warning by a Rabbi that the Trotskys make the revolution while the Bronsteins pay the price.<sup>34</sup> In fact, it is now known, on the basis of previously unobtainable archival material in Russia, that the Red Army carried out massacres of Jews during the Russian Civil War which followed the Bolshevik Revolution.<sup>35</sup>

Following the Revolution of 1917, two of the 18 People's Commissars were Jewish in 1922. A total 5.2 percent of the membership to the Communist Party was Jewish.<sup>36</sup> Seven of the 150 members of the Supreme Soviet were Jewish.<sup>37</sup> In the dreaded Soviet secret police 11 percent were Jewish. Five of the powerful Central Committee's 21 members were Jews.<sup>38</sup> However, the best evidence on the Jewish attitudes towards communism was the vote for Russia's Constituent Assembly in 1917, which was Russia's first democratic election. The results show that more than 90 percent of the Jews voted for

Jewish nationalist parties while the remainder voted for an assortment of Bundists, Zionists and socialist parties. In contrast, the Bolshevik and Menshevik parties received over 25% of the vote from the Russian population at large. When Socialist Revolutionaries are added, the figure jumps to over 60%.<sup>39</sup> This means that the leftist parties had far less support from the Jewish voters than from the population at large.

A report from the United States Department of State shows three Russian Jewish bankers appealing to the United States Government and American Jewish bankers for financial assistance to the Russian Government of Alexander Kerensky which succeeded the Czar and was overthrown by the Bolsheviks. American Jewish banker Jacob Schiff and other American Jews attempted to secure help for Kerensky in opposition to the Bolsheviks.<sup>40</sup>

Weber thought it very significant that recent archival evidence shows Lenin's maternal grandfather was Jewish. He apparently did not feel it worthwhile to mention that the new information we have on Lenin also shows that he had German ancestry.<sup>41</sup> In fact, one of the most ironic aspects of the denial movement, as well as the anti-Semitic international, is that they virtually ignore what most historians have known for many years: that Germany was the major force in helping bring Lenin to power.

In 1958 a series of 136 documents was published from Germany's World War I archives showing the government's interest and support for the Bolsheviks from 1915 to 1918.<sup>42</sup> On the Soviet side many documents were destroyed because they might prove embarrassing to Lenin.<sup>43</sup> However, this had been known since the First World War. When Germany's Jewish Community in 1932 publicly answered Nazi charges that the Jews were Bolsheviks, it pointed to Germany's role in the Russian Revolution. "The greatest supporter of Bolshevism and the actual instigation of the Russian Revolution was the [World War I] Imperial Government of Germany."<sup>44</sup>

This was not mere propaganda. As early as 1914 Germany was looking for a revolutionary party in Russia.<sup>45</sup> A denier has written that how, when and where the Bolshevik revolutionaries were set in motion "can be pinpointed exactly: it was in Vienna in the Fall of 1915 when the German and Austrian general staffs came together to plan an operation to knock Russia out of the war as an ally of Britain and France".<sup>46</sup>

Using German funds in 1915, Lenin was able to publish materials that were smuggled into Russia. The intermediary for these funds was an Estonian named Kerkula.<sup>47</sup> The late Lenin biographer and Soviet military historian, Dmitri Volkogonov, wrote that the German high command for some time "had not only been watching the Bolsheviks with interest, they had also been giving them substantial financial help through various front men."<sup>48</sup> The first attempt to gauge the German role was made by the German Social Democrat Edward Bernstein in 1921. He wrote that it had been confirmed by German General Hoffman that the World War I German Government had allowed Lenin and his comrades to pass through Germany to carry out agitation in Russia. Bernstein also learned that the amount of aid given to Lenin was 50 million gold marks.<sup>49</sup> His figure was confirmed by post-war researchers in the German Foreign Ministry archives.<sup>50</sup>

Germany's First Quartermaster, General Erich von Ludendorff, known as the "military brain of the German nation," wrote: "In helping Lenin to travel to Russia, our government accepted a special responsibility. The enterprise was justified from a military point of view." He declared that the Soviet government "exists thanks to us."<sup>51</sup> This was confirmed in a memo by Germany's Foreign Secretary written after the Revolution:

"Russia appeared to be the weakest link in the enemy chain. The task therefore was gradually to loosen it and, when possible, to remove it. This was the purpose of the subversive activity we caused to be carried out in Russia behind the front — in the first place promotion of separatist tendencies and support of the Bolsheviks. It was not until the Bolsheviks had received from us a steady flow of funds through various channels and under different labels that they were in a position to be able to build up their main organ, Pravda, to conduct energetic propaganda and appreciably to extend the originally narrow basis of their party."<sup>52</sup>

It may be one of history's great ironies that Hitler always accused the Jews of fomenting the Russian Revolution. As Germany's Chancellor from 1933 to 1945, he and his cohorts must have known the truth about Germany's involvement with the Bolsheviks.

Although deniers are quick to praise Hitler's anti-Communism, recently discovered archival material suggests that there may have been more collaboration between Hitler's Germany and the Soviet Union than previously suspected.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, it is often forgotten that the era of modern Soviet expansion, and the roots of the Cold War, lay not at the end of World War II, but at the beginning. It was Hitler's agreement with Stalin in 1939 that allowed the Soviet Union to begin its territorial expansion by invading the Baltic countries, Eastern Poland and parts of Rumania. The Soviets could not have acted without Hitler's blessing. In return for Hitler's cooperation, the Soviets supplied Nazi Germany with vast amounts of material for the German war effort as well as strategic refueling stations on Soviet soil for German submarines and warships.<sup>54</sup>

Historians understand that the Bolshevik Revolution had little to do with the national characteristics of Germans, Jews, Russians or any other group. Rather, it was part of the political, social and economic dynamics of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. There were any number of things which might have occurred to prevent the revolution. Yet, the Bolsheviks were able to seize power. Similarly, Hitler's seizure of power was far from inevitable.

Of course, deniers would be greatly offended if it was suggested that Germany's support for the Bolsheviks had to do with German subversive tendencies. Germany supported the Bolsheviks so that Russia would withdraw from World War I. Some Jews supported the Bolsheviks because they wrongly believed that only a revolutionary government would end the anti-Semitism of the Czarist era. Interestingly, it is the neo-Nazis at the IHR who insult Germans by praising Hitler and suggesting that he was among the best leaders Germany had to offer.

One of the interesting aspects of Mark Weber's arguments and those of many other deniers is that they are more than willing to accept the crimes of Stalin, who murdered more than 20 million, as fact because they want to show he was much worse than Hitler. Weber cites many different estimates on the number of people Stalin murdered. Yet, he fails to acknowledge that the sources which document the crimes of communism - which are highly authoritative - are less authoritative than those for the Holocaust. Moreover, when different estimates for deaths of Jews are given for places such as Auschwitz, deniers claim that this shows no crimes occurred. Differing estimates for the crimes of communism are treated authoritatively. It might be instructive to note that when the author was last in Russia in 1992, he found Stalinists who claim that not more than 200,000 people were killed by the late tyrant. They have much in common with Holocaust deniers.

## Techniques of Omission

One of the problems deniers have always faced is that in attempting to refute the Holocaust they must reveal the sources and factual data which show that it happened. Arthur Butz's Hoax of the Twentieth Century is the classic case. In an attempt to show that there was no Holocaust, Butz actually presented so much evidence that it happened that only a very gullible person or one desperate to believe his thesis could actually accept all of the conspiracy theories and implausible rationalizations offered to explain away the evidence. This point is overlooked not only by Holocaust deniers but their critics as well. For example, Butz actually presented so much evidence that the Hungarian deportations occurred that any reasonable minded person would reject his conclusion that there were no deportations.

However, it must be said that Butz was not afraid to confront the evidence. He simply dismissed all of it by means of some fantastic explanation. One of the best examples is his discussion of an account by Elie Cohen, a prisoner doctor in Auschwitz, who wrote that "S. B.", which means Sonderbehandlung [special treatment], was made in the notes of the Auschwitz I hospital in the main camp, not to be confused with Auschwitz II known as Birkenau. The term, as noted by Cohen and many others formerly cited in this study, meant the killing of prisoners. Butz, however, believed that what Cohen actually read was "N. B.", Nach Birkenau [to Birkenau], meaning that the inmates would be shipped to the Birkenau hospital.<sup>55</sup> Butz did not offer a single piece of evidence from any source to substantiate this assertion. Since Butz was arguing that sick prisoners were not being murdered, this may have appeared to be a plausible assumption. However, any reasonably intelligent reader would immediately realize that sick prisoners were being killed en masse. Butz dealt with nearly all of the damning evidence in the above fashion.

Staglich was more circumspect than Butz in discussing evidence. Thus, he was very careful in the way he presented the Einsatzgruppen (see Chapter 2 of this study). However, the second chapter of Staglich's book presents a great many of the statements made by Nazi leaders dealing with the extermination of the Jews. Of course, like Butz, he had an explanation. Yet, once again, a reasonably intelligent reader not prone to conspiracy theories or untenable explanations will immediately see that Staglich is early on destroying his case.

Sanning's book marked a radical departure from the precedent set by Butz. Since the German evidence, cited in Chapters 1 and 2 of this study, disproves all of his theories he simply ignored it. In fact, as has already been noted, he not only ignored all of the evidence which disproved his theories but misrepresented many of the sources he did use. This technique allowed Sanning to avoid implausible conspiracy theories. On the other hand, there is hardly a reliable piece of data in his book. Even Butz appeared to have been aware of the problem when he wrote in his laudatory foreword to Sanning's book that "[t]here is scarcely an estimate arrived at in this book that cannot be challenged on some

plausible grounds."<sup>56</sup> An understatement even for Butz. Three years after the publication of Sanning's book, Staglich admitted that there was "[s]till lacking a thorough impartial investigation as to what had become of the Jews who were deported to the East."<sup>57</sup> Staglich's mention of deportations is instructive because Sanning never acknowledged German deportations.

Between Butz's presentation of much of the evidence and Sanning's ignoring all of it, some middle ground needed to be established. Mark Weber, editor of the *Journal of Historical Review*, was able to fill the vacuum. He showed his skill at the technique of significant omission. Using this technique means unfavorable evidence is not denounced as a forgery. Rather, it is selectively quoted in a manner which makes it appear to support the case one is trying to make. Weber did this at the trial of Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel in Canada who was prosecuted for violating the country's law against spreading false news. (The author personally disapproves of such laws.) Weber cited some of the Einsatzgruppen reports to make it appear that they were only carrying out military operations, not an extermination policy. Anyone familiar with these reports, cited extensively in Chapter 2, knows their true nature. Weber cited a report of July 24, 1941 as mentioning the setting up of a health service in the Jewish area, thus attempting to give the court the impression that the Einsatzgruppen were actually beneficial to the Jews.<sup>58</sup> What the report actually states is: "In Minsk, the entire Jewish intelligentsia has been liquidated (teachers, professors, lawyers, etc.) except medical personnel. . . A Jewish health service... has been set up to prevent epidemics in the Jewish quarter."<sup>59</sup> Weber also argued, on the basis of a report dated September 12, 1941, that many Jews had escaped, thus attempting to give the impression that they were not killed. The report did acknowledge the escape of some Jews, but it also states:

"Einsatzkommando six in several instances marched the Jews through the town prior to their execution. It was likewise often deemed important to have men from the militia (Ukrainian auxiliary police force) participate in the execution of Jews. Word seems to have passed among Jews on the other side of the front, too, about the fate they can expect from us."

The report goes on to state that where labor was needed the "Einsatzkommandos refrained from shooting Jews in these cases. . ." The report states that the "[e]xecutions of Jews are understood everywhere and accepted favorably."<sup>60</sup>

Weber employed the same technique in an "open letter" to a clergyman. Weber was attempting to argue that the extermination camp of Belzec was a transit station from which Jews were being resettled. Although Weber was unable to explain exactly where this resettlement was taking place, he cited Jan Karski's book *The Story of A Secret State* as evidence. He states that Karski did not see any evidence of gas chambers. "To the contrary, he reported seeing trainloads of Jews leaving Belzec. This observation is completely consistent with Belzec's function as a transit camp..."<sup>61</sup>

Karski's book was written in 1944. He had been attempting to warn the world of what was happening to Europe's Jews as early as 1942.<sup>62</sup> It is now known that Karski did not see trains leaving Belzec. Rather, he saw the trains while in the town of Izbica Lubelska. His initial report, made in London in August 1943, shows that he saw the trains leaving from a town which matches the physical description of Izbica. He placed the location of this town outside of Belzec. The trains were on the way to Belzec. However, by the time Karski wrote his book he had confused Izbica with Belzec. «Weber probably would not have been aware of this when he wrote his article since this information became known in

1994. However, even a cursory reading of Karski's observations shows how Weber misrepresented them. The title of the chapter from which Weber quoted was "To Die in Agony." In his book, Karski describes a town near Belzec. "The common report was that every Jew who reached it, without exception, [as being] doomed to death." He describes the people on the trains being suffocated because the cars were "bursting with tightly packed human flesh... hideous groans and screams." Shots were fired by the guards. "The occupants of the cars would be literally burned to death. . ." The train would travel to a destination where the Jews would be suffocated.<sup>64</sup> Some of Karski's information was wrong about what happened when the Jews reached their final destination. They were in fact gassed — a form of suffocation. But Karski's account can in no way support the idea that Belzec was a transit camp. He was stating that the Jews were being sent to their death.

Karski had agonized in this account because he thought that no one would believe him about the conditions of the Jewish transports. However, his account is very similar to a report from a member of the Security Police dated September 14, 1942. The report is entitled "Resettlement from Kolomea to Belzec", making it clear that Belzec is the final destination of the Jews and not a "transit camp" as Weber would have us believe. The report states that 8,200 Jews were packed into fifty cars which were boarded up. About 2,000 Jews were already dead on arrival at Belzec from the extreme heat. Guards fired shots to prevent escapes.<sup>65</sup> Here again, as shown in Chapter 5, is independent German documentation supporting an eyewitness account. A Reuters news dispatch of July 9, 1998 reported the uncovering of 33 mass graves and the remains of 15,000 unburned corpses at the Belzec site.

The classic case of omission occurred in an article Weber wrote with a co-author in 1992 on Treblinka. As with Belzec, he pursued the idea that Treblinka was a transit camp. One of the "proofs" he gave is that letters arrived from the deportees to relatives in the Warsaw ghetto. But the sources he cites are Holocaust historians who have written about the well known Nazi technique of having deported Jews write post cards in order to camouflage the true nature of their fate. In a footnote Weber informs us that "Holocaust historians maintain that because none of the 'resettled' Jews from Warsaw survived Treblinka, these letters and post cards therefore are either forgeries or were written under duress."<sup>66</sup> Indeed, Weber himself cannot explain this lack of survival.

However, the main point of the Treblinka article is to show that aerial photographs of the site taken in the Fall of 1944 and discovered in 1989 are inconsistent with a death camp. Weber notes that these photographs "clearly show that fields where Polish farmers planted and cultivated crops were directly adjacent to the camp perimeter."<sup>67</sup> Weber is absolutely correct in this analysis. These photographs, without a doubt, show an area that is totally inconsistent with a death camp. There is only one problem. Treblinka was destroyed in the Fall of 1943 by the Germans, one year before these photographs were taken. The farming area shown in the photos is totally consistent with numerous reports that the Germans built a farm on the former death site.<sup>68</sup> Odilo Globocnik, who implemented the policies which sent the Jews to the camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka, wrote a memo on January 5, 1944 that the installations (i.e. the three camps), for Operation Reinhard "have been completely removed. For the purpose of supervision a small farm, occupied by an expert was developed in each camp."<sup>69</sup> Thus, a seemingly scholarly article which utilized sources in English, German and Polish in 65 footnotes omitted the one key piece of information that invalidated the article's major point. Only someone who already knew the chronology of Treblinka would be aware of the fact that these photos tell us almost nothing about the death camp. At the time they were taken the Germans had already removed much of the evidence of the mass murder.<sup>70</sup>

French denier Robert Faurisson has also shown his ability to mask crucial facts in analyzing events. In an analysis of the Warsaw ghetto uprising of April 1943 he attempts to give the impression that it was

merely a German police action to clear out subversive Jews who had revolted in the ghetto. The Jewish fighters are characterized as terrorists. Himmler is portrayed as simply attempting to quell a riotous situation.<sup>71</sup>

Faurisson's problem is that he presents this revolt in a vacuum. He starts from the time the revolt began in April 1943, and ends with the final suppression of the revolt and deportation of 56,000 Jews. This allowed him to avoid Himmler's "secret" memo of February 16, 1943 which called for the "razing" of the ghetto and the "disappearance from the sight of the living space for 500,000 subhumans."<sup>71a</sup> Nowhere in the article is it mentioned that there were, as noted in Chapter 1, (1) between 445,000 and 500,000 Jews in Warsaw in July 1942; (2) 310,000 had been deported to Treblinka before the revolt and (3) anywhere from 80,000 to 125,000 Jews had already died in the ghetto from the deprivation caused by the German occupiers.

However, Faurisson's most significant omission was to completely distort the reason that Himmler wanted the ghetto cleaned out. It had nothing to do with security reasons. As was noted in Chapter 1, Himmler had issued a general order in July 1942 that the entire Jewish population of Poland's General Government be "resettled" by December 31, 1942.<sup>72</sup> The Warsaw ghetto operation had begun in July 1942. Faurisson's account begins nine months later. The reader of Faurisson's article would never know that the most significant German policies affecting the Warsaw ghetto occurred before the revolt. Faurisson's reason was obvious: if he mentioned anything that happened prior to the revolt, he would also have to explain what happened to all the rest of the people who were no longer in the ghetto. Not surprisingly, Faurisson acknowledged the help of Mark Weber in preparing the article.

## Misinterpretations

One of the problems deniers have is that they will frequently fail to understand — or at least pretend to fail to understand—the information they are presenting. Friedrich Berg, one of the deniers' gas chamber "experts", did this when he wrote an article entitled "Typhus and the Jews." The general thrust of his article was that the Germans had to take preventive measures against the outbreak of typhus in the Warsaw ghetto. Thus, he was attempting to justify their policies.<sup>73</sup>

Berg's problem is that he ignored his own data. He reproduced German figures from World War II showing the decline of typhus in the area of Poland that Germany called the General Government. The figures are for both the Jewish and non-Jewish population from the end of World War I when typhus was a major problem to 1938 when it had ceased to be a problem. However his data shows a sharp increase in 1940 to 7,900 cases in Warsaw, up from 700 cases in 1938, the year before the German invasion.

He failed to recognize that his own German data shows that the dramatic increase began when the Germans occupied Poland in late 1939. As was noted in Chapter I, many Jews died of disease and general deprivation because of policies by the German occupation authority, especially crowding people together and denying them the items needed for cleanliness. Moreover, one German directive stated that Jews were only to receive one half of the normal food allotment. Berg deliberately ignored

the fact that the typhus epidemic was directly linked to the Nazi imposed famine.<sup>74</sup>

Berg should have looked at the data for the Lodz ghetto, which was published in 1971. For the year 1941 there were 11,437 deaths; 22 deaths were from typhus while 2,134 were from starvation.<sup>75</sup> Certainly one of the more interesting cases of misinterpretation was that of Spanish denier Enrique Aynat. In a 1991 article he argued that Auschwitz was not an extermination camp for Jews because a publication by the Polish Government in Exile in London did not identify it as such.<sup>76</sup> He noted that the Polish resistance had contacts at Auschwitz and if mass murder was occurring there, it would have been reported in the Polish Fortnightly Review (PFR), a publication of the exile government. Aynat examined all issues of the PFR from 1940-1945 and found that Auschwitz was not given any prominence as an extermination camp until 1945.

What Aynat did find is rather interesting. The July 1, 1942 issue of PFR reported the use of poison gas on Russian prisoners at Auschwitz. The report also states: "It is estimated that the Oswiecim Camp can accommodate fifteen thousand prisoners. But as they die on a mass scale there is always room for new arrivals." Oswiecim is the Polish name for Auschwitz and is the word used in the PFR anytime the camp was mentioned.

A report in the PFR of October 1, 1943 is the most revealing. It cites reports from Poland stating "that children under the age of 12 sent with the transport to the camp at Oswiecim are not accepted by camp authorities, but are killed on the spot, in special gas chambers installed for the purpose." Apparently, Aynat did not believe that a report stating that all children were murdered upon arrival was the same thing as identifying the place of arrival as an extermination camp. Similarly on November 15, 1941 the PFR stated that there were four groups of prisoners in Auschwitz, the last who were Jews. The report states that the Jews were the worst treated "and no member of the group leaves the camp alive."

Aynat wrote that the PFR had identified the camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka as extermination camps. He noted that the December 1, 1942 issue stated that Jews were taken to these three camps where the "trains are unloaded, the condemned were stripped naked and then killed, probably by poison gas or electrocution." The Chelmno camp was also mentioned as a place where Jews were gassed. On July 15, 1942 the PFR reported on the "[w]holesale extermination of the Jews" and cited an alert by the Polish National Council about "the planned slaughter of practically the whole Jewish population."

Aynat was following a technique which, as will be seen in the next chapter, David Irving utilized. He was willing to "give up" Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka as extermination camps in order to discredit Auschwitz. However, Aynat failed to inform his readers that during the five years that the PFR was published it rarely mentioned the extermination of the Jews. Most of its articles dealt with political and military matters. This is not to say that Polish publications for the period ignored the extermination. There were, in fact, a number of such publications by the Polish resistance and exile government which described the extermination of the Jews,<sup>77</sup> and the issue was certainly not ignored by the PFR. Nevertheless, the primary motive of such publications was to free Poland from German occupation.

Moreover, Aynat's reasoning is flawed. For example, he states that the Armia Krajowa (Home Army), the main resistance organization in Poland which reported to the exile government in London, would have been aware of "any massive extermination of Jews in Auschwitz. . .,"<sup>78</sup> However, the publication of the Armia Krajowa reported in September 1942 on the installation of gas chambers at Auschwitz and three crematoriums which worked around the clock.<sup>79</sup> There were three double muffle furnaces in Auschwitz during this period. It would be difficult to interpret this article as referring to Auschwitz as anything but an extermination camp. In the same year the Armia Krajowa published a brochure on

Auschwitz entitled Death Camp.<sup>80</sup> In November 1942 a situational report from the Polish underground stated that tens of thousands of people, mostly Jews and Soviet prisoners, were transported to Auschwitz "for the sole purpose of their immediate extermination in gas chambers."<sup>81</sup>

Holocaust historian Richard Breitman has examined archival evidence dealing with intelligence reports from within Poland about Auschwitz. Not all of the information is accurate. Reports during wartime tend to vary in quality because of the difficulty in getting information. Nevertheless, the reports clearly show that the Polish authorities were aware that Auschwitz was an extermination camp for Jews. Specifically, Breitman cites (1) a report from the Directorate of Civilian Resistance in Poland on March 23, 1943 that there was a new crematorium in Auschwitz disposing of 3,000 bodies per day, most of whom were Jews.<sup>82</sup> (2) A report on May 18, 1943 from Polish military intelligence in London to Washington, D.C., which was turned over to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It stated that about 640,000 people had been killed at Auschwitz, of whom 520,000 were Jews. The crematoria burned 3,000 bodies per day.<sup>83</sup> (3) A report received by the Polish general staff headquarters in London in January 1944, passed on to the Americans in March, that 468,000 Jews had been gassed at Auschwitz by September 1942.<sup>84</sup> The number, however, was far too high for the period of time it covered. (4) A Polish report reaching the American Consul general in Istanbul referring to the "execution camp at Auschwitz."<sup>85</sup>

On April 11, 1943 the British Broadcasting Corporation broadcast a report on its European Services, in Polish, "about the new barbaric German prosecutions designed to exterminate the Jews." The report discusses Jews who were liquidated. Other Jews were sent "to the concentration camp Oswiecim, which as it is known, has special installations for mass murder, that is gas chambers. . ." <sup>86</sup> This information could have only come from the Polish Government in Exile, which was headquartered in London. This report appears to have been influenced by a report being prepared by a member of the Polish underground who had spent 13 months in Auschwitz. He wrote of the gassing of Jews who were being "exterminated en masse."<sup>87</sup>

In March 1944 American newspapers carried reports by the Polish Government in Exile that the Nazis had built gas chambers and crematoria at "a concentration camp at Oswiecim. . ." which could "dispose of ten thousand bodies a day."<sup>88</sup> The reports may have been the result of a Polish underground newspaper which, one week earlier, reported that 850,000 Jews had been gassed at Auschwitz.<sup>89</sup>

Arthur Butz made arguments similar to Aynat's. He examined a booklet entitled Oswiecim, Camp of Death which was published by a New York based organization called Poland Fights. Butz wrote that Auschwitz was only presented as a death camp, not a place of extermination like Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka.<sup>90</sup> Like Aynat, he did not address why those three camps were labeled as "extermination camps." However, he ignored many key aspects of the report to reach this "conclusion." Although published in February 1944, the information in the report appears to only go up to July 1942. Nevertheless, the report is not as Butz presents it. It states that up to July 1942, 125,000 people were known to have entered the camp and 94,000 of those perished. It then goes on to mention Treblinka and Belzec, identified later on in the report as extermination camps, as being "an inferno equal to that of Oswiecim" Later on it speaks of death by poison gas at Oswiecim in underground cells from which "[n]o one emerges alive from the darkness."<sup>91</sup> Any reasonable reader of this information would reach the obvious conclusion that he was reading about an extermination camp.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

### PART III: IDEOLOGIES

#### CHAPTER 8

DAVID IRVING AND

THEODORE KAUFMAN

The introduction to this book mentioned a report about a book being written that President John F. Kennedy was not killed in Dallas on November 23, 1963. In Chapter 5 it was noted that there were discrepancies among witnesses as to where the shots came from that killed Kennedy. Additionally, it should be noted that the body was not available for public viewing. In fact, very few people actually were allowed to see the body. To this might be added the fact that the President's brain turned up missing from the place where it was being kept. Yes, there are photographs of the shooting. However, photographs can be faked, and even if the photos are real they only show him being shot. Could he have survived ?

Have we now made the case that there is at least reasonable doubt about Kennedy's death? Is there now

another "school of thought" which should be presented by academia and the media? Those who claim Kennedy was killed will be called assassinationists while those who doubt this official story will be called revisionists.

An organization called the Flat Earth Society is on the internet. They truly believe that the world is flat. They see a vast conspiracy over many years by scientists who claim that the earth is round. Such conspiracy themes are quite prevalent in Holocaust denial. Are there now two schools of thought on this issue? Should one be taken as seriously as the

other? Are the flat earthers the revisionists while those who claim a round earth to be called roundists? Deniers claim that there is a debate as to whether the Holocaust occurred. But for historians there is no debate; just as for scientists there is no debate as to whether the earth is round. There are arguments between deniers and denier critics, such as the anti denier internet groups the Holocaust History Project (website, <http://www.holocaust-history.org>) and Nizkor (website, <http://www.nizkor.org/>)

If it would seem absurd to give people equal time who claim President Kennedy was not killed or people who claim the earth is flat, then we need only to look at the claims made by Holocaust denial. Deniers argue that they are a school of thought that should be given the same attention that the other side receives. They have set up a false dichotomy of calling themselves revisionists while the historians are called "exterminationists." However, a revisionist is someone who disputes the interpretation of some historical event, not the occurrence of the event itself. The best example of revisionism in the United States was a movement of some historians and writers, beginning in the late 1950s, to blame the United States, not the Soviet Union, for the Cold War. The movement's ideas have long since been discredited. Nevertheless, these individuals were revisionists in the true sense of the word. If a writer was today to claim that there never was a Cold War and that Soviet-American relations following World War II were, in fact, good enough to the point where the countries were allies pursuing a common goal, then that writer would be a denier.

Revisionist schools of thought are usually able to attract at least some prominent personalities and academics to their cause. The Cold War revisionists were able to find a number of academics on college campuses who gave them credibility in the media and elsewhere. Historian Robert Conquest has shown that in his heyday Stalin had a great many intellectuals and personalities who supported his policies.<sup>1</sup> Even the Khmer Rouge found a staunch defender in the well known American leftist thinker and academic Noam Chomsky, who denied they were guilty of mass murder.<sup>2</sup>

The inability, therefore, of the Holocaust denial movement to attract any major talent from the ranks of academia and the media is in some sense puzzling. When the Journal of Historical Review (JHR) began its publication in 1980, it sent free copies with an introductory letter to a number of history professors on American college campuses. However, the JHR itself admitted that the effort met with no success. There were many hostile letters written by the historians and issues were returned. A number of the historians protested to the Organization of American Historians for releasing their mailing list to the JHR. The Organization of American Historians then decided to issue an apology. This caused the JHR to comment that "the OAH meekly obeyed their spiritual masters, and an apology to the membership [of] the ADL [Anti Defamation League] and to World Jewry and to the little Jewish man in the dry cleaners will be forthcoming..."<sup>3</sup> The attitude of the JHR in this whole episode is probably the best illustration as to why these historians rejected the overtures in the first place.

One would think that there would at least be some sympathetic historians in Germany. After all, in Germany during the Nazi era there were all manner of historians who were willing to fabricate any

number of things about Jews.<sup>4</sup> Yet, even in Germany the deniers have come up flat. They did make a major effort in 1993 to recruit the prominent German historian Ernst Nolte. Getting Nolte into the movement would have indeed been a major coup. However, the JHR reluctantly conceded that Nolte accepted as valid that between five and six million Jews were killed.<sup>5</sup>

Indeed, Nolte had been a prime mover in Germany's "Historians' Controversy" known in German as the Historikerstreit. The debate centered on a range of issues one of which was whether Germany's extermination of the Jews was unique or whether it should be viewed as simply mass murder in the mode of Stalin. The tenor of this debate hardly bodes well for deniers since none of the historians, even those who do not think the Holocaust was unique, have denied it happened. Thus, Nolte wrote:

"... the acts of violence perpetrated by the Third Reich are singular... the extermination of several million European Jews — and also of many Slavs, mentally ill, and Gypsies — is, judged by its motivation and its execution, without precedent. It has aroused an unparalleled sense of horror, particularly because of the cold, inhuman, technical precision of the gas chambers."<sup>6</sup>

This, then, is the real crisis of Holocaust denial. It is not that their arguments lack merit, for there have always been academics who are willing to support meritless arguments. Rather, they have been unable to attract a historian of Nolte's caliber to support their meritless arguments. Thus, when deniers demand equal time to present their case what they are really asking for is the right to be taken seriously. Yet, if no major names in academia take them seriously, why should anyone else? The only right deniers have is to free speech.

David Irving

The breakthrough came, or so it initially appeared, with the British writer David Irving in the late 1980s. Whether Irving is really a historian is a topic which has been subject to debate. Nevertheless, it must in all fairness be stated that Irving is a very skillful writer and prodigious researcher. He carries out his research in archives and the private papers of those he writes about.

It should, however, be kept in mind throughout the discussion about Irving that his own research has indirectly invalidated Holocaust denial. This is because he has never been able to reveal any type of resettlement plan for the Jews under Germany's control. If such a plan had actually existed, Irving would certainly have turned it up in his archival research. Yet, in not one of his writings since his conversion to Holocaust denial in the late 1980s has he ever attempted to explain what actually

happened to Europe's Jews. In fact, Irving does not even write about the Holocaust. He tends to focus on Third Reich personalities and presenting the German side of the war. Thus, the acquisition of Irving has had limited benefits for denial. On the other hand, Irving does have an international reputation, something that all other deniers lack. Therefore, when he questions the Holocaust, he reaches a wider audience.

Irving's journey into denial began in 1977 with the publication of his *Hitler's War*. Prior to this book he had written several books about the war which had been fairly well received. In *Hitler's War* Irving did not deny the Holocaust. Rather, he made the astounding claim that the Holocaust was carried out by Heinrich Himmler, second in command in the Third Reich, behind Hitler's back. Hitler, we are told, did not actually learn of the Holocaust until late 1943. By that time, most of the Jews were dead.

*Hitler's War* was not well received. To put it bluntly, he became something of a laughing stock among historians who specialized in such matters. It was not only his claim about the Holocaust that caused him problems, but the book was marred by a number of other errors. Historian John Lukacs, himself a revisionist (in the pure sense of the word), noted that the book was "appalling. . . [the book] contains hundreds of errors: wrong names, wrong dates, and what is worse, statements about events, including battles, that did not really take place."<sup>7</sup> Historian Walter Laqueur wrote that the reasons for the "book's shortcomings lie deep." The overall result was "a book of value to a few dozen military historians capable of separating new facts from old fiction, of differentiating between fresh documentation material and unsupported claims, distortions and sheer fantasies."<sup>8</sup> The reviewer in the official publication of the American Historical Association wrote that "[t]he key weakness of his book is professional, not polemic. It tends to push every bit of evidence to the limits of credibility, and the Jewish issue is only one example."<sup>9</sup> Historian of the Third Reich Bradley F. Smith (not to be confused with denier Bradley R. Smith) wrote: "Volumes could, and probably will, be written on the ways Irving's vision distorts every conceivable aspect of World War II..."<sup>10</sup> Two in-depth and devastating critiques were written by German historian Martin Broszat<sup>11</sup> and historian of the Third Reich Charles Sydnor.<sup>12</sup>

Irving's primary evidence that Hitler did not order the extermination of the Jews, and indeed sought to prevent it, was a handwritten entry in Himmler's telephone log. The version of the entry that Irving presents is: "Transport of Jews from Berlin, No Liquidation."<sup>13</sup> Commentators have observed the obvious: that this order only refers to one particular transport, and not a general order against liquidation. However, read in

its full context the reason Hitler did not want this particular transport liquidated is because he believed that the Soviet Foreign Minister's son was on the train. The full notation reads: "Arrest Dr. Jekelius. Presumably Molotov's son. Transport of Jews from Berlin. No Liquidation."<sup>14</sup>

The major problem, as noted by a number of critics, was that Irving had disproved his own thesis. How could Hitler not have known of the extermination of the Jews if he gave an order not to liquidate this particular transport? To give such an order, he would have had to know that such a transport was scheduled for liquidation in the first place.<sup>15</sup> Even German Historian Ernst Nolte, who, as will be seen, defended Irving on some points, wrote that "this was the weakest part of the book. The telegram, when examined more precisely, says just the opposite of what Irving suggested."<sup>16</sup>

How then could Irving have possibly interpreted a telegram that confirms Hitler's knowledge of the extermination program as showing lack of knowledge? Probably the most trenchant observation about Irving's overall problem was made by historian John Lukacs who wrote that Irving's "errors, however,

are not the result of inadequate research. . .They are the result of the dominant tendency in the author's mind."<sup>17</sup> The tendency in Irving's mind has been for more than 20 years to absolve Hitler from his crimes.

One of Irving's major arguments was that no written order was ever found from Hitler ordering the extermination of the Jews. He concluded that this meant no order was given. Charles Sydnor has noted that the nature of Hitler's power in relation to the antecedents of the extermination program "made written instructions to murder the Jews of Europe unnecessary."<sup>18</sup>

Moreover, as was noted in Chapter I, the commissioner for Reich Defense had ordered the destruction of "secret files about installations and deterring work in concentration camps" and "the extermination of some families, etc" The destruction was ordered because "they were secret orders by the Fuhrer".<sup>19</sup>

Irving appears to have overlooked the fact that assuming such a written order ever existed, it was most likely destroyed before Germany fell to the Allies. One of Irving's reviewers noted that "[t]he most credible explanation is surely that this was a real coverup of which the hapless Irving is himself the victim".<sup>20</sup>

In order to pin the blame for the extermination on Himmler, as opposed to Hitler, Irving had to ignore a great deal of evidence. His task was made more difficult by the fact that he was arguing that Hitler did not discover that the Jews were being exterminated until 1944. A key piece of evidence tying Hitler to the extermination was Himmler's memo to Hitler dated December 1942 cited earlier in Chapter 2. The memo listed under "Jews executed" a total of 363,211 while 23,000 others are listed as killed for a four month period in the Soviet Union in 1942. The receipt of this memo is initialed by Hitler's adjutant as being received on December 31, 1942.<sup>21</sup> Irving briefly mentioned this memo in Hitler's War without attempting to reconcile it with his claim of Hitler's ignorance of genocide.<sup>22</sup> The reason is obvious: the memo represents a report by a subordinate who is carrying out his boss's orders, and is keeping his boss informed as to the implementation of his policies. Further evidence of Hitler's direct knowledge of these events is a radio dispatch by Gestapo Chief Heinrich Muller which states: "From here on current reports on the work of the Einsatzgruppen will be forwarded to the Fuhrer."<sup>23</sup>

More information has now become available as the result of captured German documents discovered in the recently opened Soviet archives. A notation by Himmler dated December 18, 1941, following a meeting with Hitler, states: "The Jewish question/ to be exterminated as partisans."<sup>24</sup>

Hitler had made a number of references to the extermination of Jews from 1941 to 1943, all of which were ignored by Irving because they invalidate his thesis.<sup>25</sup> On October 21, 1941 Hitler declared: "When we exterminate this plague, we shall perform a deed for mankind. . .". On January 1, 1942 he stated: "The Jew will not exterminate the people of Europe; he will be the victim of his own machinations instead." On January 25 he stated: "The Jew has got to get out of Europe... I can see only one way — absolute extermination if they don't go voluntarily." Yet, Germany had halted Jewish emigration from territories it occupied several months earlier. On January 30, 1942 he announced that "this war will not end as the Jews imagine it, namely with the extermination of the European peoples, but that the result will be the destruction of Jewry." On February 24, 1942 he stated "that this war will not destroy Aryan humanity but it will exterminate the Jew."

On September 30, 1942 Hitler referred to an earlier speech where he threatened the Jews with extermination if they started a new world war. He announced that "I shall be proved right with these prophecies as well." He made reference to the same speech about exterminating Jews on November 8,

1942. He then stated: "People always laughed about me as a prophet... innumerable numbers no longer laugh today...". On February 24, 1943 he once again returned to this theme: "The struggle will end not with the destruction of Aryan mankind but with the extermination of Jewry in Europe..."

In his final conversation recorded by his secretary on April 2, 1945 Hitler stated that "National Socialism will earn eternal gratitude for exterminating the Jews in Germany and Central Europe."<sup>26</sup> [die Juden aus Deutschland und Mitteleuropa ausgerottet habe]. This is as close to a death bed confession as one can come.

Irving's defense of Hitler probably reached its zenith in 1983 at a conference of Holocaust deniers. He was not himself a denier at this time. He told his audience that "I'm not going to go into the controversy here about the actual going-on inside Auschwitz, or the other extermination camps or concentration camps."<sup>27</sup> However, he also repeated the false claim made in Hitler's War that Hitler forbade the murder of the Jews. On this basis Irving made perhaps the most astounding claim in his controversial career.

"The evidence all goes to support my theory that probably the biggest friend the Jews had in the Third Reich, certainly when the war broke out, was Adolf Hitler. He was the one who was doing everything he could to prevent things nasty happening to them."<sup>28</sup>

The reader of these lines with any knowledge of twentieth century history would, no doubt, greet such a statement with stunned silence. Such a statement might even leave his most severe critics speechless. Irving has been careful not to repeat this "theory" in his books. Nevertheless, Irving continued to cite this alleged order against liquidating the Jews. In an introduction to the 1991 edition of Hitler's War, he criticized his German publisher for omitting the reference to Hitler's order not to liquidate this particular convoy of Jews. "Thus history is falsified."<sup>29</sup> Irving still had not answered his critics that this so-called order actually proved that Hitler knew of the extermination program. He may have believed that as the senior statesman, so to speak, of Hitler apologists he should remain above the fray.

In 1988 Irving's publishing company published The Leuchter Report, examined in Chapter 9, which claimed that there were no homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz. In his 1989 biography of Goring he wrote that deported Jews were being brutally disposed of on arrival at their destination. However, he also stated that there was no evidence that these killings were systematic. Any massacres were of an ad hoc nature being carried out by local Nazis.<sup>30</sup> He said nothing of the Einsatzgruppen and Security Police operations in the Soviet Union. Irving was now a denier.

However, this new line was in direct contradiction to Hitler's War. There he blamed Himmler for the extermination, thus acknowledging that there was an organized plan for the genocide but that Hitler did not know about it. Specifically, he focused on Himmler's Posen speech of October 4, 1943 where he spoke to officers about the "extermination" of the Jews and his speech of two days later where he discussed the killing of women and children. Irving describes Himmler's goal in these two speeches as follows: "by the end of 1943 the last Jews in occupied Europe would have been physically exterminated."<sup>31</sup>

It was at this point that Irving made an observation, overlooked by his critics, which shows that Hitler's

War is not totally bereft of value. Irving discovered that Himmler kept a list of those who had not attended the speech. Irving believed that this list indicates that Himmler wanted to ensure that the SS generals and others would be "accessories after the fact" so that they would not be able to deny knowledge of the extermination program.<sup>32</sup>

Irving's interpretation is interesting but falls short on two points. First, he assumes that these individuals were not aware of the policy. Second, the more likely reason Himmler wanted the generals and others there is because of that part of the speech in which he states that the property taken from the dead Jews must be used for the war effort, and not to enrich individuals. Looting was a serious problem at the time. Himmler made this point right after talking about the extermination of the Jews.<sup>33</sup>

### Irving on Eichmann

In his hunt for private papers and archival materials, Irving obtained a copy of memoirs written by Adolf Eichmann before he was captured by the Israelis and put on trial. Eichmann was head of the Gestapo's Jewish Office and was involved in transporting Jews to death camps. He was one of the most sought after escaped Nazis. Irving believes that these memoirs represent a truthful account of Eichmann's activities since they could not have been written under pressure from the Israelis. He also believes that these memoirs tend to show that there were no homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. However, just as the Himmler memo, cited earlier, actually showed that Hitler knew of the Holocaust - the opposite of what Irving claimed — so do these memoirs actually disprove what Irving thinks of them.

One of Irving's problems is that he does not appear to have read the transcript of Eichmann's interrogation by the Israeli police. The significance of the memoirs is that, with some exceptions, they confirm that he was consistent in his pre-capture and post-capture accounts of what happened. Irving's account appeared in a denier publication.

In these memoirs Eichmann writes that in July, 1941 he was summoned to Berlin by Reinhard Heydrich, the chief of the Reich Security Main Office until his assassination in 1942. Heydrich is known to have been one of Hitler's favorites and was just underneath Himmler in authority. Operation Reinhard, the rounding up and extermination of Poland's Jews, was named in his honor.

Eichmann states in these memoirs that Heydrich told him: "I've come from the Reichsführer SS [Himmler]. The Führer has given the order for the physical destruction [physischen Vernichtung] of the Jews."<sup>34</sup> This is also exactly what Eichmann told the Israelis.<sup>35</sup>

Here Irving is faced with a substantial proof that not only did Hitler know about the Holocaust but that he in fact ordered it to happen. Since Eichmann wrote this before his capture, Irving needed to resort to the denier method of making somebody say something other than what they actually did. It is here that Irving offers an explanation based on fantasy and wishful thinking — one that shows the reason he has

become marginalized in the World War II historical community. Irving writes:

"I've always said "Hitler wasn't involved... Hitler gave no orders, there's no proof of it." Here we have Eichmann writing something very specific indeed. What is the explanation?

"Well if we look just at that sentence, we can say that you've only got to change one or two words and you get a completely different meaning. If it wasn't "the Fuhrer has ordered the physische Vernichtung [physical destruction] of the Jews but "die Aussrottung des Judentums," the destruction of Judaism, is something totally different. You don't do that by gas chambers and machine guns..."

First, Irving is trying to change the meaning of the word aussrottung, which means extermination. This will be examined in the next part of the chapter. However, even if we are to accept Irving's misrepresentation of the word aussrottung, Eichmann clearly states "physical destruction" and uses the word vernichtung. Irving also tried to fall back on his old argument that there is no written order by Hitler to exterminate the Jews, thus trying to discredit Eichmann. However, Eichmann says nothing about a written order in his account.

Irving then goes on to cite Eichmann as witnessing mass shootings. "I saw myself mass shootings going on..." However, Irving also writes that Eichmann does not say anything about gas chambers when he visited Auschwitz. Irving believes that this discredits the idea that there were homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Irving states, in this connection, that Eichmann acknowledges "going past an open pit where bodies are being burned, and he says it was an infernal sight, the like of which he will never forget. Eichmann describes how the [Auschwitz] commandant Hoess, tells him that they are doing these things on Himmler's orders and that it is a sacred task that has been imposed on the SS." Irving argues that having admitted to the above in his memoirs, Eichmann would surely have mentioned gas chambers had they existed. Had Irving read the transcript of Eichmann's Israeli police interrogation, he would realize that, once again, Eichmann is being consistent because he specifically states that he did not want to see any gas chambers at Auschwitz. Eichmann told the Israelis:

"I don't know my way around Auschwitz. . . As we [Eichmann and Hoess] were driving, I saw some big buildings. Almost like factories. Enormous chimneys. Hoess says to me: "Working to capacity! Ten thousand!" A job was under way. They were separating the able bodied from the ones who were supposedly unfit for work. I didn't watch the gassing. I couldn't. I'd have probably keeled over... But then he drives me to a big trench. It was very big, I can't say how exactly big, maybe a hundred meters long. . . And there's an enormous grating, an iron grating. And corpses were burning on it. Then I got sick to my stomach."36

Eichmann's memoirs, which are similar to his testimony about burning pits he witnessed, once again confirm the existence of this method of body disposal.

However, Irving then made an astounding admission — a first for a Holocaust denier. He cited the memoirs as showing Eichmann going to a location several weeks after witnessing the shootings in Minsk. While on a bus, Eichmann was told by the driver "to look through a peep hole in the back of the bus where he saw a number of prisoners being gassed by exhaust fumes." Eichmann was probably describing the gassing vans which roamed the occupied Soviet territory. Irving sought to put the right spin on this admission by saying he accepts "that this kind of experiment was made on a very limited scale... " In other words, of all the days, times and places Eichmann just happens to be in a place at a time where an "experimental" gassing is occurring!

Eichmann's admission in his memoirs to witnessing a gassing is important because he told the Israelis that "[n]either in Auschwitz nor anywhere else did I observe the extermination process," except in Minsk.<sup>37</sup> He did tell the Israelis that while he was in Treblinka he saw that "a file of naked Jews was being driven into a... one room structure, to be gassed."<sup>38</sup> However, he did not say that he physically witnessed the gassing.

Irving no doubt believed that by Eichmann admitting to witnessing a gassing, though not at Auschwitz, the argument could be made that no gassings took place at Auschwitz. Thus, Irving "gave up" gassing at one place (the bus) to discredit it at another place (Auschwitz). Only a Holocaust denier could think like this. Since Eichmann's memoirs mention the open pits where bodies were being burned, where did Irving think these bodies were coming from? Especially since Eichmann admits that Hoess says he is doing these things on Himmler's orders.

Irving believes that "Eichmann's comments on the Hoess memoirs are annihilating." In his memoirs Hoess wrote that Eichmann had told him that 2-1/2 million Jews were killed at Auschwitz and that they discussed a suitable gas to be used for the killing.<sup>39</sup> It will be recalled that Hoess stated that only 1.1 million were killed, thus contradicting Eichmann. However, Eichmann writes: "Where does Hoess believe that he got these two and a half million Jews? Not from me, from the transport point of view alone this would have been totally impossible." Additionally, Irving states that someone showed him Eichmann's copy of Hoess's memoirs. Eichmann makes a note about one of Hoess's comments: "That is a lying distortion of the facts." Eichmann also writes on his copy of the memoirs that he never was alone with Hoess.<sup>40</sup> Unfortunately, Irving does not tell us what Eichmann considered to be a "distortion of facts." However, when the Israeli police quoted to him that portion of Hoess's memoirs which states that they discussed the type of gas to be used, Eichmann said: "The overwhelming majority of these assertions are pure invention. It is obvious to me that he [Hoess] was interested in only one thing: clearing his own department. . . he is trying to clear the technical sections of the SS Administration and Supply Headquarters..."<sup>41</sup> Thus, once again Eichmann's testimony is in accord with his memoirs.

Irving's real problem with the Eichmann memoirs is that he does not understand the significance of what he is reading. Like most Holocaust deniers, Irving has managed to brainwash himself into believing that these memoirs are something other than what they really are. Eichmann was one of the world's most wanted war criminals in the 1950s. He wrote these memoirs while hiding in Argentina. He had a chance to set the record "straight." He certainly was aware of the charges against him and he had read Hoess's account. Yet, nowhere in Eichmann's memoirs is Irving able to cite any denial of the overall truth of Nazi gas chambers and genocide. This should have alerted Irving to the real significance of what he was reading. In fact, Irving knew full well that Eichmann had confirmed in these memoirs the truth of the charges which had been brought against him for implementing genocide. The full context of the portion of these memoirs which mentions the order from Hitler as relayed by

Heydrich to exterminate the Jews confirms this. Eichmann wrote, and Irving ignored, the following:

"... [A]t the turn of the year 1941/1942 , the chief of the Security Police and SD Heydrich told me... 'I come from the Reichsfuhrer [Himmler]; the Fuhrer has now ordered the physical extermination of the Jews.' He informed me further that the Reichsfuhrer had instructed Globocnik, the SS and Police leader in Lublin [ who had overall authority to implement Operation Reinhard, the murder of Poland's Jews] to use the Soviet antitank ditches for the mass annihilation of the Jews. I myself should travel there and submit to him a report about the implementation of the operation... I traveled in the direction of Lublin; I don't know what the place is called. A [captain] accompanied me. I met there a [Captain] of the Order Police [Wirth]. I expressed astonishment that the small house, completely secluded, was built, and he told me: 'Here the Jews are being gassed now'."41a

Irving notes that in these memoirs Eichmann "does regard himself, however, rather ruefully, as being an accomplice to murder, because he helped round up the Jews who were shipped off to a fate that he could only surmise."<sup>42</sup> Irving's use of the word "surmise" is rather disingenuous because he is attempting to show that Eichmann really may not have known the fate of the deportees. It should have been obvious to Irving that Eichmann was doing what most Nazi war criminals did: trying to distance himself as far away from responsibility as possible. Thus, we find both Eichmann and Hoess blaming each other.

In fact, Irving knew the full extent of Eichmann's participation in the gassings. In Hitler's War, before he became a denier, he mentioned a letter dated October 25, 1941 which showed that Eichmann approved of

a "proposal that these [Jews] arriving at Riga [in Latvia] should be killed by mobile gas trucks."<sup>42a</sup> The letter is from the Advisor for Jewish Affairs with the Reich Ministry for Occupied Eastern Territories to the

Reich Commissioner in Riga. It discusses a proposal by Victor Brack, a euthanasia expert. The memo is entitled "The Solution to the Jewish Question."

"Brack has stated his readiness to assist in the necessary accommodations] and gassing apparatuses [vergasungsapparate] . . . Brack's view is that, since construction of the apparatuses within the Reich would present far greater difficulties than onsite production, the most expedient form of action is to send his people directly to Riga in particular his chemist... I might further point out that [Major] Eichmann, the Advisor on Jewish Affairs in the Reich Main Security Office, is in complete accord with this procedure... Jews who are not fit for work can be eliminated without qualms through use of the Brack device... "42b

Irving had come quite a long way since 1977. In Hitler's War he admitted that the Hungarian Jews were being sent to Auschwitz.<sup>43</sup> However, he was now claiming that Eichmann was sending the Hungarian

Jews to Germany.<sup>44</sup> However, Irving did not cite Eichmann himself as writing this. Recall that in Chapter 3 of this study it was shown that the Hungarian Jewish deportees from May to July 1944 could not possibly have been in Germany.

### Irving on Ausrotten

As was noted in the prior discussion of the Eichmann memoirs, Irving had attempted to state that the German word *ausrotten* does not mean extermination or destruction. Why? This is a word that Hitler frequently used in speeches about Jews and therefore Irving has launched a one man campaign to have this word mean something other than what it is. Irving, who is fluent in German and writes in the language, appears to be the only German speaking writer on World War II who has trouble understanding the word.

In Hitler's War he tried to sanitize the word when it involved Hitler and the Jews. Thus, there is a record of Hitler's chief race ideologist, Alfred Rosenberg, discussing a speech the Fuhrer is about to give on December 14, 1941. Rosenberg tells Hitler, according to Irving: "I took to view that I shouldn't mention the stamping out of Judaism."<sup>45</sup> The original German states "*Ausrottung des Judentums*," extermination of Jewry. Charles Sydnor, a historian of the Third Reich, has noted that Irving's translation "simply does not convey the accurate use and meaning" of these words. Sydnor noted that when translating the noun *ausrottung* or verb *ausrotten* when dealing with Himmler, Irving stated that it meant to exterminate. For example, the memo by Himmler's adjutant in March 1943 reporting "on the accelerated extermination [*Ausrottung*] of the Jews in Occupied Europe" and Himmler's use of the word in his famous Posen speech of October 4, 1943 where spoke of "extermination" of the Jews. In both of these instances Irving had translated *ausrottung* as meaning extermination.<sup>46</sup>

In Hitler's War Irving claimed that Hitler did not learn of the extermination until 1944. At the point where Irving had already conceded that Hitler knew about the extermination, he was willing to cite *ausrottung* in its proper sense. Thus, in his speech of May 26, 1944 Hitler refers to an earlier speech where he states: "the Jews had as their program the extirpation [*Ausrottung*] of the German people. . . if Jewry really tries that, then the one that will be extirpated is Jewry itself."<sup>47</sup> A 1941 handbill distributed by the Propaganda Ministry uses *ausrotten* when describing what the Jews had in mind for Germany.<sup>48</sup>

Earlier in this chapter a number of Hitler's speeches were quoted where he openly boasted about the extermination of the Jews. These speeches make reference to the first speech where he made the threat. Hitler sometimes erroneously refers to his prophecy about the Jews as occurring in September 1939. In fact, the first speech threatening extermination was made on January 30, 1939. He states that if the Jews plunge the world once again into a world war "the result will not be the Bolshevization of the earth. . .but the extermination of the Jewish race in Europe."<sup>49</sup> In this speech he used the word "*Vernichtung*" as extermination. This caused Irving more than a little problem, since elsewhere he is willing to admit the true meaning of *Vernichtung*. Thus, while addressing a conference of Holocaust

deniers he once again used his *ausrottung* argument and stated that on January 30, 1939 Hitler said that if Jewry "succeeds once again in starting a world war, then it will end with the "ausrottung of the Jews from Europe." However, Irving then went on to parenthetically note "which I think are the words he used."<sup>50</sup> In fact, Irving knows better. Hitler spoke of the "die Vernichtung der juedischen Rasse," (extermination of the Jewish race), not ousting the Jews from Europe.

The Langenscheidt New Muret-Sanders Encyclopedia Dictionary of German-English defines *ausrotten* as to uproot, exterminate, wipe out, extirpate. Similar definitions of extermination are given in the Schoffler-Weis German-English Dictionary and Harrap's Standard German and English Dictionary.<sup>51</sup> Wahrig's Deutsches Worterbuch, the dictionary native German speakers use, gives one of the definitions for the verb *ausrotten* as *vernichten* and for the verb *vernichten* a definition of *ausrotten*.<sup>52</sup>

Yet, despite his own use of *Ausrottung* as meaning extermination in Hitler's War, he assured his audience that "[e]ven modern Germans don't understand what these words meant then. And I have tried to din it into the heads of the German historians that the word *ausrottung* did not mean then what it means now..."<sup>53</sup> Thus, according to Irving, even German historians are as ignorant as other native German speakers as to their own language. He offered no proof for any of these speculations.

Where did Irving get the inspiration to argue that the word meant something different then than now? Unnoticed in this whole fiasco is that Irving's rationalizations are nearly identical to those of war criminal Julius Streicher, whose newspaper *Der Sturmer* constantly called for the extermination of the Jews. However, Streicher was using the word *vernichten*. He was shown a copy of his newspaper where the word "vernichtet" was used and was told "that means to annihilate." Streicher's response was: "Today, when you look back, you could interpret it like that, but not at that time."<sup>54</sup> Thus, Irving used the same rationale to sanitize *ausrottung* that Streicher used to sanitize *vernichtung*. Therefore, accepting Streicher and Irving together means that there was no German word which meant extermination during World War II.

## Irving On Goebbels

Joseph Goebbels was Nazi Germany's Minister of Propaganda from 1933-1945. He was a hate monger who is one of the most despised individuals of the Twentieth Century. Not only did he constantly agitate for the extermination of the Jews, but his last act before committing suicide was to have his six children murdered — an act totally consistent with his character.

Irving's biography of Goebbels received international attention. The original American publisher for the book withdrew from the deal. The story received wide coverage. Even the NBC Nightly News and other prominent American media outlets covered the story. Yet, despite wide coverage, the book itself has not received the attention in academia that Hitler's War did. Of the publications which did review the book, most were unfavorable. Perhaps the World War II academic community is tiring of Irving.

Because Irving is a very skillful writer, he is capable of portraying even a despicable character like Goebbels in a sympathetic manner. For example, Goebbels had a handicap which often caused him pain. However, it must in fairness be said that Irving's biography of Goebbels is not an apologia or even sympathetic. Unlike denier Mark Weber, who views Goebbels favorably,<sup>55</sup> Irving's view appears to be consistent with others who have written about him.

The problem with Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich is that the main character of the book is inextricably linked with Hitler, and Irving does not want to implicate Hitler with the anti-Jewish hate which characterized the Nazi Party from 1919-1945. Also, when he wrote Hitler's War Irving was a Hitler apologist but not a Holocaust denier. Irving is now a Holocaust denier. Therefore, he must attempt to present information about Goebbels in a manner which will not implicate Nazi Germany in genocide.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that Irving does not deny the Holocaust in Goebbels. In fact, he does not do so directly in any of his books. He does not even deny the existence of gas chambers. He merely avoids the issue in his books. He did question their existence in his Eichmann article. However, this article appeared in a denier journal. This shows that Irving is more careful when writing for the general public. Irving has not been totally consistent in radio interviews. In 1995 he told an interviewer that about four million died in concentration camps from "barbarity" and diseases. However, in a subsequent interview he lowered the number to one million.<sup>56</sup>

Irving usually threatens to sue anyone who calls him a Holocaust denier. However, the Holocaust denying Journal of Historical Review, which has published many articles written by Irving and promotes his books, flatly stated in 1998 that Irving "does not believe in the six million story or in the gas chambers."<sup>57</sup>

Irving does not want to face the implication of some of his research in Goebbels. It is clear that Hitler's anti-Semitism pre-dated Goebbels'. Irving does not mention this. However, we know that Hitler's anti-Semitism dates from at least 1919. Goebbels was not anti-Semitic at this time and he even had a romantic interest in a half-Jewish woman. It is clear from Irving's account that Goebbels' rising anti-Semitism was influenced primarily by Hitler. However, Irving refuses to say this directly.

The first one-fourth of the book chronicles Goebbels' development as a Nazi propagandist and Jew - baiter up until the time that the National Socialists seized power in 1933. It is Irving's description of the events in March 1933 which is probably what caused much of the brouhaha. This discussion takes place on page 163. It is the description of a boycott undertaken by some foreign Jews of the new Nazi government. Irving then reproduces the now famous headline from London's Daily Express of March 24, 1933: "Judea Declares War on Germany." He states that a boycott of German Jewish businesses called by the new Nazi government in late March was triggered by the world Jewish boycott. According to Irving, the reason for "the international Jewish boycott of German goods" was because of "atrocities reports from Berlin" about the treatment of Jews. He goes on to cite atrocity reports, which were false, as triggering this "international Jewish boycott."

Irving's presentation of these events needs to be addressed because he has not only quite literally ignored everything which led up to the events of March 1933, but he has also grossly misrepresented the Jewish response to Hitler. Irving's discussion of Goebbels' rise as an anti-Semite in the 1920s is not placed within the context of the Nazi movement's overall attitude toward Jews and especially Hitler's uncompromising anti-Semitism. Thus, Irving presents March 1933 in a vacuum. His approach is quite typical of Holocaust deniers who seek to blame the Jews for the anti-Jewish attitudes of the Nazis.

However, that Irving knew the real truth is shown by a book he wrote before he was a denier, but still a Hitler apologist. There he wrote about Samuel Untermyer's World Jewish Economic Federation: "Hitting back at the Nazis' mindless anti-Jewish boycott, in 1933 his World Jewish Economic Federation had organized a trade boycott of Germany."<sup>58</sup> Irving shows here that he knows the true sequence of events.

Hitler's and the Nazis' views of the Jews was uncompromising right from the beginning in 1919. In that year Hitler wrote a letter in which he urged "rational anti-Semitism" as the "ultimate goal" which "must unalterably be the elimination of the Jews altogether."<sup>59</sup> A pamphlet published by the Nazi Party in 1920 stated that measures must be taken "to sweep away.. Jewish vermin in general with an iron broom."<sup>60</sup> The official program of the National Socialist Germany Workers Party (Nazis) published in 1923 could not have been more explicit. The fourth of the 25 theses states that "[o]nly he who is of German blood can be a folk comrade. No Jew, therefore, can be a folk comrade."<sup>61</sup> In other words, no Jew could be a citizen in a Nazi state.

In 1924 came one of the primary works upon which Nazi ideology was forged: Alfred Rosenberg's *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion and Jewish World Policy*.<sup>62</sup> Rosenberg, who would later become Nazi Germany's chief racial ideologist, described the Jewish desire to dominate the world and deceive the nations.

In 1924 Hitler published *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle) in which he blamed the Jews for most of the world's misfortunes. The Jews were responsible for communism and capitalism. They defiled races and plotted against humanity. The Jew had to be resisted and dealt with at all costs. *Mein Kampf* is the most important Nazi statement on its Jewish policy since it was written by the man who led Nazism from 1919 to 1945.

There were other important statements. In 1926 Himmler wrote a tract entitled *Farmer, Wake Up* in which he blamed the Jews for farm problems.<sup>63</sup> In 1929 came the "Fourteen Theses of the German Revolution" which stated that the revolution must fight against racial degeneration. "This fight applies particularly to the Jews. . ." <sup>64</sup> British historian Simon Taylor has found a whole series of Nazi leaflets and posters dated 1919 to 1933 filled with this type of anti-Semitic propaganda.<sup>65</sup> These were also accompanied by acts of violence. Even Irving cites a Nazi "orgy of destruction" of Jewish owned stores in West Berlin in 1930 and attacks on Jews by Nazis in 1931.<sup>66</sup>

The Nazis had also targeted Jewish owned stores. Irving notes that Nazis were shaking down Jewish stores for protection money.<sup>67</sup> Jews owned most of the large department stores in Germany. Four of the five largest department stores were either owned by Jews or had Jews among their largest stockholders.<sup>68</sup> Jewish department stores had been consistently singled out by Nazi propaganda since the 1920s.<sup>69</sup> A similar situation existed in Austria. From 1930 to 1932 Austrian Nazis had been calling for a boycott of Jewish businesses.<sup>70</sup>

As the Nazis grew in power and influence throughout 1932, so did their anti-Jewish agitation. Nazi led anti-Jewish riots in February led to the jailing of 20 Nazis.<sup>71</sup> The University of Berlin was threatened with closure by Nazis unless it banned Jewish students.<sup>72</sup> The official Nazi newspaper advised all Jews to emigrate and announced that Germany would be free of the "Jewish Plague."<sup>73</sup> During 1932 the Central Organization for German Citizens of Jewish Faith prevailed in 200 lawsuits attempting to lift Nazi boycotts.<sup>74</sup>

March 1933 was critical because the Nazis seized control of the government. The Nazis attacked the

Central Organization for German Citizens of the Jewish Faith and its headquarters were sacked.<sup>75</sup> Goebbels wrote in an official Nazi organ: "Our Hatred of Jews is no passing fancy but rather the logical consequence of our love for the German people."<sup>76</sup> On March 8 pickets were posted in front of Jewish shops warning people to stay away.<sup>77</sup> At the same time all Jewish owned shops were forced to close in Duisburg and other towns in the Ruhr area.<sup>78</sup> All Jewish merchants in Annaberg were arrested by Nazis.<sup>79</sup> During the second week of March, Nazi Stormtroopers supported a militant organization's boycott of Jewish businesses.<sup>80</sup> The reporter for the Chicago Tribune reported that on March 9 and 10 bands of Nazis "carried out wholesale raids to inundate the opposition, particularly the Jews. . . Men and women [were attacked]. . . Never have I seen law abiding citizens living in such unholy fear."<sup>81</sup>

The government response to the escalation of violence and boycotts was given by Goring, who controlled the Prussian police. On March 10 he stated: "I am unwilling to accept the notion that the police are a protection squad for Jewish shops. No, the police . . . are not here to protect Jewish profiteers."<sup>82</sup> Goring's green light to the rioters and boycott promoters was unmistakable. On March 11 the SS leader in the city of Braunschweig ordered his men to break into Jewish warehouses and do all the damage they possibly could. Two days later, in Breslau, Stormtroopers prevented Jewish lawyers and judges from entering the courts. From March 15 "onwards the Polish consul in Leipzig was obliged to intervene almost daily, as even Jews who were Polish citizens were being subjected to ill treatment."<sup>83</sup>

March 14 was a significant day. The League of National Socialist Lawyers called for a purge of "all Jews" from the courts.<sup>84</sup> At about the same time Jews from law courts, government and local colleges began to be weeded out.<sup>85</sup> On the same day the American Consulate General in Germany reported attacks on American Jews in Germany.<sup>86</sup> It is now known that on March 14 America's ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd, sent a "strictly confidential letter" to a friend in Washington advocating a boycott of German goods. He stated that America should not make the same mistake as German Jews who had "naively trusted the intelligence of the German people" and not fought the Nazis.<sup>87</sup> Although it was not known at the time, Dodd's letter appears to be the first reference to a boycott of German goods. The American government never adopted a boycott policy.

On March 21 Goring stated: "it is true that the [Jewish] department stores were attacked. I am certainly opposed to force being used... but I do not see why it should not be permissible to warn people against buying in Jewish department stores."<sup>88</sup>

It is against this background of escalating violence and boycott that Jews began to hold protest rallies. Many Jews began to call for a boycott against German goods. However, Jewish leaders in Britain and the United States refused to endorse a boycott. Harold Laski, president of Britain's Jewish Board of Deputies, stated that "[t]he leaders are hanging back."<sup>89</sup> In a speech delivered to the Board, Laski stated that "[t]he Germans had the right to choose their own form of government and to conduct the administration of their state in accordance with their own political views," but that anti-Jewish actions were not acceptable. As for the boycott: "The Board of Deputies are taking no part in it."<sup>90</sup> Similarly, no official boycott sanction was given by the American Jewish Congress.<sup>91</sup> On March 27 the German government called for a one day boycott of German Jewish businesses to take place on April 1. Nevertheless, on the following day The Times of London reported that the American Jewish Congress did not advise a boycott of German goods.<sup>92</sup>

These are the events which led to the now famous "Judea Declares War on Germany" in the Daily Express. Nevertheless, the actual article, which Irving ignored, was unable to cite any official pronouncements from Jewish leaders calling for a boycott much less a declaration of war. What the

article did say is that Jews would "stand by the 600,000 Jews of Germany who are terrorized by Hitlerite anti-Semitism and to compel Fascist Germany to end its campaign of violence and suppression against the Jewish minority." The Daily Express, moreover, was not published by Jews. The paper was run by Lord Beaverbrook who used sensationalist headlines "to denounce his pet peeves and promote his pet causes." During the early years of the Hitler regime Beaverbrook feared that the Jews "may drive us into war."<sup>93</sup>

This headline has been promoted by deniers and neo-Nazis for years, and obviously Irving took it very seriously. He even reproduced what appeared to be the front page of the Daily Express on page 164 of his Goebbels biography. There was only one problem. The page he reproduced is not the actual page. The actual front page of the Daily Express for March 24, 1933 shows a large picture of a contrite and sullen Hitler with his hands folded standing before four rabbinical judges right under the headline. Not even deniers, for all of their far fetched claims, allege that such a thing actually happened. The page that Irving reproduces omits this picture. The real significance of this is that no one who actually saw the headline at the time could possibly have taken it seriously since the picture of Hitler standing before these rabbinical judges was a complete fabrication.<sup>94</sup>

Following the German boycott another significant event occurred. Late in 1933 a report by the Interior Ministry of the city of Wurtemberg offered four possible solutions to the Jewish problem. One of the solutions was physical extermination (physische ausrottung). Although this solution was rejected, it has been noted "that a killing mentality was already present even at that early stage of the Third Reich."<sup>95</sup> In 1933 laws were passed which were designed to oust Jews from professions and revoke the citizenship of Jews who had entered Germany since 1918. Irving ignores these laws. In September 1935 Germany passed a set of anti-Jewish race laws known as "The Nuremberg Laws." Irving's 721 page book devotes all of one paragraph to these laws by merely mentioning that they circumscribed the rights of Jews and half Jews. Moreover, he gives the wrong date.<sup>96</sup>

In his treatment of the anti-Jewish riots in 1938 known as "Kristallnacht", Night of the Broken Glass, Irving is quite willing to lay the blame on Goebbels.<sup>97</sup> Kristallnacht is considered to be the beginning of the end for Germany's Jews.<sup>98</sup> It was used as an excuse to levy a one billion mark fine on the Jews and to seize their property. Irving, however, is unwilling to see Hitler's fingerprints on Kristallnacht even though he may not have directly known of what was to take place. Kristallnacht was in some way the inevitable result of years of Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda. In this respect Irving ignores what may be the most important diary entry Goebbels would make concerning Jews in the years immediately following the Nazi seizure of power. On November 30, 1937 Goebbels wrote:

"Long discussion [with Hitler] over the Jewish question. . . The Jews must get out of Germany, in fact out of the whole of Europe. It will take some time but it must happen, and it will happen. The Fuhrer is absolutely determined about it."<sup>99</sup>

Goebbels wrote this almost two years before the war began and one year before Kristallnacht. One may indeed wonder how Hitler would have known at this early date that all of the Jews would have to be ousted from Europe. Was he already laying the groundwork?

Irving's treatment of Chaim Weizmann is typical of the way he views Nazi-Jewish relations. He writes

that in 1939 Goebbels had relaxed his personal vendetta against Jews "only to be goaded into reviving it by one of their less felicitous moves as the Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann formally declared war on their behalf against Nazi Germany in September 1939."<sup>100</sup> Irving's characterization of what Weizmann actually said is similar to the way he approached the 1933 Daily Express headline. In fact, Weizmann never declared war on Germany on anybody's behalf. Only Irving and his band of Holocaust deniers actually believe that Weizmann had some kind supra national authority to speak for all of the world's Jews. Weizmann wrote a letter to Britain's Prime Minister shortly before the war broke out "that the Jews stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies."<sup>101</sup> It is worth emphasizing that nowhere in the letter does Weizmann ever so much as hint that he is speaking on behalf of all the world's Jews. Moreover, if the Jews had indeed declared on war on Germany in 1933 as deniers claim ( i.e. the Daily Express headline), why would it be necessary for Weizmann to do so again in 1939?

In 1977 Irving referred to this letter by saying that "Hitler no doubt considered it an unorthodox Jewish declaration of war. He often referred to it in later years. "The problem is that Irving did not cite any evidence that Hitler was ever aware of the letter even though it is known that Hitler referred to it in July 1942 - nearly three years after it was written.<sup>102</sup> Irving has the same problem with Goebbels. The Propaganda Minister was a voracious writer and his diaries run to 75,000 pages — all of which Irving appears to have read. Goebbels always recorded anything he believed to be of significance in his diary. Yet, Irving has not cited one entry from Goebbels' diary referring to the Weizmann letter. Unfortunately, German historian Ernst Nolte has cited Irving in the belief that this letter is significant.<sup>103</sup> Perhaps Nolte has had more luck than Irving in finding some evidence that Hitler was aware of the letter at the time it was written.

While Irving believes Weizmann's letter to be very significant, he does not appear to understand why a Jewish leader would pledge Jewish support for democratic principles against a totalitarian anti-Semitic government. Eight months before Weizmann's letter Hitler had publicly threatened "the extermination of the Jewish race in Europe." There does not appear to be any other instance in the twentieth century where the leader of a powerful nation has publicly threatened during peacetime to exterminate an innocent civilian population. Irving had a difficult time dealing with this threat. Twice in his book he mentions Hitler's prophecy before finally telling the reader what the prophecy is.<sup>104</sup> Moreover, even though Hitler's threat occurred before the Weizmann letter, Irving does not tell us what the threat actually is until long after he has discussed the letter.

Irving cited the well known Goebbels' diary entry of March 27, 1942 where he discusses the "barbaric" procedure of Jews being deported. Goebbels notes that 60 percent will have to be liquidated while another 40 percent will be put to work. The significant part of this entry is when Goebbels states that the measures are being carried out by the

"Gauleiter of Vienna." This was Odilo Globocnik, who was in charge of Operation Reinhard. Goebbels states that Globocnik "who is carrying out this operation, is doing so pretty discreetly and also using a procedure that is not too flagrant."<sup>105</sup> The entry continues:

"A judgement is being visited upon the Jews that while barbaric, is fully deserved by them. The prophecy which the Fuhrer made about them [the January 30, 1939 speech] for having brought on a new world war is

beginning to come true in a most terrible manner."<sup>106</sup>

Yet, despite this entry Irving goes on to write that nowhere in Goebbels' diary's 75,000 pages is there an order from Hitler to murder the Jews. But what does Irving possibly think that Goebbels could be referring to in this entry? What is the discreet procedure that Goebbels is talking about? Why is this procedure barbaric? And why does Goebbels tie all this to Hitler's 1939 threat to exterminate the Jews of Europe? Every historian who has analyzed the entry knows that Goebbels can only be talking about the gassings that were to be part of Operation Reinhard. But Irving does not reveal what he thinks Goebbels is talking about. Also, Irving is willing to cite a memo to Himmler dealing with Globocnik's view that the entire Jewish action "should be executed as fast as humanly possible."<sup>107</sup> What does Irving possibly think that this can mean? Once again, he never tells his readers.

At least Irving has indirectly discredited Arthur Butz, who argued that Goebbels' diaries are either forgeries or that offending passages were interpolated by forgers.<sup>108</sup>

Irving missed some of Goebbels' more incriminating entries on the mass murder. On December 14, 1942 he wrote: "I believe both the English and the Americans are happy that we are exterminating [aufraumen] the Jewish riff-raff."<sup>109</sup> On March 13, 1945 he wrote: "Anyone in a position to do so should kill these Jews off like rats. In Germany, thank God, we have done a fairly complete job. I trust the world will take its cue from this."<sup>110</sup> In June 1942 he wrote in a German newspaper: "The Jews will pay with the extermination of their race in Europe and perhaps beyond."<sup>111</sup> In a 1943 speech he stated that foreign protests cannot stop Germany from "exter... the elimination of Jewry"<sup>112</sup>

The first reference to Hitler's actually beginning to exterminate the Jews was made in an entry on August 19, 1941 after a meeting with the Fuhrer. Goebbels writes:

"The Fuhrer is convinced his prophecy in the Reichstag [January 30, 1939] is becoming a fact. That should the Jews succeed in provoking a new war, this would end with their annihilation. It is becoming true in these weeks and months with a certainty that appears almost sinister. In the East, the Jews are paying the price, in Germany they have already paid in part. And they will have to pay more in the future."<sup>112a</sup>

Another early wartime entry from Goebbels' diaries has been discovered in the recently opened Soviet archives. We can now trace the first reference to the extermination of all Jews to an entry made on December 12, 1941 after meeting with Hitler. This significant entry occurred shortly after Germany declared war on the United States and reads as follows:

"With respect of the Jewish Question, the Fuhrer has decided to make a clean sweep. He prophesied to the Jews that if they brought about a world war, they would live to see their annihilation [Vernichtung] in it. This wasn't just a catch- word. The world war is here, and the annihilation [Vernichtung] of the Jews must be the necessary consequence."<sup>112b</sup>

The significance of this entry is that Goebbels is citing Hitler for the proposition that all Jews must be exterminated whereas the entry for August 19 can arguably be read to mean that only Jews in the occupied Soviet territories should be exterminated because of his reference to the East.

Irving's approach in Goebbels somewhat resembles his method in *Hitler's War*. In the 1977 book Irving was attempting to blame the Holocaust on Himmler and clear Hitler. Now, however, in 1996 Irving was a Holocaust denier. Thus, his approach is to make Goebbels seem more militant than Hitler on the Jewish question.<sup>113</sup> Unlike *Hitler's War*, where Irving was willing to admit to an extermination plan, he now says nothing about any such plan. He has quite literally ignored all of the evidence on this issue which shows that the killings were indeed part of a well organized plan.

Irving also attempts to give the impression that Hitler wanted to delay action on the Jewish question until after the war. He cites a memo by one of Hitler's assistant's to this effect. Yet in the source note Irving also quotes Goebbels, at about the same time, that Hitler was relentless on the Jewish question: "The Jews must get out of Europe, if necessary by applying the most brutal means."<sup>114</sup>

Irving has a problem with one particular Goebbels entry dealing with a conversation he had just had with Hitler. Irving cites it as follows:

"The Fuhrer once again expresses his ruthless resolve to make a clean sweep of the Jews out of Europe. One can't go getting all sentimental about it. The Jews have richly deserved the catastrophe they are suffering today.... We have to accelerate this process with a studied ruthlessness."<sup>115</sup>

Irving has presented this entry in a manner in which the reader might assume that "clean sweep" does not mean killing. However, where Irving places his ellipsis he has left out the most important and revealing part of the entry where Goebbels states: "Their destruction [vernichtung] will go hand in hand with the destruction [vernichtung] of our enemies."<sup>116</sup> Irving faced an obvious dilemma with this entry because Goebbels is writing that Hitler has just told him about the "Vernichtung" (extermination) of the Jews. Since even Irving does not deny the meaning of vernichtung, revealing the true contents of the passage would destroy his thesis about Goebbels' diaries not saying anything about an extermination order from Hitler. All historians have understood the significance of this entry. Interestingly, Irving did not give the date or source note for this entry.

Another revealing entry, totally ignored by Irving, was made on May 13, 1943. Goebbels goes into a discussion with Hitler on the Protocols of Zion and the Jewish threat to humanity. Hitler now tells Goebbels about the Jewish threat. The Jews pose a particular threat to societies with a high standard of civilization. Hitler's opinion is: "There is therefore no other recourse left for modern nations except to exterminate the Jew..."<sup>117</sup> Once again Hitler is directly telling Goebbels about the extermination of the Jews.

Interestingly, however, Irving is still not squeamish about revealing Himmler's role in the killings. He cites, as an example, a speech given by Himmler in Posen on January 26, 1944 and the reaction to it by those present. Himmler discusses "the fate of Germany's Jews" as follows:

"When he announced that they had totally solved the Jewish problem most of the officers applauded. 'We were all there in Posen' recalled one of them, a rear-admiral 'when That Man told us how he had killed off the Jews. . . I can still recall precisely how he told us': 'If people ask me, Why did you have to kill the children too?, then I can only say I'm not such a coward that I leave for my children something I can do myself.'"118

It might be recalled that Himmler had given a similar speech in Posen several months earlier. Irving also cites a speech by Himmler on May 24, 1944, who "again hinted that Jewish women and children had been killed too."119 Irving did not attempt to reconcile these speeches with the thesis that the killings were of an ad hoc nature.

## Theodore Kaufman

The ideology of Holocaust denial necessarily must deal in moral equivalencies. The Daily Express headline and Chaim Weizmann's letter are two of the most salient examples. However, the most interesting and provocative figure in denial is not a Nazi or even a prominent Jew. Rather, it is an obscure Jewish writer named Theodore Kaufman.

Very little is known about Kaufman. The information available on him suggests that he was a loner with no ties to any organization. Kaufman wrote a book entitled *Germany Must Perish* in 1941. The theme of his book is that most Germans were an inherently warlike and aggressive people who would forever be starting a war unless something was done to stop them. His solution was to sterilize all Germans so that they could not procreate. However, this sterilization plan did not apply to German-Americans.<sup>120</sup>

Kaufman's book does not appear to have been reviewed in any publications. It is not listed in the *Book Review Digest* for 1941 or 1942. This is not unusual since he had to publish the book under the Argyle Press, in Newark, New Jersey. The Argyle Press was a creation of Kaufman himself. Nevertheless, denier Paul Rassinier saw Kaufman's book as constituting a major threat to Germany.<sup>121</sup> Similarly, Wilhelm Staglich cited Kaufman as justification for Germany's anti-Jewish policies.<sup>122</sup>

Both Kaufman and his book would probably have gone completely unnoticed if it had not been for a *Time* magazine article on March 24, 1941. This is where David Irving, ever the inventor of historical desideratum, enters the Kaufman fiasco. Underneath a photograph of Kaufman, Irving states that *Time*

magazine "lauds the book."<sup>123</sup> Irving writes: "The [book's] dust cover carried endorsements from Time magazine, the Washington Post and the New York Times."<sup>124</sup> Irving gives Kaufman prominent attention in several places in his Goebbels book.<sup>125</sup> He even goes so far as to quote from Eichmann's memoirs that "Kaufman's plan for the complete Ausrottung of the German people was known to us at the time when the first order was given for the physical destruction of the Jews."<sup>126</sup> Thus, there is an implication, subtly stated, that Germany's destruction of the Jews was a defensive measure. Interestingly, here Irving uses the word *ausrottung* as meaning extermination.

The cover of the book that Irving reproduces states that this is "The Book that Hitler Fears." However, this cover and the alleged endorsements cited by Irving on the back cover are not from the original book. *Germany Must Perish* was republished by Liberty Bell Publications in 1980, a printing arm of the neo-Nazi Liberty Lobby. On the inside of the book's front cover we are told that "[t]his book so completely unnerved Dr. Goebbels that he denounced it on the front page of every newspaper in Germany and over the entire German radio network." These claims will now be examined.

Time magazine was said to have called the theme of this book "a sensational idea". Both the book's back cover and an article by Irving quote this portion of the Time article. The reason for this is obvious: both Liberty Bell and Irving are attempting to give the impression that a significant American media outlet was endorsing Kaufman's idea. However, not surprisingly, the quote is taken out of context. Time analogized Kaufman's idea to that of an early 18th century writer, Dean Swift, who proposed that Ireland cure its economic ills by selling "its starving children as dressed meat." Time also notes: "no less grisly than the Dean's it [Kaufman's idea] was not even supposed to be ironic."

Time's article on Kaufman's book is totally derisive. Kaufman is subjected to ridicule and compared to Nazi Jew-baiter and publisher Julius Streicher. Kaufman's book is stated to be "[s]trictly a one man job" and he informed Time that he did not have any organization or backers. He had done all of the legwork in promoting the book. However, the most significant part of the Time article deals with Kaufman's first sterilization plan. In 1939 he advocated sterilizing "Americans so that their children might not become homicidal monsters. In step with the times, Sterilizer Kaufman had simply transferred his basic idea to the enemy."<sup>127</sup> Thus, any rational person reading this article would have understood that Kaufman was (1) mentally unbalanced (2) spoke only for himself and (3) had a morbid fascination with sterilization.

The so called endorsement from the New York Times is non-existent. The back cover of the Liberty Bell edition of the book cites the Times as calling Kaufman's idea "A plan for Permanent Peace Among Civilized Nations"! However, the New York Times only discusses Kaufman twice in 1941 and neither article speaks favorably of the book.<sup>128</sup> As for the Washington Post "endorsement" it is as apocryphal as that of the New York Times. Using the methodology of Liberty Bell

and Irving one could argue that Irving endorsed the book because he calls it "extraordinary."<sup>129</sup>

Nevertheless, Irving does give some indication that the book was used for propaganda purposes. Irving notes that Goebbels "gleefully" wrote in his diary: "This Jew has done a disservice to the enemy. If he had composed this book at my behest he couldn't have done a better job." Goebbels also "issued the book with a photograph showing President Roosevelt apparently dictating the contents."<sup>130</sup> The German Press was also claiming that Roosevelt supported and inspired the book.<sup>131</sup> At the time Germany and the United States were not at war. We may someday see a denier accusation that Germany's declaration of war against the United States in December 1941 was because of Kaufman's book.

The book was used as an excuse to evict Hanover German Jews from their homes. When asked about this, Kaufman said:

"The Nazis are merely finding a scapegoat for their barbarities. They have hounded the Jews since the beginning of the Nazi regime, and I am sure anything I have written could not make their atrocities worse."

"But the simple answer may not even be my book. Perhaps the [British Air Force] is writing an even better story with its bombs over Hanover."<sup>132</sup>

As was noted above, the Time magazine article compared Kaufman to Julius Streicher. Irving's willingness to focus on Kaufman's book while ignoring Streicher's outrages is quite typical of denial methodology. Julius Streicher, discussed in Chapter 6, was among the most violent of Nazi agitators. He published the notorious Der Sturmer. The paper constantly called for the extermination of the Jews. Long before there was a Theodore Kaufman, Der Sturmer was publishing the following articles.

"The Jewish problem is not yet solved. . . when world Jewry has been annihilated, it will have been solved." (January 1939)

"The Jews in Russia must be killed, they must be exterminated root and branch." (May 1939)

"One day all peoples will rise up against the world's enemy... Then will the criminal Jewish race be forever eradicated." (May 1939)

"The Jewish people ought to be exterminated root and branch." (September 1939)

"At the end of this Jewish war the extermination of the Jewish people will have been brought about." (February 1940)

"The Jew is a devil in human form. It is fitting that he be exterminated root and branch." (March 1940)

Der Sturmer constantly published this type of article from 1939 through 1944.<sup>133</sup> There was, however, one important difference between Kaufman and Streicher. Kaufman had no official or unofficial support for his ideas. Streicher's paper was published in a totalitarian state where only acceptable views could be aired. Der Sturmer was published with the full approval and encouragement of the German government. Otherwise, it could not have been published at all.

Moreover, Streicher not only reflected Hitler's views, a point never admitted to by Irving, but Hitler greatly admired Streicher. In his "table talk" in 1941, Hitler stated that Streicher "idealized the Jew. The Jew is baser, fiercer, more diabolical than Streicher depicted him." Hitler went on to describe Streicher as "irreplaceable. His name is engraved in the memory of the people of Nuremberg... I shall have to recognize that this man fought like a buffalo in our cause." In an obvious reference to Streicher's perversions, Hitler states "[p]robably none of us is entirely normal." On the other hand: "When I examine the faults of which Streicher is blamed, I realize that no great man would pass through this sieve."<sup>134</sup>

For obvious reasons deniers prefer to ignore Streicher and focus on Kaufman. Thus, Rassinier goes so far as to claim that Kaufman's "voice was the [sic] tocsin of the forthcoming entry of the United States into the war. . ." In an attempt to justify Hitler's Jewish policies, Rassinier quotes Kaufman as stating the German Jews agreed with his sterilization plans.<sup>135</sup> In fact, Kaufman wrote no such thing. Moreover, Kaufman's book says very little about Jews under Nazi rule.

Rassinier does, however, offer some valuable insight as to how the book was used to inflame German public opinion:

"Hitler ordered the book to be read over all the radio stations and one can imagine the effect it produced on German opinion. I have myself met Germans who told me that from that day on, when they learned about this scheme, everyone — people, army, police — everywhere began to talk about the necessity to literally exterminate the Jews and expressed the hope that Hitler would issue an order to that effect."<sup>136</sup>

One of the aspects of Kaufman's hate book that has been overlooked is that it is remarkably similar in tone to Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, published 17 years earlier in 1924. In fact, it is probably safe to say that *Mein Kampf* is the spiritual father for *Germany Must Perish*. Kaufman simply took Hitler's ideas about Jews and substituted Germans instead. Deniers such as Rassinier, Irving and others have all but ignored Hitler's anti-Jewish ranting in *Mein Kampf*.

The Kaufman saga does not end with *Germany Must Perish* in 1941. In 1942 Kaufman wrote a pamphlet entitled *No More German Wars*. In this pamphlet Kaufman says nothing about sterilization. He offers a ten point peace plan for Germany after the war. Among his proposals were: a system of education to inculcate German youth with democratic ideals; a works program for German soldiers returning from the war; and an economic council to strike a balance between German imports and exports. For obvious reasons, no denier has ever mentioned this pamphlet. However, these types of

ideas, especially inculcation of democratic ideals, were responsible for the post war West German economic and political resurgence. It would seem only fair that if deniers want to blame Kaufman for having a hand in the events of World War II, they should also credit him with bringing about Germany's post war emergence as a political and economic force in European affairs.

## Irving the Rainman

One of Irving's major problems has been his growing animus towards Jews. He probably believes that the chorus of attacks against his professional reputation is Jewish inspired. In fact, however, there are many different individuals who have come out against Irving in recent years. Irving has begun to accept Nazi arguments about Jews at face value. Thus, the anti-Jewish Nazi boycott of 1933, discussed earlier in this chapter, was a response to the Jewish declaration of war. Irving told an interviewer that "[t]he Nazis were simply retaliating." He then mockingly stated that Goebbels called the boycott for the Jewish Sabbath because he was attempting to get the Jews to obey their own faith. When asked about Jewish attempts to reclaim Nazi-confiscated Jewish gold in Swiss bank accounts, Irving replied: "Now that the Jews have exhausted their lust and greed for animate objects, they have turned them on inanimate objects." When discussing a journalist whose first name was Chaim, Irving criticized himself for "assuming he was just another writer despite his glasses, hook nose and beard down to his chest."<sup>137</sup>

Irving's questionable use of sources when discussing Jews in his Goebbels biography was best illustrated when describing the Jewish response to Nazi persecution in the 1930s. Irving claimed that the Jews had a near-monopoly on overseas film distribution which Goebbels was attempting to break. The problem is that Irving's source for this was Goebbels' diary.<sup>138</sup> There can be little doubt that Goebbels believed this to be the case. But Goebbels is hardly an authoritative source on such issues since he believed in a Jewish worldwide conspiracy which controlled the media of many nations.

Irving also wrote that German film exports had previously covered 40 percent of production costs "but now, with the increasingly effective worldwide Jewish boycott [in the 1930s], barely seven percent."<sup>139</sup> The problem is that neither of the two sources cited by Irving supports the statement. One source, a book by a British expert on German films, mentions the percentages cited by Irving but says nothing about a Jewish boycott. Rather, the expert cited overall political hostility towards the Nazis, Germany's attempt to keep its film imports as low as possible, and import quotas by foreign countries.<sup>140</sup> Similarly, the other source cited by Irving says nothing about a Jewish boycott.<sup>141</sup>

Irving also claimed that in Berlin all but one of the private banks were controlled by Jews in 1930.<sup>142</sup> Irving wrote the following about Goebbels in a denier publication:

"In 1923 he worked in a bank in Cologne, where he was shocked by Jewish banking methods. He saw Jews ruining ordinary Germans, he saw speculation, and he saw inflation wiping out people's savings. His colleagues at the bank undoubtedly drew his attention to the Jewish role in all of it, as the private banks in Germany were almost entirely in Jewish hands".<sup>143</sup>

Once again Irving is accepting Goebbels as an authoritative source for these matters without checking any further data. The official German statistics for 1930 show that 48.7% of private banks were Jewish owned.<sup>144</sup> However, Irving appears to be unaware of the fact that private banks in Germany had been on the decline since the late 19th century. <sup>145</sup> German statistics show that in 1900 private banks accounted for less than ten percent of the assets held by all banks.<sup>146</sup> Total Jewish ownership in all German banks amounted to less than 19 percent in 1930.<sup>147</sup> Irving literally ignored all of the sources available on this issue.

More importantly, however, is that Irving was not aware that the inflation which ravaged Germany in the 1920s had little to do with banking practices and great deal to do with the reparations demanded from the victorious World War I allies and the adverse economic consequences which accompanied Germany's defeat.<sup>148</sup> Any student familiar with this period of time is aware of the fact that losing the war was the principal reason for Germany's economic crisis in 1920s.

The above illustrates that Irving cannot be relied upon for accurate information anytime he writes about the Jews — especially the Jews in Germany. He is prone to either rely on Nazi statements at face value, to ignore evidence or to misrepresent his sources — all tactics for which Irving has acquired a well deserved reputation over the years.

Part of Irving's problem is that he is unable to put any of his information into the wider context of Germany's social, political and economic history in the twentieth century. True, Irving writes books which span hundreds of pages. He knows many facts about Third Reich personalities. He even knows when Goebbels lost his virginity. Yet, he is lost when it comes to understanding the reasons for Germany's economic crisis after World War I. Like the rainman who could do complex mathematical computations but could not add 2+2, so does Irving know all manner of factual minutiae about Nazi Germany but cannot place any of this information within a broader understanding. What can be said about Irving is that he knows a great deal but has learned nothing.

## POSTSCRIPT

As this book gets ready to go to press, David Irving has just lost a civil lawsuit in British court against

Holocaust historian Deborah Lipstadt for calling him a Holocaust denier, Nazi apologist, and Hitler admirer who has resorted to distortion. He is also required to pay Professor Lipstadt's court costs. The court found Irving to be an "active Holocaust denier; that he is and Semitic and racist..." He was also found "for his own ideological reasons" to have "persistently and deliberately misrepresented and manipulated historical evidence..." The court would not accept "Irving's contention that his falsification of the historical record is the product of innocent error or misinterpretation or incompetence on his part." One of the better examples was in his Goebbels' biography where he claimed that in 1930 no fewer than 31,000 cases of insurance fraud were committed by Jews in Germany when the real number was 74. The court relied on extensive reports submitted by five experts on topics ranging from Irving's neo Nazi affiliations, Holocaust historiography, Hitler's role in the "Final Solution" and Auschwitz. The most damaging evidence came from Dr. Richard Evans, a professor of Modern European History at the University of Cambridge, who exposed Irving's misuse of historical sources.

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

PART III: IDEOLOGIES

CHAPTER 9

GAS CHAMBERS :  
THE « SCIENCE » OF

HOLOCAUST DENIAL

Holocaust deniers base most of their arguments on the claim that there were no homicidal gas chambers. As noted in the introduction to this book, such arguments are easier to make than to explain what actually happened to the between five and six million Jews who were missing after World War II.

Much of the agitation on this issue has occurred in Europe, especially France and Germany, and Canada. However, deniers have also been able to gain much publicity in the United States. Many people, though not aware of the specifics of the Holocaust, know that there are those who question the existence of the gas chambers. The issuance in 1988 of a denier financed report which claimed that there could not have been homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz received international attention.

In 1992 the American Jewish Committee decided to take a poll in the United States to determine how many people doubted the existence of the Holocaust. The AJC commissioned the Roper Organization to conduct the poll. The results caused a sensation. The poll found 22.1 percent of the respondents believed it "possible" that the Holocaust never occurred. Two-thirds stated that it was "impossible" that the Holocaust never occurred while the remainder did not know.

The poll's results appeared to bolster the claims of Holocaust deniers that they were making inroads to public opinion. However, some critics noted that the question was worded in such a way as to mislead the respondents. The question asked: "Does it seem possible or does it seem impossible to you that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened?" Critics noted that using double negatives in the question could cause confusion in the minds of respondents as to exactly what they were answering.<sup>1</sup>

In a subsequent poll the questions were changed to eliminate double negatives. It was then found that about five percent of the respondents expressed some degree of doubt. However, most of this group believed that the Holocaust occurred.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the percentage of people who expressed some doubt about the Holocaust roughly equals those who believe Elvis is still alive.

These results do not help the cause of denial. After years of propaganda deniers have failed to make any inroads to American public opinion.

They now have several internet sites which spread their arguments and enable them to reach a wider audience. A great deal of the denier material which appears on the internet deals with the existence of gas chambers.

Much of this material is based on denier publications, as deniers tend to rely on and cite other deniers.

Not even all anti-Semites have been convinced by denier arguments. One of the better illustrations of denier failures is Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakan, arguably America's best known anti-Semite. Deniers have courted the NOI. There is even a photo of Arthur Butz addressing the NOI in the mid 1980s. However, in 1997 on national television Farrakan stated that the Jews played a role in their own destruction in the death camps during World War II. He did not, however, say that there was no Holocaust. Deniers may attempt to take comfort from Farrakan's placing part of the blame for the Holocaust on the Jews themselves, but the key fact is that — disregarding whether the statement contains any element of truth — he is acknowledging that the destruction took place.

Deniers like to argue that since some concentration camps did not have gas chambers, then none did. No historian of the Holocaust has ever claimed that every German concentration camp had gas chambers. One of the stock quotations used by deniers is a letter written by the highly respected German historian Martin Broszat in 1960. Broszat acknowledged that no Jews were gassed in three of the better known camps on German soil. However, when read in its entirety, the letter hardly offers any comfort to deniers.

"Neither in Dachau nor in Bergen Belsen nor in Buchenwald were Jews or other prisoners gassed. The gas chamber in Dachau was never entirely finished or put into operation. Hundreds of thousands of prisoners who perished in Dachau and other concentration camps in the Old Reich [that is, Germany in its borders of 1937] were victims, above all, of the catastrophic hygienic and provisioning conditions. . . The mass extermination of the Jews by gassing began in 1941-1942 and occurred exclusively in a few facilities selected and equipped with appropriate technical installations, above all in the occupied Polish territory (but at no place in the Old Reich); in Auschwitz-Birkenau, in Sobibor on the Bug [river], in Treblinka, Chelmno and Belzec."

"It is at those places, but not in Bergen Belsen, Dachau or Buchenwald, where mass extermination facilities... were built and disguised as shower baths or disinfection rooms."3

No responsible person has ever claimed that Bergen Belsen had a gas chamber even though many people died there. In the subsequent trials of individuals who were at Bergen Belsen, the prosecution made it quite clear that no gas chambers were at the camp.<sup>4</sup> Bergen Belsen is perhaps best known as the camp where the young Dutch diarist Anne Frank died.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, many people died in Buchenwald, but no historian has ever claimed that gas chambers were in the camp.<sup>6</sup>

Dachau was more problematical. Broszat, as noted above, wrote that there was a gas chamber in the camp but that it was never put into operation. This has now become the accepted view among historians. There was, however, some basis for believing that the gas chamber in Dachau had been used for murder. An American Congressional delegation investigating the camp in May 1945 reported:

"The room in which the gas chamber stood was flanked on both ends by warerooms in which bodies were placed after execution to await cremation. At the time we visited the camp these warerooms were piled high with dead bodies."<sup>7</sup>

The committee saw dead bodies piled up near the gas chamber and reached the conclusion that these victims had been gassed. The conclusion was logical under the circumstances even though it was erroneous. However, it is clear that the committee was not attempting to deliberately pass along false information. In the section of the report dealing with Buchenwald the committee noted the slave labor, high death rate, medical experiments and crematoria, but said nothing about gassing because no such facility was at the camp.<sup>8</sup>

Sigmund Rasher, a doctor who carried out medical experiments at Dachau, wrote the following to Himmler in 1942:

"As you know, the same facilities have been built at the Dachau concentration camp as at Linz [the reference is to the Hartheim euthanasia facility near Linz]. Because the convoys of invalids end up, one way or another, in the chambers that are intended for them, I am asking the following question: In these chambers, on people who are destined for them in any case, would it not be possible to test the efficiency of our combat gases? So far, all we have are [the results of] tests made on animals..."<sup>9</sup>

Rasher's memo shows that if there were no gassings at Dachau, the German authorities were seriously considering the prospect.

One of the favorite quotes that deniers use is a comment made by Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal that there were no extermination camps on German soil. This is correct. The camps which were used for massive extermination were, as Broszat noted, in Poland, not the borders of pre-war Germany. Nevertheless, neither Broszat, Wiesenthal nor any other historian has claimed that there were no homicidal gassing facilities on German soil. Such installations were to be found in the Women's Camp at Ravensbruck, Stutthof, Neuengamme, Natzweiler-Struthof and Sachsenhausen. The Mauthausen camp in Austria also had a gas chamber.<sup>10</sup> However, the principal purpose of these camps was not to gas prisoners.

In 1987, a neo-Nazi Austrian publication entitled *Halt* published what purported to be a document from a Major Muller. Dated October 1, 1948, the "document" claims that "the Allied Commission of Inquiry" determined that there were no gas chambers on German soil and that those who confessed to such gas chambers only did so under torture.<sup>11</sup> The "Austrian Resistance Archives," an organization comprised of Austrian scholars who monitor neo-Nazi materials, quickly established that this "report," known as the "Lachout Document," was a clumsy forgery. Most significantly, it was established that there never was an "Allied Commission of Inquiry." Emil Lachout, who claimed to discover the document, could not explain where he found the report. Moreover, it was shown that Lachout, whose signature appears on the 1948 "report", could not be who he claimed during World War II.<sup>12</sup> Deniers have quietly dropped any mention of the "document" in recent years. However, deniers who are forever claiming that many documents which prove the Holocaust are forgeries, may have believed that they were entitled to their own forgery.

Carbon monoxide poison was used in Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka. It was also used in the gas vans which patrolled the Soviet Union. One of the issues that has arisen with respect to the efficacy of these gassings is the use of diesel engines to pump exhaust fumes into the chambers. Some of the eyewitnesses identified diesel engines as the method of poisoning. Deniers, as might be expected, argue that that this was not an efficient means of killing, so that the witnesses are lying. In fact, it is known that such engines were used, though it is also possible that other types of engines were also used. There is a bill dated November 2, 1942 from the manufacturer of a diesel engine [dieselmotor] to the Criminal Commissar, Bothman, in Chelmno. It is addressed to the SS-Sonderkommando X. There are also scientific studies showing the lethal nature of diesel exhaust.<sup>12a</sup>

There are several contemporaneous documents which have survived from the period which deal specifically with carbon monoxide poisoning. The first was cited in Chapter 1. It is a "Top Secret" memo of May 16, 1942 by an SS lieutenant who describes, from first hand knowledge, the gassing process and how the people die.<sup>13</sup> A subsequent memo from Reich Main Security requests gas hoses for the gas vans.<sup>14</sup>

Another memo is from Walter Rauff, a lieutenant - colonel who was heavily involved in these activities. It is dated March 26, 1942 and deals with carbon monoxide bottles for the Mauthausen concentration camp in lieu of the gassing vans, which are due to arrive.

"In the attachment I refer back to the procedure of the garrison doctor at concentration camp Mauthausen."

"The special vans [sonderwagen] manufactured by us are at this time in operation pursuant to the order of the Chief of the Security Police [Himmler] and the SD. There are more vans under construction... I will let you know as soon as the van can be deployed."

"Since I assume that the Mauthausen concentration camp cannot wait indefinitely for the delivery, I request that you use steel bottles with carbon monoxide or respectively other remedies to get things started."14a

The most revealing memo is dated June 5, 1942 and labeled "Top Secret." It discusses the use of gassing vans and is addressed to the aforementioned Walter Rauff. The report reads in part:

"Since December 1941, ninety-seven thousand have been processed, using three vans, without any defects showing up in the vehicles..."

Previous experience has shown that the following adjustments would be useful:

(1) "In order to facilitate the rapid distribution of CO [carbon monoxide]. . .two slots. . . . will be ordered at the top of the rear wall..."

(2) "The normal capacity of the vans is nine to ten per square meter [one square meter equals 10.763 square feet]. . .The problem [of space] cannot be solved by merely reducing the number of subjects treated, as has been done so far. For in this case a longer running time is required, as the empty space also needs to be filled with CO [carbon monoxide]..."

(3) "The pipe that connects the exhaust to the van tends to rust, because the exhaust is eaten away from the inside by liquids that flow into it..."

(6) "Greater protection is needed for the lighting system... Experience shows, however, that when the back door is closed and it gets dark inside, the load pushes hard against the door. The reason for this is

that when it becomes dark inside the load rushes toward what little light remains..."

The report goes on to state that alterations are being made in ten other vans which will be used for the same purpose.<sup>15</sup>

Auschwitz

The principal denier arguments about the gas chambers center on Auschwitz, the best known of the death camps. As noted in Chapter 1, the death camps of Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor and Treblinka were destroyed by the Germans. Auschwitz, and the smaller camp of Majdanek, were left standing after the war. While the aforementioned four camps existed purely for homicidal purposes, Auschwitz also functioned as an internment camp and industrial producing facility. Therefore, unlike the other camps, there were many survivors — numbering in the hundreds — from Auschwitz.

The denier approach, first articulated by Arthur Butz, is that if the Auschwitz gas chambers could be discredited, then the whole notion of the Holocaust would fall. This explains why deniers have put so much effort in their attempts to discredit the Auschwitz homicidal gas chambers.

One of the misleading arguments deniers have used concerns the gas chamber that visitors to the Auschwitz State Museum see on their tour of the camp. The principal gassing facilities, as noted in Chapter 5, were in the Birkenau area of the camp, known as Auschwitz II, where the four crematoriums were located. These facilities were destroyed when the Germans retreated. The gas chamber shown to tourists is located in the crematorium of the main camp known as Auschwitz I. This facility was not used extensively for gassings and was abandoned in 1942 or 1943. The camp authorities converted the gas chamber into an air raid shelter in 1944. Some years later, the State Museum constructed a model of what it believed a gas chamber to look like by remodeling the defunct air raid shelter, which had previously been a crematorium and gas chamber. Deniers have claimed that this shows that the Auschwitz authorities are perpetrating a fraud on the public. David Cole, a former Jewish denier who worked closely with other deniers,<sup>16</sup> shot a video of the facility shown to tourists. Cole interviewed camp historian Franciszek Piper and claimed that Piper acknowledged the hoax on tourists. Piper angrily responded that Cole had "deceitfully"

represented himself as someone who wanted to convince his acquaintances that Auschwitz was a "place of genocide." Piper told Cole:

"The nature of the adaptation [i.e. conversion to an air raid shelter] works carried out by the Nazis and what one had to do to remove those changes in order to regain the previous appearance. In spite of the fact that such secondary restoration works had to be done there is an [i]ndisputable reality that the gas chamber in question is housed in the [building] which has ... existed from prewar times until now.

"The fact that the Nazi murderers used the gas chambers (in Birkenau you can see the ruins of the other[sic] five gas chambers) for mass annihilation of innocent men, women and children, mostly Jews,

has been proved by thousands of memoirs and depositions of eyewitnesses as well as by German official documents and plans...

"I have devoted 28 years of my life to [saving] the memory of the countless victims of the Nazi barbarity to warn people against indifference to all forms of racial, religious and national based hatred. . . Because of it I take the fact that my name is used for disseminating such . . . lies ... as a lack of honesty and dignity."

Piper also cited a book that is required reading for Auschwitz tour guides which states that the crematorium in Auschwitz I which housed the gas chamber had been converted in 1944 to an air raid shelter.<sup>17</sup>

Another stock quotation appearing in denier literature is a book by Jewish historian and Princeton University professor Arno Mayer. He wrote that "from 1942 to 1945, certainly at Auschwitz, but probably overall, more Jews were killed by so-called "natural" causes [i. e. typhus and other diseases] than by "unnatural" ones [i. e. gas chambers]."<sup>18</sup> The implication is that most Jews died of diseases, a myth deniers have perpetrated for many years. Mayer's book is an overall fairly accurate and good history of the Holocaust. It has been criticized because there is not a single footnote in the whole work. Mayer's problem in making this statement is that he was simply unaware of the demographics of Auschwitz. He was not familiar with the Auschwitz death books or number of deportees to Auschwitz discussed in Chapter 4 of this study. Moreover, Mayer's statement also shows that, while he is aware that many Jews died of overall deprivation, he is not familiar with all of the demographic data dealing with deportations. The point never acknowledged by deniers is that Mayer appears to be the only historian who has ever made such an assertion — and done so without citing any evidence. Deniers often ignore the following observation by Mayer:

"In sum, selection for almost certain and instant death was implicit in the very decision to send Jews, regardless of age and physical condition, to Auschwitz and other camps. Selection upon or after arrival was merely the logical consequence and implementation of this prior warrant for destruction."

"This is not the same as saying that the "pre selected" Jews and Gypsies were sent to Auschwitz, especially to Birkenau to be gassed. At Auschwitz — and Majdanek — the idea and practice of gassing only developed gradually. But for the Jews Auschwitz was an unqualified inferno even without gas chambers. Indeed, the killing by asphyxiation may be said to have intensified the torment of the camp's Jews in degrees, not kind."<sup>19</sup>

Mayer also wrote that "[s]ources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable" because most of the evidence was destroyed by the Nazis, including "camp records" and "nearly all killing and cremating installations. . ."<sup>20</sup> Deniers interpret this statement as meaning that there is no

evidence. In fact, it was never Mayer's intention to make any such suggestion. As will be seen, there is a substantial amount of primary documentation, not all of which was available to Mayer when he wrote his book.

## The Leuchter Report

Deniers like Butz and Stiglich challenged the concept of the Auschwitz gas chambers, but had never attempted to present systematic or scientific evidence that such installations were not feasible. The vacuum was filled by literature professor Robert Faurisson, identified in Chapter 4 as Europe's best known denier. He quickly emerged as the principal gas chamber "expert" among deniers. In several articles published in early issues of the denier publication *Journal of Historical Review*, he attacked the feasibility of using the structures inside the Auschwitz crematoria for gas chambers.<sup>21</sup>

The ideas expressed by Faurisson were subsequently incorporated into a study by an American death penalty consultant named Fred Leuchter. The study known as *The Leuchter Report: A Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek* is among the most widely disseminated of denier materials. Deniers have lavished so much attention on this report that it is fair to say that their gas chamber arguments stand or fall on Leuchter's — in reality Faurisson's — conclusions.

The Leuchter Report grew out of the false news speech trial of Canadian denier and German expatriate Ernst Zundel. It is not the purpose of the following analysis to defend the trial itself. Unlike the United States, Canada had laws against spreading false news (of which I disapprove). Rather, the purpose of the following analysis is to examine the validity of Leuchter's arguments and their subsequent defense by deniers. Leuchter's report was, in reality, nothing but a rehash of arguments previously expressed by Faurisson.<sup>22</sup> Leuchter was paid a reported \$35,000 by Zundel for the report.

Faurisson had contacted Leuchter on behalf of Zundel. It was believed that an American execution expert could help clear Zundel of false news speech if it could be shown that nobody was gassed at Auschwitz.

Leuchter took a team to Poland to examine the Auschwitz crematoria. However, it appears from his own admission that nearly all of the technical information needed for this report came from Faurisson. After issuing the report Leuchter described how he became involved in the Zundel trial. He was initially contacted by Faurisson:

". . . I met with Dr. Robert Faurisson twice in Boston and, as a result of these meetings I was summoned to Toronto to meet with Ernst Zundel, attorney Douglas Christie and the rest of Zundel's very able staff."

Dr. Robert Faurisson had postulated thirteen years ago that a gas-chamber specialist should be sought who could evaluate the alleged gas chambers in Poland and report on their efficacy for execution purposes, something the Revisionists already knew was impossible."

"...Two days of lengthy meetings followed, during which I was shown photos of the alleged German gas chambers in Poland, German documents and Allied aerial photographs. My examination of this material led me to question whether these alleged gas chambers were, in fact, execution facilities."

"After due consideration I agreed, and made plans to leave for Poland... I also stated that although the photos and documents seemed to support the view that these places were, indeed, not execution facilities, I would reserve final judgement until after my examination and, if I determined that these facilities were, in fact, or could have been, execution gas chambers, I would state this in my report."

Leuchter goes on to write that while Zundel and Faurisson did not accompany him on his trip, they "were with us every step of the way in spirit."<sup>23</sup> Nowhere in the report itself or Leuchter's description of the report is it ever acknowledged whether he sought to get another opinion of the materials presented to him by Faurisson. For example, Leuchter never bothered to ask the Auschwitz State Museum about these materials. The director of the Auschwitz State Museum, in answer to an inquiry, stated that the museum had never issued any blueprints of the crematoria which housed the gas chambers to Leuchter.<sup>24</sup> Leuchter claimed to have examined original drawings of the crematoria.<sup>25</sup> Based on Leuchter's above description it is obvious that he had already formulated an opinion before the examination began. His claim that he would reserve judgement until after the examination is disingenuous considering that he made no effort to check Faurisson's data with any independent experts. In fact, Faurisson wrote the foreword to the report.

Leuchter had substantial credibility problems when he testified for the defense at Zundel's trial. He presented himself as an "engineer" who had served as a consultant to a number of penal institutions. The conclusion in his report that there were no execution gas chambers in Auschwitz is signed "Fred A. Leuchter, Jr. Chief Engineer." Next to this "conclusion" is a photo of Leuchter with Faurisson, Zundel and another denier discussing "a model of alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz."<sup>26</sup>

Leuchter's problems began when he was questioned by the court about his engineering credentials. He testified that the State of Massachusetts and the United States governors "made that determination when they issued me my medical license." However, Leuchter also admitted that his "medical license" was a license to carry and use drugs. The court also established that Leuchter did not have an engineering degree.<sup>27</sup> An issue also arose as to Leuchter's expertise on Zyklon B, the product which releases the poison gas that he denied was used for mass murder at Auschwitz. The court noted that "he got all that information from a manufacturer and other material. He hasn't worked with Zyklon B." Based on Leuchter's lack of credentials and expertise, the court refused to allow his report to be filed.<sup>28</sup>

Leuchter testified at the trial that he had consulted with Warden Juan Vasquez of San Quentin on a heart monitoring system and that a new system would be installed for both chairs in their gas chambers. However, Vasquez stated that San Quentin "has not contracted with Fred A. Leuchter for the installation of a heart monitoring system or any other work."<sup>29</sup> Leuchter also testified that a former warden at North Carolina consulted with him on remedial procedures for gas chambers. However, the current warden, who had served as a deputy warden, denied that Leuchter had ever "performed either consulting or any service during the installation of our execution chamber."<sup>30</sup>

Leuchter also claimed that he consulted on a regular basis with DuPont Chemical, the largest manufacturer of hydrogen cyanide in the United States. However, DuPont denied ever providing Leuchter with any information on cyanides.<sup>31</sup>

The final blow to Leuchter's credibility came in June 1991 when he admitted that he was not an engineer, even though he had represented himself as such to states that use the death penalty. The admission was made as a part of a consent agreement so that he would not have to stand trial in Massachusetts for practicing engineering without a license.<sup>32</sup>

Nevertheless, despite Leuchter's substantial credibility problems, deniers continue to promote his (in reality Faurisson's) report. The following is an analysis of Leuchter's report.

Leuchter claimed that the structures identified by Holocaust historians, numerous eyewitnesses and the Auschwitz State Museum could not possibly have served as gas chambers. He stated that there were no gaskets on the doors to prevent gas from seeping out. He did not appear familiar with numerous documents from those involved with the crematoria describing the installation of "gas tight doors" for these structures.<sup>33</sup>

Leuchter further claimed that gassing prisoners was too dangerous because the individuals who poured in the gas from the roof vents would have been killed from exposure to the gas.<sup>34</sup> At the Zundel trial he was asked if this danger could be prevented by wearing a gas mask. He replied "perhaps."<sup>35</sup> However, elsewhere in his report he stated that this same hydrogen cyanide was used to delouse the chambers of vermin when he found traces of the gas in these installations. He did not explain why it was too dangerous to use Zyklon B to kill people, but not too dangerous to kill vermin. Moreover, he was not familiar with a general directive from the camp commandant, from August 1942, requiring all SS members handling poison gas to wear a gas mask.<sup>36</sup>

Leuchter stated that the structures could not have functioned as gas chambers because it took too long to air them out. He claimed that the ventilation would take at least 10 hours and longer if the buildings had no windows or fans.<sup>37</sup> He attached to the report a copy of Nuremberg Document NI-9912, which was a translation of the DEGESCH manual for handling Zyklon B. DEGESCH was the German manufacturer of Zyklon B. The instructions are entitled: "Directives for the Use of Prussic Acid (Zyklon) for the Destruction of Vermin (Disinfestation)."<sup>38</sup>

Leuchter was attempting to argue that the structures identified as gas chambers could not have operated on a continuous basis with such a long aeration period. However, Leuchter was not aware that there are whole series of documents from the Auschwitz Central Construction Management for Crematoria II and III which mention the installation of air extraction devices in morgues which were used as gas chambers.<sup>39</sup> Also, it is unlikely that it was necessary to operate a chamber more than once in a day except during the Hungarian operation from mid May to mid July 1944. Prior to this period it would not have been necessary to use any chamber more than once daily. Even during the Hungarian

operation, when on some days as many as 9000 per day were being exterminated, it probably would not have been necessary to use any of the four structures used for gassing more than twice. 40

One of the most important assertions Leuchter made was that there could not have been gas chambers inside the crematoria because the gas would have caused an explosion in the furnaces.<sup>41</sup> However, it has been noted that the threshold of gas needed to kill people was far less than the amount needed to cause an explosion.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, as noted earlier, there were a series of orders for gas tight doors. Recall also that Leuchter had stated that these morgues were deloused with Zyklon B. He did not explain why a delousing, which took 16 hours, would not cause an explosion while a homicidal gassing which took several minutes would cause an explosion.

Leuchter also repeated a familiar denier argument that the gas chambers could not have accommodated enough people to kill as many as was being asserted. He stated that the structures identified as gas chambers in Crematoria II and III each had a space of 2,500 square feet which could only accommodate 278 people each. The correct square footage is 2264 square feet. However, at the Zundel trial he was asked: "in a room that has 2,000 people squeezed into 2,500 square feet, would you agree that the amount of air in that room is going to be displaced by the people?" He replied, "unquestionably,"<sup>43</sup> without objecting to the question itself. Recall that the German report on gassing cited above from 1942 states that 9 or 10 people can be squeezed into an area of about eleven square feet. Denier Carlo Mattogno, who denies any homicidal gassings, writes that "it would have been possible to gas 1,800 victims without difficulty" in a space of 2264 square feet.<sup>44</sup>

The most important and controversial part of Leuchter's report dealt with samples he collected at Auschwitz. These samples were taken from areas identified as homicidal gas chambers in Crematoria I through V and from a known delousing chamber. A delousing chamber used Zyklon B, a hydrogen cyanide poison, to disinfect clothing of lice. The purpose of Zyklon B was to kill insects and other vermin which infested clothing and living quarters. Zyklon B could also be used to kill people in the homicidal gas chambers of the crematoria.

Leuchter submitted his samples to a laboratory for an analysis of cyanide levels. The laboratory found very high levels of cyanide in the control samples from the delousing chamber. However, extremely low levels were found in those samples which tested positive from the crematoria when compared to the delousing chamber samples. The control sample from the delousing chamber showed 1,050 mg/kg of cyanide. Six of the seven samples from Crematorium I tested positive ranging from 1.1 to 7.9 mg/kg of cyanide. Two of the four samples from Crematorium III tested positive at 1.9 and 6.7 mg/kg. Two of the seven samples from Crematorium IV tested positive at 1.4 and 2.3 mg/kg. Two of the four samples from Crematorium V tested positive at 1.7 and 4.4. None of the samples taken from Crematorium II tested positive. Crematoria II-V were destroyed by the Germans in January 1945 before they evacuated the camp. Therefore, Leuchter had to obtain his samples from the ruins of these structures. Crematorium I and the delousing chamber were not destroyed.

Denier critic Jean-Claude Pressac who, shortly after Leuchter released his report, wrote the standard history of the Auschwitz gas chambers, viewed a video of Leuchter's sample gathering. Pressac noted that whereas the sample from the delousing chamber contained three to four hundred grams of lime mortar, the crematoria samples only contained 10 to 50 grams. Therefore, according to Pressac, Leuchter's samples were biased. More importantly, however, is that the low levels contained in the homicidal gas chambers as compared to the delousing

chamber could be explained by the fact that it took much longer to kill lice and vermin than people.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, there was more time for the prussic acid to concentrate in the delousing chamber. This is confirmed by the DEGESCH Manual, referred to earlier, which Leuchter attached to his report. The manual states that, "[p]russic acid is one of the most powerful poisons .1 mg per kg. of body weight is sufficient to kill a human being. Women and children are generally more susceptible than men." On the other hand, the manual states that it takes 16 hours to kill vermin. In warm weather the time is reduced to 6 hours, but extended to 32 hours in cold weather.<sup>46</sup>

Leuchter was specifically queried about the fact that the greater traces of prussic acid in the delousing chambers were the result of the longer amount of time it takes to kill vermin (6 to 32 hours) as opposed to human beings (5 to 10 minutes). He answered that this was an area about which he was not qualified to testify.<sup>47</sup> Leuchter did not explain how he could have arrived at his "conclusions" when he was not familiar with how the lethal properties of Zyklon B differed when applied to individuals versus insects.

The real problem deniers faced was to explain why there were any traces of cyanide poisoning in crematoria morgues identified as homicidal gas chambers by many eyewitnesses. In his foreword to the Leuchter Report, Faurisson argued that the premises had been disinfected with Zyklon B during the war.<sup>48</sup> Faurisson, however, already knew that some traces might show up in Leuchter's samples. In an earlier interview he had been asked about a Polish report in 1945 which found cyanide in ventilation openings in one of the crematorium's morgues. Faurisson replied: "A morgue has to be disinfected. For this they used Zyklon B. . . an absorbent of hydrocyanic acid on an inert, porous base. . ." <sup>49</sup> As will be seen below, there is no evidence that a morgue would need to be disinfected with Zyklon B.<sup>50</sup>

Leuchter argued that, "[t]he small quantities detected would indicate that at some point these buildings were deloused with Zyklon B — as were all the buildings at all these facilities." This is essentially the argument that Faurisson was making. However, elsewhere in the report he stated that "[n]one of the alleged gas chambers were constructed in accordance with the design for delousing chambers which were operating for years in a safe manner."<sup>51</sup> Leuchter never explained how the morgues could be deloused when they were not built in accordance with such a design. Also, he did not explain why these morgues would need to be deloused.<sup>52</sup> More importantly, however, neither Leuchter nor any of his defenders have ever explained why, if the morgues were being deloused, the concentrations of cyanide Leuchter found in the

morgues did not approximate the levels found in the sample taken from the delousing chamber. This shows the true nature of the argumentation techniques of Holocaust deniers. Small traces of cyanide mean that the morgues could not have functioned in a homicidal way. These small traces are explained away as the product of delousing. Yet, if the amount of cyanide found in these morgues was as great as that found in the delousing chambers, deniers would have argued that such high levels can only mean that the morgues were being deloused otherwise the concentrations would have been lower.

The fact is that it made no difference what concentrations of cyanide Leuchter found in these structures. Deniers like Faurisson had some explanation ready why these morgues could not have been homicidal gas chambers.

## The Forensic Evidence

After issuing his report, Leuchter challenged the international community to investigate his findings.<sup>53</sup>

In 1990, Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research undertook a very limited analysis of its own specimens gathered from the gas chambers of the five crematoria and one of the delousing chambers. A total of twenty samples were taken; ten from a delousing chamber and ten from the gas chambers of the five crematoria. The delousing chamber samples showed heavy concentrations of cyanide while only one of the ten samples taken from the crematoria showed slight traces of cyanide. Deniers boasted that this report, "essentially replicated Leuchter's findings and implicitly corroborated his conclusions."<sup>54</sup>

This initial report from Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research was not meant to be comprehensive for the simple reason that one half of the twenty samples gathered were from a delousing structure. Moreover, the Institute did not claim that it was undertaking a thorough analysis.

The bombshell came in 1994 when the Institute published a comprehensive analysis of samples it gathered from six of the eight known gassing sites. These were Crematoria I-V and the cellars of Block 11, the execution block where only one or two gassings were known to occur. The two other gassing sites, the bunkers located outside of the camp, have been destroyed and hardly a trace remains. The full text of the report is reproduced in Appendix III.

As can be seen, the Institute found cyanide in 29 of the 36 samples gathered from the six sites. The Institute's findings should be carefully compared to Leuchter's because the Institute was able to find cyanide where Leuchter claimed he could not find any. The best illustration is Crematorium II. In 1990, denier critic Jean - Claude Pressac called into question Leuchter's credibility because Leuchter found no cyanide in Crematorium II despite gathering seven samples. Pressac stated that this crematorium was known to be the most widely used of all the crematoria and that Leuchter purposely avoided those parts of the gas chamber where he could have found cyanide. Pressac examined a videotape of Leuchter's sample gathering in Crematorium II and found it wanting in a number of respects.<sup>55</sup> Pressac's analysis is confirmed by the Institute's finding that Crematorium II shows the highest concentrations of cyanide among the six gassing sites it tested. Since none of Leuchter's samples revealed cyanide in Crematorium II, this proves that his report cannot be relied on for accurate information. It should also be pointed out in this respect that Leuchter gathered his samples illegally because he never had permission from the Auschwitz authorities to engage in sample gathering.

Not surprisingly, the samples tested by the Institute from the delousing installations show greater concentrations of cyanide than those from the homicidal gas chambers. The Institute states - a point made earlier in this chapter - that a delousing took considerably longer (24 hours according to the Institute) than a homicidal gassing (20 minutes according to the Institute), and that this accounts for the variance. It also needs to be emphasized in this respect that it would take many homicidal gassings to equal the time of one delousing - 72 homicidal gassings at 20 minutes each equals 24 hours. Once intense delousing for a 24 hour period would be more likely produce cyanide traces using Leuchter's methodology than 72 homicidal gassings over a period of months, and there were many more delousings than homicidal gassings. (See the foreword to Appendix III for an explanation of the terminology used in the Institute's report.)

As noted earlier, Crematoria II-V were destroyed by the Germans when they evacuated Auschwitz. These structures, and their gas chambers, now lay in ruins and had been exposed to the elements for more than 45 years when testing began. In this respect it should be noted that a doctor who worked with the Sonderkommando - prisoners who removed bodies from the gas chambers- and a member of the Sonderkommando stated that it was necessary to wash the chambers after each gassing because of the blood and excrement which resulted.<sup>56</sup> The Institute noted, after conducting extensive tests, that

rain would elute the cyanide in these structures. The Institute did tests which showed that cyanide could be eluted by up to 90% when flushed with water. The Institute noted that the highest concentrations of cyanide which were found in Crematorium II was "because many fragments of the gas chamber were to a great degree protected from precipitation." On the other hand, the delousing facilities were not destroyed and thus not subjected to the elements. It appears, therefore, that Leuchter deliberately avoided those areas of Crematorium II which would have yielded positive results.

The Institute also tested the cellars of Block 11, the execution block where prisoners were hanged or shot. As noted in Chapter 6, in his memoirs camp commandant Rudolf Hoess wrote that the first gassing of prisoners occurred in that block.<sup>57</sup> This was also established at subsequent trials in post-war Poland. Leuchter had avoided gathering any samples from Block 11. The Institute found concentrations of cyanide in two of its three samples. Moreover, the low concentrations found in Block 11 when compared with the other structures is consistent with what is known about that structure — that it was abandoned as a gassing site early on because of its unsuitability.<sup>58</sup> The presence of cyanide in the cellar of a known execution block will challenge the explanation talents of even the most creative deniers.

Probably the most troubling part of the Institute's report for deniers is what was not found. The Institute gathered samples from the living quarters of prisoners which tested negative for cyanide. In order to understand the significance of this finding, it is necessary to know something about Zyklon B.

Zyklon B was not developed for the purpose of killing people. It was intended to be an insecticide to protect people. The manufacturer's manual on Zyklon B, referred to earlier, makes this quite clear when it refers to using the gas on furniture, mattresses, pillows, etc:

Holocaust denier Friedrich Berg has reproduced studies from German sources in the 1930s and 1940s dealing with Zyklon B. These studies show that Zyklon B was intended to delouse clothing, trains, ships, passenger vehicles and areas which house foodstuffs.<sup>59</sup> A 1943 order by the Reich Minister of Labor for foreign workers states:

"All rooms must be cleaned daily. The rooms and their inhabitants must be regularly examined for instances of vermin. Proper installations for the extermination of vermin must be available."<sup>60</sup>

The problem is that, to date, nowhere in the literature on Zyklon B cited by deniers is it even suggested that it should be used in a morgue.<sup>61</sup> Rather, its purpose was to be used in places where people live or places where people might gather, such as a train or ship. A study appearing in a German scientific journal in 1942 which was co authored by Gerhard Peters, the author of the classic study of prussic acid published in 1933, mentions delousing of large mills where food was kept, military barracks, military hospitals, fruits and railway cars. The study notes that in the fall and winter months of 1940/41 "millions and millions of cubic meters and lodging areas had to be rid of bugs by gassing with Zyklon prussic acid, to make secure for our soldiers the peace in winter they deserved." Nothing is said about morgues. Similarly, a 1942 article in a German scientific journal mentions storage rooms but says nothing about places where the dead are stored. Moreover, these two studies were undertaken to test the efficiency of prussic acid in cold temperatures. A morgue would have been the ideal place to conduct these tests since it must be kept cold. But nowhere was a morgue mentioned in either study. A German

study from 1944 states that the clothing and equipment of approximately 25 million had been fumigated with hydrocyanic acid. However, nowhere is it suggested that a morgue should be deloused. Rather, the delousings occurred where people were housed or where food is stored.<sup>62</sup>

Given the stated purpose of Zyklon B, deniers must explain the following: how is it that amounts of Zyklon B could be found in morgues and the cellar of a known execution block (Block 11), places of death, but none in the barracks where people lived? It is precisely in these living barracks where one would expect to find large traces of hydrocyanic acid. The aforementioned studies make it quite clear that places where people live or gather are the target areas for the gas.

Even the Institute appeared to be surprised by the lack of Zyklon B in the living barracks samples it tested. The Institute stated, in this respect, that there was probably at least one known fumigation of the barracks with Zyklon B during typhus epidemic in the summer of 1942.<sup>63</sup> However, the Institute also noted that the period of the typhus epidemic in the summer of 1942 occurred prior to the building of the Birkenau crematoria, the first of which came into operation in mid March 1943 and the last in June 1943, therefore discrediting the denier claim that these morgues needed to be deloused because of the typhus epidemic.

Unlike the morgues, the living barracks were not destroyed by the retreating German forces. They are still standing in their original form in Auschwitz. They have not been subjected to the elements in the same manner as the destroyed crematoria morgues. Therefore, if these living barracks had been continuously deloused, as they should have been, there would be much higher traces of the gas showing up in these structures than in the crematoria.

The Institute's findings have totally discredited the Leuchter Report. The embarrassment caused to deniers by the Institute can be seen from the fact that in the years since the report was released, there has rarely been any mention of it in denier literature.<sup>63a</sup> The often stated challenge by deniers for some third party to investigate Leuchter's findings has now been forgotten. Rather, deniers continue to disseminate Leuchter's report without criticism as if it was the final word on these issues.

## The "Gassing Cellar"

In 1988 French denier critic Jean - Claude Pressac published a massive analysis of the Auschwitz gas chambers. The study is based on research conducted at Auschwitz. Pressac located a number of documents, many of which were unknown at the time. He reproduced these documents in his study. Holocaust deniers, forever trying to find a silver lining inside the cloud, attempted to downplay the significance of the documents by claiming that they by no means meant that homicidal gassings were occurring at Auschwitz. At the time that *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* was published, Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research had not undertaken its study of these structures. Throughout the following discussion it should be kept in mind that the Institute's forensic analysis, reproduced in Appendix III, makes perfectly clear that these documents are referring to the use of

Zyklon B in the crematoria gas chambers. The following is a discussion of the "criminal traces" Pressac found in his research and the attempted denier responses.

One of the best known documents is dated January 29, 1943. It was written by the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Management. The "gassing cellar" document reads in part:

"Krematorium II has been completed but for minor details. . . The furnaces have been lit... Because of the frost, it has not yet been possible to remove the formwork from the ceiling of the corpse cellar. This is of no consequence, however, as the gassing cellar [Vergasungskeller] can be used to this end [as a morgue]."64

This document is stating that in Crematorium II there is a corpse cellar and a gassing cellar, and that this gassing cellar can be used as a corpse cellar. The document has caused no shortage of far fetched explanations by deniers.

In 1977 Arthur Butz argued that the word vergasung meant

carburetion, turning something into gas.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, he argued, the document did not refer to the poison gas Zyklon B. Butz appears not to have noticed that another German definition for the word is "gassing."<sup>66</sup> The political and military definition for the verb vergasen is "to gas."<sup>67</sup> Pressac was able to show that Butz's 1977 interpretation was incorrect. Butz conceded, in 1992, that Pressac's documentation on Crematorium II "show that they [the crematoria ovens] were not of the design I assumed. . ."<sup>68</sup> However, Butz now had another explanation. He argued that the "gassing cellar" was not really in Crematorium II but somewhere else.<sup>69</sup> He did not produce a shred of evidence to support this latest thesis. The document in question clearly states: "Subject: Krematorium II. State of Construction." Moreover, Butz could not give any other location for such an underground structure. He merely stated that "I assume that it was somewhere in the vicinity..."<sup>70</sup> In fact, there were no other underground structures in the vicinity, except for the morgues of Crematorium III, which like Crematorium II, were underground.

Butz and other deniers who have attempted to place the "gassing cellar" outside of Crematorium II have ignored another document also dated January 29, 1943 which states that Crematorium II "is completed ...but for secondary details (the formwork cannot yet be removed from corpse cellar 2 because of the frost)".<sup>71</sup> Recall that the "gassing cellar" document refers to "frost" on "the ceiling of the corpse cellar" which prevents its use as a morgue. Thus, on the basis of this second document, it is possible to identify the "gassing cellar" as Corpse Cellar I of Crematorium II because Corpse Cellar II had a frost problem. The completion document on Crematorium II identifies two corpse cellars.<sup>72</sup> In 1997 Butz offered yet a third explanation for "gassing cellar." He now argued that the term referred to an air raid shelter the purpose of which was to protect its occupants from gas attacks. This was not a new explanation. It had, in fact, been offered by another denier.<sup>73</sup> However, not one piece of evidence has been produced to support such a view.

Although no denier will admit to it, the attempt to turn the "gassing cellar" of Crematorium II into an

air raid shelter appears to be based on the fact that in 1944 Crematorium I, built early in Auschwitz's existence, was converted into an air raid shelter. However, there is no evidence that it was ever contemplated prior to 1944 that either Crematorium I, or any other crematorium, would serve such a function. No documents from either the camp archives or the recently discovered Auschwitz Archives in Moscow have been produced to support such a view. Moreover, deniers who make this argument conceal the fact that an air raid shelter would not be called a gassing cellar. The German verb *vergasen* denotes that a gassing is actually occurring. Thus, a gassing cellar is a structure where a gassing is taking place, not a place to protect people from gassing. A protection cellar would have been called a *luftschutzkeller* (air protection cellar), the key word being *schutz* which means safety or protection.<sup>74</sup>

Robert Faurisson offered yet another interpretation for gassing cellar. He argued that the word could mean a place in the cellar of Crematorium II where gas was stored, a "cellar for gassing [material]." The justification for such storage being that the morgues would be deloused — an argument examined earlier. Faurisson's problem, as he acknowledged, is that the German word for storage is *vorrat*.<sup>75</sup> Thus, for his interpretation to work the word *gasvorratskeller*, gas storage cellar, would need to be used, not gassing cellar, a place where gassing actually occurs.

Ironically, it is Butz himself who may have unwittingly provided the real context in which *vergasung* was used. In 1977 he wrote that during World War I the German military used the word as "attacking an enemy with gas."<sup>76</sup> Not even deniers deny that Nazi Germany considered the Jews as mortal enemies.

One of the reasons that deniers are desperate to dissociate gas from morgue I of Crematorium II is because of other incriminatory evidence. In particular is a letter from the Auschwitz Central Construction Management that deals with Crematoria II and III, which were built along the same lines. The letter states "that cellar I [in both morgues] should be preheated with air coming from the rooms of the three forced draught installations."<sup>77</sup> However, morgues should be kept cool. Why would a morgue need to be "preheated"? Heat was helpful during the gassing phase for Zyklon B. The patent for Zyklon B states: "Method for generating the necessary heat for the vaporization of poisonous substances for gases used for pest control."<sup>78</sup>

Faurisson tried to downplay the significance of the preheating letter by pointing to a subsequent letter in March 1943 from the crematoria builders which stated that the "hot air supply installation for [corpse cellar] I has to be eliminated because" of the elimination of three electric motors damaged by the high temperatures.<sup>79</sup> He has never explained why it was ever considered necessary by the Auschwitz authorities to heat up a morgue which had earlier been referred to as a "gassing cellar." The discovery of the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow suggests that the technical problems of heating the "gassing cellar" were overcome. A bill from the oven builders to the Auschwitz authorities requests payment for a "warm air induction system" [*warmluftzufuhrung*] for Crematorium II installed in June 1943.<sup>80</sup>

The pre-heating letter of March 6, 1943 also contains a reference to an "undressing room" in Crematoria II and III. That this "undressing room" is actually one of the morgues located in the cellar is made clear by five subsequent reports from Topf and Sons, the oven builders, which mention an "undressing cellar" in these two structures.<sup>81</sup> One of the letters specifically mentions "Undressing Cellar 2", signifying that it is Corpse Cellars II in Crematoria II and III which are the undressing cellars.<sup>82</sup>

An "undressing room" or "undressing cellar" would be incompatible with a morgue. There would be no reason to call a morgue an "undressing cellar" unless it was anticipated that people would be undressing in the facility. Why would people be undressing in a morgue? It makes sense if live

prisoners were entering the morgue. They would undress in the "undressing cellar", Corpse Cellar II, and proceed to the "gassing cellar", Corpse Cellar I. The dimensions of the two cellars support this view. People would need more room to undress than to stand and be gassed. Corpse Cellar II was 4219 square feet while Corpse Cellar I was 2264 square feet.<sup>83</sup>

Faurisson argued that undressing room could refer to the undressing of the dead corpses stored in the crematoria. However, the German word used in the March 6 letter was "auskleideraum." This same word had been used to denote a place where live people undressed in the Auschwitz central bathing area, a place where new prisoners took showers.<sup>84</sup> Faurisson was not sure of his interpretation because he wrote that "it is not impossible, but I haven't been able to verify, that in a morgue the same word [auskleideraum] is applied to the room in which clothes were removed from the corpses."<sup>85</sup>

The six documents which speak of "undressing room" and "undressing cellar" clearly show that the Auschwitz Central Construction Management did not, at the time these reports were written, think of this structure as a morgue. Nowhere in these six documents is the undressing installation referred to as a corpse cellar. This is clearest in the March 14 letter where there is specific reference to Corpse Cellar I and Undressing Cellar II. Thus, cellar I was still a corpse cellar but cellar II was to serve a different function.

Arthur Butz apparently realized the dilemma. He came up with one of his familiar rationalizations. The undressing cellar is a place where the corpses were undressed. They would then be stored in Corpse Cellar I where they would await cremation.<sup>86</sup> Butz, however, failed to explain why it would be necessary to remove the corpses from a 4219 square foot morgue to a 2264 square foot morgue. Rather, it would have been logical to undress the corpses in cellar II and leave them there rather than move them to cellar I; or the corpses could have been undressed in cellar I rather than undressing them in cellar II and moving them to cellar I. The only logical interpretation is that the prisoners undressed themselves in cellar II and walked into cellar I where they were gassed. The bodies were then removed from cellar I to be cremated.

Another series of documents deal with air extraction devices from the cellars of Crematoria II and III. Since these structures were underground, an air extraction device would have been needed to remove the poison gas. Deniers argue that these documents show that the air extraction device for cellar 2, the "undressing cellar", was stronger than the device for cellar I, the gassing cellar.<sup>87</sup> They argue that if the extraction was really for poison gas, then the extractor for cellar I would have to be more powerful. However, it is quite possible that the Auschwitz construction authorities envisaged that cellar 2 might also serve as a gassing facility. Since cellar 2 was much larger than cellar I, it would need a larger extraction device..

The priority for an air extraction device, however, was clearly for Corpse Cellar I. A letter dated February 11, 1943 from the head of the Auschwitz Construction Management underlines the fact that a 3.5 horsepower motor is still missing for Crematorium III. "[I]t is precisely this blower destined for C-cellar I for which our need is the most urgent. Also, a 7.5 HP motor for the No. 550 air extraction blower for C-cellar 2."<sup>88</sup> The completion document for Crematorium II lists ventilation and extraction ducts for Corpse Cellar I, but none for Corpse Cellar 2. This same document also specifies a "gas tight door" for Corpse Cellar I.<sup>89</sup> Although a ventilation system was eventually installed in Corpse Cellar II, there were no gas tight doors in this cellar.

Another document Pressac found for the cellar of Crematorium II mentioned "4 wire mesh introduction devices" and "4 wooden covers."<sup>90</sup> The four insertion openings, as noted in Chapter 5, can be seen on

the roof of Crematorium II.<sup>91</sup> They are aligned in an area over Corpse Cellar I, the "gassing cellar." These are the spaces into which Zyklon B poison were inserted. Deniers criticized this finding because, as Pressac acknowledged, the document states that these devices are to be located over Corpse Cellar 2, the "undressing cellar."<sup>92</sup> Pressac, however, noted that the author of the document simply made an error in designation because the photos taken of these devices show them over Corpse Cellar I. Moreover, Pressac was able to show the nature of the inversion error which caused the incorrect designation of Corpse Cellar II as opposed to cellar I.<sup>93</sup> The further denial claim that these photos have been altered will be examined in Chapter 10.

Following the publication of his massive study on the gas chambers, Pressac was able to obtain access to the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow. These were documents seized by the Soviets when they liberated the camp in January 1945, and are now available to researchers. The existence of these documents became known in 1989. A letter dated March 2, 1943 from the builders of the 46 crematoria ovens in the Birkenau section of the camp to the Auschwitz Central Construction Management states:

"Re: Crematorium II. We acknowledge receipt of your telegram stating: "Immediate shipment of 10 gas detectors [Gasprüfer]... we can tell you that for two weeks now we have been making inquiries of five different firms about the apparatus you want indicating traces of prussic acid [Anzeigegeräte für Blausäure-Reste]."94

The reference to prussic acid clearly shows that it was envisioned that Zyklon B was to be used in Crematorium II — a structure which several weeks earlier was identified as having a "gassing cellar."

This document has caused many problems for deniers because it directly connects Zyklon B with Crematorium II. Carlo Mattogno claimed that the document was a forgery because the type of gas detector mentioned is not the one which would have been used to detect Zyklon B.<sup>95</sup> However, the important point is that the builders of the ovens believed that they were being asked to locate such a device. They only misidentified the device that was needed. The key question is: Why would they believe it necessary to locate a device to detect prussic acid? Clearly the reason for the crematoria was known to the oven builders. Arthur Butz hypothesized that the prussic acid reference was to fabrics to be incinerated which "were known to present a danger of evolution of HCN [prussic acid] in such incineration." He prefaced this theory by stating that "I do not have a document that says so. . ."96 Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research's findings of more prussic acid in the cellar of Crematorium II than in the other gassing facilities, discussed earlier, show the real meaning of the prussic acid reference. Predictably, neither Mattogno nor Butz mentioned this report.

One of the more incriminating documents to surface was an inventory of equipment installed in Corpse Cellar I of Crematorium III which listed "14 showers" and one "gas tight door" [gasdichte Tür].<sup>97</sup> Why would 14 showers be placed in a morgue which had a gas tight door? Recall from Chapter 5 that there was much eyewitness testimony about using phony showers to deceive victims who were about to be gassed.

Faurisson argued that early crematoriums had a room to wash corpses.<sup>98</sup> However, he ignored the fact that Pressac had examined inventory drawings for Corpse Cellar I of Crematorium III which showed that none of its three water taps were connected to the "showers,"<sup>99</sup> meaning that these "showers" were

fake. Moreover, it is known from the completion document for Crematorium II — which was the twin for Crematorium III — that there were three washrooms on the ground floor, not the basement.<sup>100</sup> Faurisson simply could not explain why a morgue would have showers and a "gas tight door." Pressac also examined the buildings in the camp which had legitimate showers. Based on the space allotted to showers in these buildings, the 2264 square feet of Corpse Cellar I should have had 115 showerheads, not 14.<sup>101</sup> Pressac also examined the ruins of Corpse Cellar I of Crematorium II and found that seven wooden bases to which similar phony showerheads had been installed were still visible.<sup>102</sup>

The presence of "gas tight" doors in Corpse Cellars I of Crematoriums II and III has generated no shortage of explanations from deniers. Faurisson claimed that such doors would be needed to protect the area from explosions which can be caused by the crematoria ovens.<sup>103</sup> However, the completion document for Crematorium II only mentions such a door for Corpse Cellar I.<sup>104</sup> If these doors were for protection they should have been on the ground floor where people worked and the ovens were located. There were 11 rooms on the same floor as the 15 ovens in Crematorium II. The description of these rooms show that they were places where people would be located. Yet, none had a gas tight door.<sup>105</sup> Why then would only a morgue in a basement need such a door? It was also claimed that they would prevent the stench of rotting bodies.<sup>106</sup> However, if this was true then mere should have also been such doors for Corpse Cellar II, which was nearly twice the size of Corpse Cellar I.

Not as much is known about Crematoriums IV and V as Crematoriums II and III.<sup>107</sup> Nevertheless, there are still a number of incriminating documents dealing with these two structures. There are work orders requesting four "gas tight doors" for Crematorium IV and two "gas doors" for Crematorium V. There are also requests for Crematorium IV for "gas tight windows", anchors for "gas tight doors" and an iron bar for "gas doors."<sup>108</sup>

The meaning of these requests for Crematorium IV became clear in 1982 with the discovery of a worker's report dated March 2, 1943 which speaks of the "ground covered with hard fill, tamped down and floor concreted in gas chamber [gaskammer]". On the following days his reports make reference to "both chambers" and "the second chamber."<sup>109</sup> Clearly these reports show that the worker knew that he was not in a regular morgue, but another type of structure. The finding of residues of cyanide in Crematorium IV by Cracow's Institute for Forensic Research confirms the accuracy of the worker's report.

When the "gas chamber" document first surfaced in 1982, Faurisson argued that this was really a delousing gas chamber.<sup>110</sup> However, when he attempted to answer Pressac nine years later he did not specifically refer to this document. Rather, he made general references to the fact that gas chamber was a word that could be used for delousing chamber.<sup>111</sup> He was probably reluctant at this point to concede that any type of gassing would take place in structures which were built to house dead bodies and cremate them. This argument would fall to another denier.

## The Metamorphosis

The discrediting of the Leuchter Report and the vast array of documents reproduced by Pressac has done much to undermine denier arguments. Indeed, the aforementioned analysis shows that in these crematoria there was a "gassing cellar" and a "gas chamber", "gas tight doors", "gas tight windows",

"undressing cellars", "showers" in the morgues, air extraction devices for corpse cellars, a document mentioning four introduction devices on the roof of Crematorium II, and the heating of a morgue identified as a "gassing cellar." The finding of residues of prussic acid in these structures (Appendix III) leaves no doubt as to what all of this evidence means.

In 1994 denier Carlo Mattogno offered yet another theory for these documents. He claimed that at the end of 1942 the SS decided to install disinfestation chambers in Crematoria II and IV. He then claimed that the word gassing cellar "designates a disinfestation basement."<sup>112</sup> Thus, though he did not specifically say so, he was also arguing that the "gas chamber" document for Crematorium IV, discussed earlier, was really intended as a delousing installation for clothing. His argument is distinguishable from Leuchter's and Faurisson's, examined earlier, because they were arguing that the physical morgues themselves were being deloused. Mattogno was arguing that these structures were intended to be used to house delousing facilities.

The question may arise as to why Mattogno did not simply claim that the crematoria were deloused, as other deniers had done (see the discussion at footnotes 58-63), rather than making the claim that these structures were actually intended to be used as delousing installations. The reason, though never specifically stated, is that assuming *arguendo* that these structures were deloused, as claimed by Leuchter and Faurisson, it would not explain why they would be referred to as a "gassing cellar" and "gas chamber" in camp documents. For example, ships that were deloused with Zyklon B were not called gassing ships. Mattogno recognized, as other deniers did not, that the "gassing cellar" and "gas chamber" designations could only be explained as places that were intended to be used for gassings on a regular basis. Since he would not admit that people were being gassed, the only alternative was to argue that the structures were intended to delouse clothing.

Mattogno did not present one shred of evidence that there was ever a delousing chamber placed in any crematorium in Auschwitz - Birkenau or that the idea was ever contemplated by the camp authorities. He argued that in other German camps one could find a delousing chamber in a crematorium, but could not identify such a structure in an Auschwitz crematorium. Moreover, the completion document for Crematorium II gives an analysis of everything in the structure, but says nothing about delousing installations.<sup>113</sup> There were already nine separate delousing structures in the camp which were used for delousing. The camp authorities were also in the process of erecting the Central Sauna which housed a number of delousing facilities. He could provide no evidence that such structures were ever to be found in the morgue of any German crematorium. In fact, he did not explain why a "corpse cellar" would be used for such a purpose.

Moreover, if his theory about placing a delousing structure in a crematorium in Auschwitz was correct, there should have been a crematorium in the Birkenau Central Sauna which became operational in late 1943. The Central Sauna had a number of new and more modern delousing facilities and legitimate showers for prisoners. Yet, no one has claimed that there was a crematorium in this structure.

Mattogno found a document in the Auschwitz State Museum Archives from 1941 that identified a "gassing room"[*vergasungsraum*] in two of the camp's delousing facilities.<sup>114</sup> He concluded that this meant that the term *vergasung* as used in the "gassing cellar" document discussed earlier referred to delousing and not homicidal gassings. However, what he really did was to discredit all other denier explanations examined earlier. He had connected the term directly with Zyklon B. It is only natural that the term *vergasung* would be used in connection with delousing since clothes were disinfested with the gas. However, as noted in the prior chapter, the word "*vergasungsapparate*" [gassing apparatus] was used by the Advisor for Jewish Affairs with the Reich Ministry for Occupied Eastern Territories when

he mentioned eliminating Jews" who could not work by using gas.115

In 1995 a denier publication claimed that Mattogno located a document in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow which refers to a "delousing chamber for crematory II." However, the actual document when finally reproduced said nothing about Crematorium II, but referred to the building known as the Central Sauna which had delousing installations. A number of drawings by the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency for disinfestation installations do not show any of these structures being placed in the morgues or the crematoria which housed the morgues.116

Although the German word entlausung [delousing] generally meant to disinfect clothing and furniture, its use in connection with a structure identified as a "corpse cellar" would have provided evidence to its true meaning in this instance had there actually been such a document. Specifically, there is a letter dated April 11, 1942 from SS Major General Dr. Harald Turner, the chief of the German administration in Serbia, where the word is used to denote the gassing of victims. It reads in part:

"Already a few months ago I shot dead all the Jews I could get my hands on in this area, concentrated all the Jewish women and children in the camp and with the help of the SD [Security Police] got my hands on a "delousing van" [entlausungswagen], that in about 14 days to 4 weeks will have brought about the definitive clearing out [raumung] of the camp.. ."117

Just so there is no misunderstanding as to what Turner means when he uses the term "delousing van", these are the only words placed in quotation marks in his lengthy letter. Otto Ohlendorf, a general in the Einsatzgruppen killing squads discussed in Chapter 2, testified that in the Spring of 1942 Himmler gave the order that gas vans were to be used for the killing of women and children as opposed to the prior method of shooting. 118

The attempt to turn the homicidal gas chambers of Birkenau into delousing chambers has an obvious appeal for deniers. It will allow them to "explain" the presence of cyanide in these structures. To date, however, Mattogno appears to be the only denier to make this argument. Faurisson has waffled on the issue while Butz has rejected it in favor of arguments examined earlier.119 The main problem for deniers in using this argument is that they are admitting that a principal purpose for the crematoria was to use Zyklon B. Most deniers will probably feel uncomfortable in making such an argument for structures identified in a number of German documents, examined earlier, as "corpse cellars."120

Arguing that the morgues were delousing chambers or had such chambers installed in them also has other problems. At the time the four crematoria in Birkenau were being built, there were at least nine known structures in the camp for delousing clothing and furniture.121 Seven of these structures were in the main camp. There were also two delousing buildings in the Birkenau area of the camp, still standing today. There is no evidence that at any time it was necessary to use the crematoria for this purpose. By the time the first crematorium became operational in March 1943 the worst of the typhus epidemic of 1942 had passed. Typhus prevention was the principal reason for delousing. In December 1943 the Central Sauna was completed which provided new and improved delousing facilities.

The real dilemma deniers will have when attempting to turn the homicidal gas chambers into delousing chambers is to explain why these facilities are referred to as "corpse cellars" in official camp

documents examined earlier. Why would a morgue be used to delouse clothing when there were already many other structures in the camp to serve such a function? Apparently, deniers who promote such a view would have us believe that clothes were being deloused at the same time bodies were being stored there!

The findings by the Cracow Institute for Forensic Research will also complicate those deniers who seek to transform morgues into delousing chambers. Since the Institute found cyanide in all five crematoria, deniers will have to argue that all of these structures were used for delousing. Mattogno only claimed that Crematoria II and IV were intended for such use. What about the other three? Moreover, as noted earlier, the Institute also found cyanide in the cellars of a known execution block. Even deniers will probably be hesitant to turn an execution block into a delousing facility.

Deniers will also face the problem of integrating an argument that the crematoria were used as delousing facilities with the Leuchter Report. Leuchter, as will be recalled, stated that these structures could not be used as delousing facilities.<sup>122</sup> Arguments that these facilities were used for delousing directly challenge Leuchter's credibility. Deniers, no doubt, will attempt to use both arguments simultaneously. That is, cite Leuchter for the proposition that there could not have been gas chambers in the crematoria, but then argue that such chambers existed for delousing purposes when confronted with all of the evidence cited in this chapter.

## The Smoking Gun

One of the important pieces of evidence that was examined in chapter 1 was the use of the term "special treatment" [sonderbehandlung] by the German authorities to designate the murder of prisoners. There is a great deal of evidence linking this term to Auschwitz.

French researcher Jean - Claude Pressac found in the archives of the Auschwitz State Museum that every document in a 120 item of inventory of material needed for completion of the four crematoria in Birkenau, dated December 10 to 18, 1942, was captioned: "Concerning Prisoner of War Camp Auschwitz (Carrying Out of Special Treatment)" [Durchfuhring der Sonderbehandlung].<sup>123</sup>

Similar documents mentioning "special treatment" in connection with the Auschwitz construction authorities have now surfaced in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow. These documents were seized by the Soviet forces when they liberated the camp in January 1945.<sup>124</sup> One important memo dated January 29, 1943 deals with Crematorium II and electricity problems. It states: "The functioning is limited to existing machines (therefore enabling a concurrent burning with special treatment)."<sup>125</sup>

The "machines" mentioned can only be ovens which burn bodies. This memo is stating that cremation and special treatment can occur simultaneously. The importance of this memo is that it directly links the "special treatment" to taking place in the crematorium. The date of the memo, January 29, 1943, is also highly significant. Recall that on the same day the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction

Agency wrote a memo stating that there was a "gassing cellar" in Crematorium II. Two months earlier a member of the construction agency wrote a memo designating a cellar in Crematorium II as a "special cellar" [sonderkeller].<sup>126</sup>

The linking of cremation to special treatment as murder can be found in memo dated June 15, 1944 from the Gestapo headquarters in Dusseldorf, Germany. The memo is stamped "Secret". The subject of the memo is: "Special Treatment For Foreign Workers." The relevant portion reads:

"... I request that those persons subjected to special treatment be sent to a crematorium to be cremated if possible... for purposes of intimidation, the proclamation by means of posters of the execution of the death sentence in the labor camp will be continued." <sup>127</sup>

As noted in Chapter 1 of this study, there is a great deal of primary documentation from the period which directly states that special treatment is the killing of prisoners.<sup>128</sup> In Chapter 5, two documents from the camp authorities were cited which show that in Auschwitz special treatment meant the disappearance of prisoners.<sup>129</sup>

The term has caused deniers to come up with some of their well known "explanations." In particular are three memos from the Auschwitz camp authorities from 1942, two of which were cited in chapter 1. The first memo gives the driver permission "for dispatch of a truck to load gas for disinfection of the camp." The second memo gives permission for dispatch of a truck to Dessau, where Zyklon B was stored, "to load material for special treatment." The third memo gives permission for a five ton truck to go to Dessau "to load material for Jewish resettlement."<sup>130</sup>

When these three memos were first reproduced by Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg in 1971, he was showing that Zyklon B had two functions. One was for legitimate delousing of the camp, as noted in the first memo, while the other was for murder, as noted by the references to "special treatment" and "Jewish resettlement" in the other two memos. Indeed, why would the authorities want to camouflage the word disinfection by calling it "special treatment"?

Denier Mark Weber argued that because the first memo mentioned disinfection this meant that "special treatment" and "Jewish resettlement" in the other two memos also meant disinfection.<sup>131</sup> Weber, as usual, made this leap of faith without showing any evidence that "special treatment" had anything to do with delousing. Moreover, he literally ignored all of the evidence which shows special treatment to mean execution. The explanation was the only one he could offer under the circumstances since he was looking at a document that directly linked "special treatment" with poison gas.

A summary of the above documentary evidence on special treatment means that the term can be directly tied to three related circumstances. The truck driver memo ties the term directly to the acquisition of poison gas. The Crematorium II memo on special treatment and burning occurring simultaneously ties the term to taking place in the crematoria. The two camp documents cited in Chapter 5 show that it means the disappearance of prisoners. The report of the Cracow Institute (Appendix III) shows cyanide in all of the crematoria. All of this primary evidence is irrefutable proof that special treatment means that prisoners were being gassed in the crematoria.

Denier Carlo Mattogno also argued that special treatment meant sanitary measures against typhus. He cited a document found by Pressac which mentions "special measures" (sondermassnahmen) relating to sanitary issues in the Central Sauna. The problem is that the special measures document, which specifically relates to sanitary issues, says nothing about "special treatment."<sup>132</sup> Pressac clearly linked the "special measures" memo to the Central Sauna, the sanitary building which was under construction at the time the memo was issued in June 1943. However, the memo says nothing about the "special treatment" which was taking place in the crematoria.

Pressac discovered a memo from the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency, dated July 1942, requesting "four huts [Stuck Baracken] for the special treatment of the prisoners at Birkenau." Mattogno argued that this meant sanitation even though the document says nothing about sanitation or the delousing of clothing. The memo specifically calls for the "sonderbehandlung der haftlinge [prisoners] in Birkenau."<sup>133</sup> This memo causes problems for deniers because prior to its discovery there was a great deal of eyewitness testimony from perpetrators and victims about the building of huts during the summer of 1942 in the wooded area of Birkenau where prisoners were gassed. These huts were used for undressing. The prisoners were then gassed in one of two bunkers.<sup>134</sup> The memo is consistent with all of the testimony that describes these facilities as being constructed in the summer of 1942, prior to the completion of the four Birkenau crematoria which first became operational in March 1943.

Like Weber before him, Mattogno could not make the documents say what he wanted them to. Also, like Weber, Mattogno literally ignored all of the documentation which showed "special treatment" to mean the murder of prisoners and their disappearance from Auschwitz.

The paper trail which has been built on the Auschwitz crematoria will undoubtedly lead deniers to make the following arguments. Before prisoners entered Auschwitz they had to take showers in the crematoria, thus explaining the reference to such facilities. The showers were located in Corpse Cellars I of Crematoria II and III. The prisoners would undress in the "undressing cellars" of Corpse Cellars II in these two structures. After showering, their clothing would be deloused with Zyklon B in the shower room, thus explaining the reference to a "gassing cellar." The cellar would also be used as a morgue when prisoners were not showering or having their clothing deloused there.<sup>135</sup>

John C. Zimmerman

Holocaust Denial

PART III: IDEOLOGIES

## CHAPTER 10

CREMATORIA AND

BURNING PITS

Perhaps no aspect of Holocaust denial is more widely disputed than the issue of body disposal at Auschwitz. Holocaust deniers argue that it was not possible to dispose of the 1.1 million killed at the camp.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, they claim that this many people were not killed at Auschwitz. The guru of body disposal issues at Auschwitz is denier Carlo Mattogno, whose writings have been dealt with elsewhere in this book. This chapter will deal with his body disposal arguments.

In 1941 Auschwitz had two double muffle coke fired furnaces built by the German firm of Topf and Sons. An additional double muffle oven was added in the Spring of 1942. Each muffle can be considered an oven, so that there were six ovens in the camp during this time. The six ovens were in the main camp known as the Stammlager or Auschwitz 1. These six ovens were housed in a crematorium known as Krema I in much of the literature. In the summer of 1942 the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency, known as the ZentralBauleitung (hereafter referred to as the Bauleitung), made plans to build four new crematoria in the Birkenau area of the camp, also known as Auschwitz II. These four crematoria housed an additional 46 ovens. Kremas II and III each had five triple muffle furnaces (15 ovens in each) while Kremas IV and V each had a single eight muffle furnace (eight ovens in each). Like the six ovens in the Auschwitz main camp, the 46 new ovens were built by the firm of Topf and Sons and used coke as fuel.<sup>2</sup> None of these facts are disputed by deniers or their critics.

The principal issue that deniers have disputed is the reason the Bauleitung began to build so many new ovens. As noted in Chapter 4, deniers claim the reason for building so many was due to the typhus epidemic which swept the camp in the summer of 1942. Recall, however, that the recently discovered

Auschwitz death books show very few deaths from typhus. A postscript to erroneously attributing typhus as a leading cause of death also arises in the Mogilev prisoner of war camp for Soviet soldiers. It was commonly believed that many of these soldiers died of typhus. However, it is now known that they died from the German policy of extermination through labor.<sup>3</sup>

Historians have long recognized that the extensive building campaign was because the authorities were committing mass murder and wanted an efficient means of disposing of the bodies as well as structures which could be used to gas prisoners. At the time the building began there were two structures in Birkenau which were used for gassing. They were located in the wooded area behind the camp. There was also a gas chamber in the crematorium located in the main camp which housed the six ovens. As noted in the previous chapter, forensic tests done by the Institute For Forensic Research in Cracow, Poland in 1994 found traces of the poisonous hydrocyanic acid in all five crematoria, which was consistent with a great deal of eyewitness testimony and other documents from Auschwitz which show that these structures were used as gas chambers (see Appendix III). The two structures in the wooded area were destroyed by the Germans and hardly any trace remains. However, as will be seen later, there is photographic evidence for one of these structures.

### Origins of the Crematoria

On October 22, 1941, more than six months before the outbreak of the typhus epidemic, the Auschwitz Bauleitung sent a letter to Topf and Sons, builder of the Auschwitz ovens. The letter referred to a previous conversation between the head of the Bauleitung and a representative of Topf and Sons. It informed Topf that the Bauleitung was ordering five triple muffle furnaces, or 15 ovens. The order is also referred to in two subsequent letters of March 5 and March 30, 1942.<sup>4</sup> At the time Auschwitz had four ovens and another double muffle furnace was being built. Therefore, the authorities had six ovens.

Why did the authorities decide to increase the camp's cremation capacity by 3-1/2 times (6 to 21 ovens) when there was no major epidemic in the camp? The answer lies in other events of October 1941, the month that the order was first placed. As noted in Chapter 6, for the period October 7 to 31 the Auschwitz morgue registries - not to be confused with the Auschwitz Death Books - show 1255 deaths of Soviet Prisoners of War. For the period from October 1941 through January 1942 the morgue registries record the deaths of 7343 Soviet POWs of the 9997 brought into the camp, an astounding 73% mortality rate over a four month period.<sup>5</sup> The Auschwitz authorities had plans to greatly expand the camp to hold 125,000 prisoners.<sup>6</sup>

There is also substantial evidence that non - Soviet registered prisoners were being murdered en masse. The Auschwitz Death Books, though incomplete, provide useful information in this regard. They show that from August 4 to September 10, 1941, 1498 registered non Soviet POW prisoners died. An additional 1490 died from October 21 to November 22, 1941.<sup>7</sup> Although there are two death books missing for this period, each death book carries between 1400 and 1500 names. This means that about 6,000 non Soviet prisoners died in the five month period from August to December 1941.<sup>8</sup> Although the total number of prisoners registered in Auschwitz at one time in 1941 is not known, camp records for January 19, 1942 show a total of 11,703 registered prisoners, which includes 1510 Soviet POWs.<sup>9</sup> This means that in the last five months of 1941 more prisoners died than were registered at the beginning of 1942. Camp documents show that of the 36,285 prisoners who were known to have been

in Auschwitz from May 20, 1940 to January 31, 1942, 20,565 cannot be accounted for. From February 1942 to the end of June 1942 approximately 12,500 registered prisoners died.<sup>10</sup> These deaths all occurred before the typhus epidemic of July 1942. This lends further support to the analysis in Chapter 4 of the present study that typhus was not a major cause of death in Auschwitz. In November 1941 the Polish Government in Exile reported, based on information received from the Polish underground, that "[d]uring the winter months, the crematoria ovens have not sufficed for burning all the corpses."<sup>11</sup> Consequently, the origins of the new crematoria can be traced to mass murder.

Our knowledge of Auschwitz is that some time in the Spring of 1942 it became an extermination camp for most of the Jews who arrived there.<sup>12</sup> On October 13, 1942 the head of the Bauleitung stated in a letter: "As regards the construction of the new crematorium building, it was necessary to start immediately in July 1942 because of the situation caused by the special actions."<sup>13</sup> This letter clearly shows that the "special actions" were resulting in dead bodies which needed to be cremated. As noted in Chapter 4, the term "special action" was mentioned 14 times in a diary kept by Auschwitz doctor Johann Kremer for the period from September through November 1942. It meant the killing of prisoners.

Another revealing letter dated August 21, 1942 from the Bauleitung deals with discussions with Topf and Sons on building six new ovens in the Birkenau area of the camp. The letter states that it is anticipated that the new ovens will be built near the "bathing installation for special actions."<sup>14</sup> The new ovens were probably intended to be used on a temporary basis until the crematoria were built. The letter is saying that these special actions are taking place in the "bathing installation." The fact that the ovens are to be located near the "bathing installation" gives a good idea that the "bathing" will be producing dead bodies. The context of the bathing remark should be viewed in light of a great deal of testimony from eyewitnesses, discussed in Chapter 5, that it was a common practice to disguise the gas chambers as showers.<sup>15</sup> As noted in Chapter 9, an inventory of equipment for one of the "corpse cellars" in Krema III lists "14 showers" and a "gas tight door."<sup>16</sup>

It is also possible to discredit the denier argument that the above "special action" memos of August and October 1942 concerned typhus control. A lengthy three page memo issued by the camp commandant on July 23, 1942 deals with quarantine and other sanitary measures to combat the typhus epidemic which was sweeping the camp. Nowhere in this lengthy memo is the term "special action" used.<sup>16a</sup> This means that the term had nothing to do typhus, quarantines or other sanitary measures in the summer of 1942.

## Necessity of the Crematoria

As noted above, deniers attribute the building of the four new crematoria and 46 additional ovens to the typhus epidemic that swept the camp in the summer of 1942.<sup>17</sup> Although it was shown in Chapter 4 that typhus was responsible for very few deaths,<sup>18</sup> it is still possible to test the necessity of the building based on the amount of deaths of registered prisoners had they died of typhus. In other words, assuming that all of the deaths of registered prisoners were due to typhus, was it necessary to build four new crematoria and 46 ovens to handle these deaths? The only way to test the necessity is to compare it to deaths in other concentration camps and the cremation capacity of those camps. While such comparisons are difficult because they depend on knowing the amount of deaths and cremation

capacity of other camps, there is one camp that affords the information needed to make the comparison.

Gusen was a camp in the Mauthausen concentration camp complex. Mauthausen and Gusen are located in Austria. Gusen was comprised of three camps. In February 1941, Gusen had a Topf double muffle furnace, two ovens, installed in order to handle the deaths there. No additional ovens were added during the remainder of Gusen's existence.<sup>19</sup> Prior to March 1943, Auschwitz had three Topf double muffle ovens, or three times the cremation capacity of Gusen. In 1942 there were 7410 deaths in Gusen.<sup>20</sup> In 1942 about 44,000 registered prisoners died in Auschwitz with an additional 1100 Soviet POWs listed in the morgue registries.<sup>21</sup> These numbers do not include prisoners murdered upon arrival because they did not receive registration numbers. Therefore, Auschwitz had six times more officially registered deaths than Gusen and three times the cremation capacity. Also

revealing is an examination of the highest three consecutive months of deaths in both camps. The highest three months of deaths of registered

prisoners in Auschwitz was 21,900 for the period from August through October 1942. The highest three month period for Gusen was from December 1942 through February 1943 when 3851 prisoners died. Thus, in the highest three month period Auschwitz death totals for registered prisoners were six times the Gusen amount.

A comparison of these death statistics suggests that Auschwitz could have accommodated the excess amount of deaths over that of Gusen by doubling its cremation capacity from 6 to 12 ovens. If Auschwitz really needed 46 additional ovens, a nearly nine fold expansion of its existing capacity, then Gusen needed to expand to at least 12 ovens. Yet, no such expansion was ever undertaken.

The evidence for this comes from data available on the Gusen ovens which show that each oven could burn on the average about 26 bodies per day, so that both ovens together could burn at least 52 bodies per day or about 1500 per month.<sup>22</sup> This means that the six Auschwitz ovens could have consumed about 4500 per month. However, as will be seen later, these ovens could also substantially exceed this number. The highest monthly death total for Gusen was 1719.<sup>23</sup> The highest monthly death total for registered prisoners at Auschwitz was 9000 in September 1942. Yet, as early as October 1941 the Bauleitung had ordered 15 additional ovens. Even if we accept Mattogno's low estimate of the burning capacity of the six Auschwitz ovens as being 120 per day, or 20 per muffle,<sup>24</sup> the existing six ovens in place by mid 1942 and the additional 15 would have enabled the authorities to dispose of 420 bodies per day or about 12,500 per month.

If the denier explanation of the 46 new ovens is to be believed, then the authorities were anticipating an incredible 30,000 deaths per month of registered prisoners! This, of course, assumes that the low denier estimate of these ovens' cremation capacity is correct. The only explanation is that the camp administration anticipated this many deaths, but not of registered prisoners. More verification comes from attempts in early 1943 to investigate the possibility of building a sixth crematorium. As the result of a meeting with Topf and Sons, the crematoria oven builder, on January 29, 1943, the Bauleitung instructed the firm to produce a sketch for a sixth crematorium. The sketch was delivered to the Bauleitung in the first half of February and the Auschwitz camp commandant was informed of the discussions.<sup>25</sup>

At the time these discussions were taking place, Auschwitz was experiencing a low death rate for registered prisoners when compared to the summer of 1942. The death books show about 3000 deaths of registered prisoners for January 1943. A similar number of registered prisoners had died in the

months of November and December 1942.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, the 9000 deaths of registered prisoners for the period from November 1942 through January 1943 - though very high - was far less than one half of the 21,900 deaths from August through October 1942. The four new crematoria were scheduled to become operational in the near future. The first would go into operation in March 1943. Thus, according to low denier estimates, the total cremation capacity of the ovens at 30,000 per month could dispose of 10 times the number of registered monthly deaths at the time these discussions were taking place. Why then would the camp authorities seek to build another crematorium in addition to the four that would shortly begin operation? The answer lies in the date that the Topf representative, engineer and oven builder Kurt Prufer, was in the camp for discussions concerning this newly proposed (but never built) crematorium - January 29, 1943. On this same day the Bauleitung (1) issued a memo saying that there was a "gassing cellar" in Crematorium II 27 and (2) issued another memo that in Crematorium II body burning and "special treatment" could occur simultaneously.<sup>28</sup> As discussed in Chapters 1, 5, 6 and 9 of this study, special treatment [sonderbehandlung] was a word used to denote the killing and disappearance of prisoners.

Perhaps the best evidence for the reason for the crematoria was the secrecy required of those involved in building projects. Bauleitung Directive 108 issued in 1943 is a reminder of Directive 35 issued on June 19, 1942. It states that for those involved in building projects "we have to point out that we are dealing with econo - military tasks that must be kept secret [geheimzuhaltende.] As for the crematoria: "Specifically, plans for the crematoria are to be strictly controlled. No plan can be passed to the work brigade... and all plans must be kept under lock and key when not in use."<sup>29</sup> This Bauleitung memo raises the question as to why the building of crematoria would be considered an econo - military task requiring a great deal of secrecy if the only purpose of these structures was to dispose of dead bodies. In the memo, the key German words wehrwirtschaftliche und geheimzuhaltende are the only ones underlined. The memo only makes sense if these structures were to be used for some secret purpose in addition to body disposal.<sup>30</sup>

## Expansion of the Camp

Mattogno and other deniers often argue that a planned expansion of the camp to 200,000 announced on August 15, 1942 was the catalyst for the new crematoria. However, the Bauleitung began inviting construction firms to submit bids to build the crematoria on July 1, 1942 - two days before the outbreak of the typhus epidemic. <sup>31</sup> The Bauleitung "special actions" memo from October 1942 - cited earlier - also traces the origins to July 1942. At the beginning of July 1942 the population of the camp was less than 16,000. On July 15, a memo by the camp authorities stated that "for the time being" [vorerst] the planned population of the camp would be 30,000. No higher number was articulated in the memo.<sup>31a</sup> Two days earlier the camp authorities had begun to negotiate with an engineering company to build a crematorium that would hold 15 ovens in addition to the six that were already in the camp.<sup>31b</sup> Therefore, we know that at least 21 ovens were being planned for a population of 30,000.

As noted earlier, a planned expansion of the Auschwitz camp to a population of 125,000 was enunciated by the Bauleitung in October 1941. It coincided with the mass murder of camp inmates, especially Soviet POWs. At this time the Bauleitung requested 15 ovens in addition to the six already in use. However, this was before the extermination of the Jews began in the Spring of 1942.

The first planned expansion was proposed on March 1, 1941, before the mass extermination of Soviet POWs. It called for 130,000 prisoners. The only additional plan for ovens was to order another double muffle furnace in September 1941 which was installed in the spring of 1942.<sup>32</sup> This may give a true picture of the real cremation needs of the camp absent mass murder.

It is questionable whether the planned expansion of the camp to 200,000 could have influenced the Bauleitung to expand the cremation capacity from 6 to 52 ovens because, as noted earlier, the Bauleitung memo of October 1942 tied the building of a crematorium to the "special actions" taking place in July 1942, not any planned expansion.<sup>32a</sup> Moreover, comparative information from other concentration camps shows that there would not have been a reason for the Auschwitz authorities to build so many ovens even with the planned expansion.

In 1942 Mauthausen experienced about a 50% death rate for its registered prisoners. This percentage dropped to 15% in 1943. In 1944 Mauthausen expanded its camp population from 17,000 to 50,000, and experienced a 15% death rate for the year. Moreover, Mauthausen operated with one oven in 1942 and 1943 when its population reached more than 17,000.<sup>33</sup> However, the camp only added one double muffle oven to the existing single muffle oven in January 1945 for a total of three ovens.

In 1944 Gusen expanded from two to three camps, but did not add any ovens. Figures for Gusen show that that 14,500 entered the camp in 1940 and 1941, 6000 in 1942, 9100 in 1943, 22,300 in 1944 and 15,600 in 1945. Death rates from 1940 to 1945 were very high. From 1940 to 1944 slightly less than 25,000 of the 52,000 prisoners who entered the camp died. The population for the camp exceeded 22,000 by September 1944.<sup>34</sup> Yet there was never more than one double muffle oven in Gusen.

Similarly, the expansion of the Buchenwald camp was not accompanied by large increase in the number of ovens. Buchenwald had eight ovens. The camp increased the number of ovens from two to eight as it underwent expansion. At the end of 1941 there were 7900 prisoners in Buchenwald. This number increased to 37,000 by the end of 1943. By August 1944 there were more than 82,000 prisoners in the camp.<sup>35</sup> Yet, the number of ovens never exceeded eight.

The most informative comparison of oven needs versus camp expansion comes from the Dachau concentration camp. Dachau had six ovens. A total of 22,675 prisoners arrived at Dachau in 1940; 6255 in 1941, 12,572 in 1942, 19,358 in 1943 and over 76,000 in 1944. Therefore, the prisoner population of the camp had reached over 41,000 by the end of 1942, over 60,000 by the end of 1943 and over 137,000 by the end of 1944. By contrast, the Auschwitz camp population never reached more than 92,000 - 112,000 if transit prisoners to be shipped to other camps are counted in the summer of 1944. Moreover, there were typhus epidemics in Dachau in the winters of 1942-43 and 1943-44. Therefore, Dachau should have undergone a dramatic expansion of its cremation capacity if the denier arguments about Auschwitz are correct. Thus, at a time of typhus epidemics and a doubling of Dachau's camp population, there were never more than six ovens.<sup>35a</sup> Why did Auschwitz need 52 ovens and Dachau only six? The principal difference between Dachau and Auschwitz is that while many prisoners were murdered in Dachau, it was not an extermination camp.

As noted earlier, the Gusen information shows that an oven had a capacity to incinerate 26 bodies per day. Thus 12 ovens had the capacity to dispose of 300 per day. Yet, as noted earlier, the Bauleitung had already begun to order 15 additional ovens in October 1941. When added to the existing six ovens, there was more than enough capacity to handle the maximum number of deaths that could be expected in the absence of a massive extermination campaign. Even a 50% annual death rate of registered prisoners in Auschwitz on a camp population of 200,000 could have easily been handled by 21 ovens.

The real problem, as noted earlier, is that the Auschwitz death books show about a 15% monthly death rate of registered prisoners as early as 1941, before the typhus epidemic of July 1942, as opposed to a 15% annual death rate. The denier argument is that the high death rate Auschwitz was experiencing during the typhus epidemic coupled with the expansion meant that the cremation capacity provided by an additional 46 ovens was justified. However, this argument assumes that the camp administration was expecting something on the order of 30,000 to 50,000 deaths per month from typhus as a result of this proposed expansion. In fact, the camp would not have been able to function under these circumstances and would most certainly be forced to close down with a continuous epidemic of this proportion.

The camp authorities must have envisaged that any camp expansion would accompany an eventual bringing of the typhus epidemic under control. On July 15, 1942, twelve days after the typhus epidemic hit the camp, a Bauleitung memo stated that for the time being the camp's population would remain at 30,000. As late as December 1942 there had hardly been any increase in the camp's prisoner population from 30,000. The new prisoners who were added to the existing registered were brought in for labor to replace the sick prisoners who were killed by the camp authorities.

The registered camp population began to increase in 1943, after the worst of the typhus epidemic had passed and there was a relatively substantial decrease in the number of camp deaths of registered prisoners. On August 31, 1943 Auschwitz held 74,000 prisoners. For the five months from April through August 1943 there were about 10,300 deaths of registered prisoners in Auschwitz. Though very high, these 1943 death figures for registered prisoners compare very favorably with the 26,000 registered who died in the four months from July through October 1942.<sup>35b</sup> Therefore, the Auschwitz authorities had clearly foreseen a decrease in the death rate of registered prisoners in Auschwitz as the camp expanded, not an increase. Of course, non registered prisoners were still brought into the camp to be gassed en masse before, during and after the typhus epidemic.

## Oven Durability

Mattogno argued that the Auschwitz ovens could not have burned as many bodies as has been asserted because they did not have a long enough useful life. He claimed that the ovens had a relatively short life span when compared to what would be needed to dispose of all the bodies. His principal source for this assertion was an article appearing in a 1941 German engineering journal by engineer Rudolph Jakobskotter. Mattogno quoted Jakobskotter as "speaking in 1941 of the Topf ovens heated with electricity in the crematory of Erfurt [in Germany][he] states that the second oven was able to perform 3000 cremations, while the normal duration of the refractory walls of the ovens was 2000 cremations." However, the ovens Jakobskotter referred to were electric ovens. The type of oven used in the concentration camps was coke fired. Many of the coke fired ovens had been converted from oil burning. The electric oven, as Jakobskotter noted, was first placed into service in 1933. The first electric oven lasted until 1935. After burning 1300 bodies it was found that renovations were needed. The second electric oven began operation in 1935 and had a life of 3000 bodies. The third electric oven developed at the end of 1939 was expected to have a life span of 4000 bodies.<sup>36</sup>

It is not known what additional improvements were made by the early 1940s to the electric ovens. All that is really known is that these ovens were not used in the concentration camps, and even if they were they could have had a substantially extended useful life beyond 4000 bodies by the 1940s. It is obvious

from Jakobskotter's discussion of them that rapid progress was being made in improving the useful life of the electric oven. In addition, discussions about the number of bodies which an oven could burn over its useful life, as in the Jakobskotter study, refer to burning a single body at a time. This was the normal civilian practice. This method also utilized a coffin. As will be shown later, multiple body burnings of emaciated corpses in an oven was common at Auschwitz and other camps, and coffins were not used for such cremations.

Mattogno's principal argument that the Auschwitz ovens could not really burn that many bodies without being overhauled was based on a file which shows that the Topf double muffle oven - two ovens - in the Gusen concentration camp had to be overhauled after that camp experienced 3200 deaths from the time the ovens were installed in February 1941. This means that each muffle burned about 1600 bodies before having to be overhauled. The overhaul took place in October 1941. He concluded from this that the Topf ovens did not really have that long of a useful life.<sup>37</sup> Gusen was part of the Mauthausen concentration camp complex.

The problem is that the file on the Gusen ovens Mattogno relied on -when read in its entirety - does not support any of his theories on the limited durability of those ovens. Two weeks after the Gusen ovens were first installed the camp authorities complimented Topf on the ovens.<sup>38</sup> However, in mid March 1941, six weeks after the ovens had been installed, the camp authorities complained that they had found "several defects" [verschiedene Mangel] in the ovens and requested materials to fix them. More repair materials were ordered in June.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, there is a distinct possibility that the first double muffle oven installed in Gusen may not have been made correctly. In Auschwitz, the eight ovens of Krema IV broke down shortly after they were placed in service in March 1943 and could not be used again.<sup>40</sup> Topf accepted responsibility - though reluctantly - for the defects in the Krema IV ovens.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, the 15 ovens of Krema II worked quite well. Krema II was closed down for a brief period of one month in 1943, but that did not involve the life span of the ovens.<sup>42</sup> In light of the complaint filed by the Gusen authorities six weeks after the ovens had been delivered, it is quite possible that the ovens were defective when built.

Mattogno argued that if the Auschwitz ovens really had burned as many bodies as would be needed to dispose of all the victims historians say were murdered in the camp, they would have needed to be overhauled several times, but that there is no information in the Auschwitz Archives which suggests that these overhauls took place.<sup>43</sup> Mattogno is correct in that the Auschwitz ovens were in all likelihood not overhauled, but incorrect that they would need to be overhauled for the number of bodies they burned.

Mattogno's own data on the Topf ovens suggested that they could burn many thousands of bodies without being overhauled. The source from which Mattogno obtained his information about the number of deaths at Gusen being 3200 from February through October 1941 also gives a monthly breakdown which shows there were about another 18,600 deaths there from November 1941 through the end of 1944, and a total of 30,000 cremations from the time these ovens were installed until May 1945.<sup>44</sup> Yet the evidence from the Topf file which Mattogno examined for the overhaul in 1941 shows that that no overhauls of these ovens took place after October 1941.

The file carries the correspondence between Topf and the Mauthausen authorities on the issues concerning the installation of an additional double muffle furnace in Gusen and installing a double muffle oven in Mauthausen. This correspondence starts in late 1940 and goes on throughout 1941 and 1942 up until the end of August 1943. In November 1942 and January 1943 the materials for one double oven in Gusen and one in Mauthausen began to arrive. However, on January 19, 1943 the

Mauthausen authorities informed Topf that the construction of the double muffle ovens in Gusen and Mauthausen was not an option for the time being 45 The Gusen authorities did order materials for repairs of the ovens in April and May 1943.<sup>46</sup> However, there was no overhaul as in October 1941. Moreover, there was no complaint about defects after the overhaul in October 1941 as there was in March 1941 after original installation of the ovens.

From November 1941 until the end of August 1943 - the period for which there is a paper trail between Topf and the camp authorities- there were 13,600 deaths in Gusen. Another 5000 died from September 1943 to December 1944. In 1945 slightly less than 9000 prisoners died in Gusen. <sup>47</sup> As just stated, we know that there was no overhaul of the Gusen ovens from November 1941 until the end of August 1943. What about after that date? There is no information in the Topf file for September 1943 until December 1944. However, this may be due to the fact that there was no longer any need for a correspondence. The Topf file shows that the Mauthausen ovens were not installed until January 1945. The correspondence picks up again in December 1944.

Moreover, there is other compelling evidence that the Gusen ovens were not overhauled after August 1943. Recall that the materials for two double muffle ovens - one each for Gusen and Mauthausen - were delivered in early 1943 but that the authorities informed Topf that they would not be installed. From September 1943 until December 1944 the number of deaths for Mauthausen was 8470 whereas they were about 5000 for Gusen for the same period.<sup>48</sup> Mauthausen also underwent a substantial expansion of its population to more than twice that of Gusen in 1944. Mauthausen only had one single muffle oven while Gusen had double muffle oven, or two ovens. Since Gusen and Mauthausen were part of the same concentration camp complex, the administration for the camps would have certainly installed the ovens in Mauthausen before Gusen. This is especially the case since the materials for both ovens had been delivered. However, the ovens for Mauthausen were not installed until January 1945. This means that there was certainly no overhaul of the Gusen ovens between September 1943 and December 1944.

How many bodies could a Topf oven cremate before having to be overhauled or replaced? There does not appear to be a definitive answer. The detailed file on the Gusen ovens just examined does not address the issue directly.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, no information has as yet appeared from the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow. The limited number of Auschwitz files examined by the author which give billing and installation information do not address the issue of durability.<sup>50</sup> However, based on the Gusen data, we can estimate that a Topf oven could probably burn anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000 bodies. However, this estimate does not take into account multiple body burnings, that is burning more than one body simultaneously. As will be discussed later, this was a common practice in Auschwitz.

Since the eight ovens of Krema IV went down soon after they were built, there were 44 ovens which could be used to burn the bodies. In the author's opinion, these ovens probably incinerated about 550,000 bodies or one half of the total killed in Auschwitz. The other half were burned in the open air. As will be seen later, open air burnings were utilized extensively in Auschwitz. We can, however, reject Mattogno's argument that all 52 Auschwitz ovens could not have disposed of more than 162,000 bodies.<sup>51</sup>

There is also information about oven durability from 19th century Paris. In the late 1880s, two ovens were installed in a crematorium in Southern Paris. These ovens were designed to cremate 5000 bodies per year or 2500 per furnace.<sup>52</sup> Augustus Cobb, a leading cremation expert of the period, learned from the engineer who worked in the crematorium that "[a]lthough nearly four hundred bodies are burned in these furnaces every month, a close inspection of their walls showed no traces of fissures; and the same

remark applies to the walls of the furnaces in the crematory in Milan [in Italy]."<sup>53</sup> Additional information on these Parisian cremation facilities published in 1893 shows that from 1889 to 1892, 10,852 were cremated. This number includes 3743 stillborn children. The only problem mentioned in the report accompanying these statistics is that of transporting the bodies to the crematorium.<sup>54</sup> However, nothing is said about inability to handle the cremations -which was very high for this period of time. As will be seen, Germany led Europe in cremation technology in the 1930s. It would appear logical to conclude that Germany of the 1940s had more durable ovens than France of 50 years earlier.

## Cremation Capacity

The use of cremation ovens appears to have begun sometime in the 1870s. It is known from cremations carried out in 1874 that a 47 pound child could be cremated in 25 minutes, a 144 pound woman in 50 minutes and a 227 pound man in 55 minutes.<sup>55</sup> In 1875 it was reported that a body could be cremated in 50 minutes.<sup>56</sup>

Mattogno cited a participant from a British cremation conference in 1975 who stated that the "thermal barrier " for a cremation was 60 minutes.<sup>57</sup> However, the observations of another participant at the same conference suggested that most of the body was cremated in the first 30 minutes.

"After about half an hour, whether the furnace has gotten up to a temperature of 1100 [degrees] C or whether it is 900 [degrees] C, there is a rapid fall away, and I think the investigations should be concerned with the last twenty minutes or so of the cremation cycle. At that time you have in the cremator a very small quantity of body material... roughly the size of a rugby football, about twenty minutes from the end of the cremation, and this is the thing which is most difficult to remove."<sup>58</sup>

These comments suggest that a body can be added before the small quantity remaining during the last 20 minutes is fully consumed. The instructions for the Topf double muffle furnaces envisaged that a body would be added into the oven during the last twenty minutes that it took to fully cremate the corpse that had been previously inserted:

"As soon as the remains of the corpses have fallen from the chamotte grid to the ash collection channel below, they should be pulled forward towards the ash removal door, using the scraper. Here they can be left for a further twenty minutes to be fully consumed.... In the meantime, further corpses can be introduced one after the other into the chambers.<sup>59</sup> [*italics added*]

As will be seen later, there is now strong evidence that bodies were added before the prior corpse was fully incinerated, resulting in a 25 minute burning cycle for each body.

In Germany of the 1880s it was possible to cremate a body and the coffin which housed it in 60 to 75 minutes.<sup>60</sup> The cremation process became very popular in Germany in the years preceding World War II. In 1926, Berlin newspapers reported that one fifth of all those who died in that city were cremated.<sup>61</sup> By 1931 Germany led Europe in cremations. Of the 94,978 cremations in Europe that year, 59,119 were in Germany, which had 107 of the 226 crematoria in Europe. Membership in German cremation societies exceeded those in other countries. Germany also had more cremation journals than any other country. Of the seven named cremation journals at a British cremation conference in 1932, four were German.<sup>62</sup> By the 1930s there were two principal oven builders in Germany. One of these was Topf and Sons, identified earlier as the builder of the Auschwitz ovens.

One of the problems when discussing cremation issues at Auschwitz is that using ovens to dispose of bodies at the rate taking place there is without precedent in human history. To put this in some type of perspective, in the state of California with 20 million people in 1982 there were 58,000 cremations.<sup>63</sup> Yet in Auschwitz, which never had more than 92,000 registered prisoners, many times this number were cremated over a four year period.

The traditional means of body disposal in times of war has been open air burnings. Thus in Leningrad, now St. Petersburg, during World War II at least one million people were known to have died. They were burned in the open.<sup>64</sup> As will be seen later on in this chapter, open air burnings were also utilized extensively at Auschwitz.

The specific problem with Auschwitz is that because of the unique nature of what was happening there and the absence to date of any records documenting even one cremation in any of the 46 ovens of the Birkenau crematoria or how these ovens worked, we are necessarily forced into a certain amount of speculation. We don't really know how many bodies could be burned in the crematoria on a daily basis, how much fuel was needed to burn a body, the life span of an oven, or the effect on any of these considerations when more than one body was being burned in an oven. Moreover, the nature of what happened makes it scientifically impossible to replicate. For example, it is unlikely that there will ever be another opportunity for 52 ovens, all in the same location, to dispose of bodies under the same conditions that existed in Auschwitz. Also, modern cremations are subject to a whole host of rules and regulations not applicable to German concentration camps. In modern cremations the ashes of those cremated cannot be commingled with the ashes of other decedents and caskets are required for the body. German concentration camps were under no such compulsion.

Mattogno computed what he claimed was the maximum number of bodies that could possibly be cremated in the four Birkenau crematoria from the time each became operational until October 30, 1944, the date that camp historian Danuta Czech identifies as the last gassing. He had found documents showing the days that repairs were done to the ovens. From these repair documents, he claimed that he was able to establish how many days each of the crematoria could function. He claimed that Krema II went into operation in mid March 1943 and went out of service shortly thereafter for 115 days until July. It then functioned until October 30, 1944. He also claimed that Krema III went into operation on June 25, 1943 and was out of service for 60 days in 1944.<sup>65</sup> He was correct as to the dates that these crematoria went into service. However, the sources he cited do not support his contentions about the crematoria being out of service for the period claimed. His source for Krema II being down for 115 days was a letter to Topf from the Bauleitung, dated July 17, 1943, which discusses problems with the blueprints for the chimney because they had not taken into account temperatures caused by an expansion of the heat. However, the letter says nothing about the Krema being out of service.<sup>66</sup> The most current research on this issue states that Krema II went out of service for one month beginning on

May 22, 1943 because internal lining of the smokestack and the flues connected to the incinerator began to collapse.<sup>67</sup>

Similarly, Mattogno's source for Krema III being down for 60 days in 1944 only mentions that doors on the ovens were being repaired on June 1. It also mentions that there were continuing repairs in all of the crematoria from June 8 to July 20, though it is not stated whether these repairs were on the ovens. However, these documents present no evidence that any of the crematoria were shut down or that the ovens for Crematoria II, III and V were not working during this period of time. (Recall that Krema IV's ovens went down permanently in May 1943.) Moreover, the documents suggest that the ovens were actually working since they mention the production of 4 pieces of firehooks [feuerhaken], something that would not be needed if the ovens were down.<sup>68</sup> It is known from information on Gusen that Topf ovens could function even on days they were being repaired.<sup>69</sup>

Based on his erroneous estimate on down time of the ovens in Crematoria II and III, Mattogno calculated that if each oven could burn 24 bodies per day, then a maximum of 368,000 bodies could have been burned from the period these ovens first started operation until October 31, 1944.<sup>70</sup> No mention was made of Krema I, in the main camp, which was shut down on July 19, 1943.<sup>71</sup> As will be seen, however, in the part of this study dealing with open air cremations, Mattogno also identified a body disposal method not dependent on the functioning of the ovens. This means that even if his numbers on Krema capacity are correct, they are irrelevant.

The issue of oven overuse surfaced in the recently discovered post war interrogations of three Topf engineers by the Soviets. Kurt Prufer, builder of the ovens, was asked why the brick linings of the ovens were damaged so quickly. He replied that the damage resulting after six months was "because the strain on the furnaces was enormous." He recounted how he had told Topf's chief engineer in charge of the crematoria, Fritz Sanders, about the strain on the furnaces because of so many corpses waiting to be incinerated as a result of the gassings.<sup>72</sup> Sanders stated that he had been told by Prufer and another Topf engineer that the "capacity of the furnaces was so great because three [gassed] corpses were incinerated [in one oven] simultaneously."<sup>73</sup> A

Sonderkommando, one who worked in the crematoria during this period of time, wrote that cracks in the brickwork of the ovens were filled with a special fireclay paste in order to keep the ovens running.<sup>74</sup>

At the trial of Canadian denier Ernst Zundel <sup>75</sup> in 1988, a supposed expert on cremations named Ivan Legace testified that the maximum number of bodies which could be disposed of daily in each of the 46 Birkenau ovens was three per oven for a total of 138.<sup>76</sup> This figure found its way into the Leuchter Report.<sup>77</sup> This is one more example of Leuchter's incompetence in these matters. Even Mattogno stated that "[t]his figure is actually far below the actual capacity."<sup>78</sup>

Contrary to Legace and Leuchter, it is known that the Topf ovens could work very efficiently on a daily basis. This information comes directly from notes kept by prisoners who worked at the crematorium on the daily operation of the Topf double muffle furnace in Gusen from October 31 to November 12, 1941. The notes show an average daily incineration of 26 per muffle over a 13 day period.<sup>79</sup> However, the Gusen ovens did not usually work around the clock. Therefore, the records show that on most days it was only necessary to operate the ovens part of the time.<sup>80</sup> Topf's instructions for these muffles from July 1941 require three hours of daily maintenance and also state:

"In the coke-heated T double muffle incinerator, [30 to 36] bodies can be incinerated in about 10 hours. The quantity mentioned above can be incinerated daily without any problem, without overworking the oven. It is not harmful to operate the incinerator day and night if, required, since the fireclay [resistant walls] lasts longer when an even temperature is maintained".<sup>81</sup>

These comments also apply to the three double muffle furnaces in Krema I of Auschwitz which were of the same construction. Similar instructions were issued by Topf for the Auschwitz ovens in September 1941. These instructions state that "[o]nce the cremation chamber (muffle) has been brought to a good red heat (approximately 800 C), the corpses can be introduced one after the other in the cremation chambers." The instructions also state that at the end of the operation the air valves and doors and dampers must be closed "so that the furnace does not cool."<sup>82</sup> These instructions directly contradict Legace's assertion that the ovens needed to be cooled.<sup>83</sup>

It is interesting to note that the instructions for both the Gusen and Auschwitz ovens suggest that continued use at an even temperature will actually prolong the useful life of the ovens. Two Topf engineers stated that the Topf double muffle furnace could incinerate 30 to 36 bodies (15 to 18 per muffle) in a 10 hour period. This means that about 60 to 72 bodies could be cremated in a 20 hour period in a double muffle oven.<sup>84</sup>

Kurt Prufer, the Topf engineer who built the 46 Birkenau ovens, stated in a letter on November 15, 1942 that the ovens he installed in the Buchenwald concentration camp had a one third greater output than had previously been thought.<sup>85</sup> Unfortunately, he does not say what number the one third is greater than or what is meant by "output." However, extrapolating from other crematorium data cited in the prior paragraph - 60 to 72 bodies in a 20 hour period - Prufer's five triple muffle furnaces, 15 ovens, have been interpreted to be able to incinerate 800 corpses in 24 hours, or about 53 per muffle.<sup>86</sup> Reducing the time to 20 hours leaves about 660 per day, or about 44 per muffle.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the best information we have on the output of these ovens is the period from October 31 to November 12, 1941 in Gusen, after they had been overhauled. While the 677 bodies burned during these 13 days average 26 per muffle, an analysis of the underlying data reveals that a Topf oven could burn far in excess of this amount. On November 7, 1941 these two muffles incinerated 94 bodies in a period of 19 hours and 45 minutes, or 47 per muffle. This means that each oven could incinerate a body in 25.2 minutes. This was probably achieved by adding a new body to the oven before the prior body had been totally incinerated, a method which appears to have been envisaged by the Topf instructions discussed earlier (See the discussion at footnotes 58 and 59). This method should not be confused with multiple body burnings to be discussed in the next part of this chapter. Mattogno did not mention this information. Rather, he focused on the November 8 information which shows 72 bodies burned. He erroneously claimed that it took 24 and 1/2 hours to burn these bodies. He had misread the time sheets. The actual burning time for these bodies was between 16 and 17 hours.<sup>87</sup>

The most controversial information comes from the Bauleitung on June 28, 1943. It reported that in a 24 hour period the six ovens of Krema I could incinerate 340 bodies; the five triple muffle furnaces each in Kremas II and III could incinerate 1440 corpses, or 2880 combined; Kremas IV and V could each incinerate 768 corpses or 1536 combined. The total for all five was 4756 while the total for the four Birkenau crematoria - Kremas II through V - was 4416. For purposes of comparison with Gusen,

there were many lighter weight women and children incinerated in Auschwitz. By contrast there were only heavier men in the Gusen camp in 1941 when the 25 minute per body cremation time was achieved.<sup>88</sup>

Deniers reject the Bauleitung figures outright. Denier critics have not totally accepted these numbers. However, the Gusen data suggests that the Bauleitung figures may be more credible than previously suspected. The Bauleitung's 340 figure for 24 hours for the six ovens of Krema I comes out to about 25 minutes per body burned, the same result achieved at Gusen on November 7, 1941.

What about the four Birkenau crematoria? At the time the Bauleitung gave these numbers, all the crematoria had been functioning for some period of time. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the Bauleitung at least had some information upon which to base these figures. Both deniers and their critics agree that an oven could not incinerate a body in 15 minutes, which is the time required for the 46 ovens to burn 4416 bodies in 24 hours. The information available from Gusen suggests that the maximum attainable was 25 minutes, and then only by adding a body before the previously introduced body was fully consumed. Moreover, an oven could not work around the clock day in and day out. But were there circumstances in which an oven could burn a body in 15 minutes? Not with the traditional method of burning one body at a time. However, the issue becomes more problematical if multiple body burnings are considered. This means that an oven would burn more than one body at a time. The practice was not unusual in German concentration camps. For example, one of the early histories of Dachau stated that it took 10 to 15 minutes to burn a body.<sup>89</sup> The source does not say how this was accomplished. However, the standard history of Dachau, written some years later, states that an oven could burn 7 to 9 "emaciated" bodies in two hours when they were all introduced simultaneously.<sup>90</sup> Seen in this light, the 15 minutes becomes more feasible. The issue of multiple body burnings will be examined more comprehensively in the next part of this study dealing with fuel consumption.

It needs to be emphasized that while it may have been possible at certain times for a Topf oven to work 24 hours, this would be the exception and not the rule. An oven would normally have to shut down 3 or 4 hours per day.

## Fuel Consumption

As noted earlier, the furnaces at Auschwitz were coke fueled. Mattogno claimed that there were not enough coke deliveries to Auschwitz to cremate the number of bodies of non-registered prisoners who were murdered in Auschwitz from April to October 1943, the time when the four new crematoria were operating. Prior to mid March 1943 only Krema I in the main camp was operational. There are only records of coke deliveries for the period from February 16, 1942 through October 1943. From April 1943 to October 1943 there were 497 tons of coke delivered.<sup>91</sup> The information on coke deliveries was compiled by denier critic and French researcher Jean - Claude Pressac, who gathered the information from the records of the period held in the Auschwitz State Museum. He examined the records of 240 coke deliveries and then compiled these amounts into monthly figures for the period in which records exist. It should be noted that it is not known whether these records are complete for this period of time.

Considering the fact that there are no coke records for the periods before mid February 1942 and after October 1943, and that ovens were known to have operated during this period, it is quite possible that

the records under discussion are incomplete. Such incompleteness can be inferred by comparing coke deliveries for which there are monthly records with the number of deaths of registered prisoners. In July 1942 there are records for 16.5 tons of coke delivered. In that month there were 4124 deaths of registered prisoners. However, for March 1942 there are records for 39 tons of coke delivery but only 3000 registered prisoner deaths.<sup>92</sup> In September 1942 there were about 9000 deaths of registered prisoners and 52 tons of recorded coke delivery. In the following month there were about 5900 deaths of registered prisoners and only 15 tons of recorded coke delivery. The second highest month of coke deliveries was in May 1943 when 95 tons were delivered. However, the deaths of registered prisoners were very low in that month. The exact number cannot be isolated because the death books run from April 14 to June 4 and show 2967 deaths. Thus, it is safe to assume that there were about 2000 deaths of registered prisoners. Therefore, the month of the second highest recorded coke delivery also corresponds with the month of either the lowest or one of the lowest monthly death totals of registered prisoners.<sup>93</sup>

The issue as to how much coke was actually delivered to Auschwitz would be resolved if there were some central numbers issued by the Bauleitung for the years at issue. Holocaust denier David Irving published in 1993 what he purported to be such numbers for the years 1940 through 1944. These figures had allegedly been found in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow.<sup>94</sup> However, no file number is cited for these figures. Three attempts by the author to have Mr. Irving identify the source of these numbers have not been successful. Mattogno writes that he was unable to find any support for Irving's numbers in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow.<sup>95</sup> Therefore, to date there is no information as to whether the records on file for coke deliveries to Auschwitz for the period from April to October 1943 are complete.

Mattogno examined the record of cremated prisoners at Gusen for the period from October 31 through November 12, 1941. These numbers are a contemporaneous account that were kept by prisoners on the cremation detail. Photocopies were sent to the author by the Mauthausen Memorial Museum.<sup>96</sup> Mattogno stated that the numbers show that over a 13 day period from October 31 to November 12, 677 bodies were cremated using 20,700 kilograms [1 kilogram equals 2.2 pounds] of coke, or 30.5 kilograms per body. Mattogno argued that the 497 tons of coke delivered to Auschwitz from April to October 1943 were not enough to cremate the number of registered and non - registered prisoners who were killed. One thousand kilograms equals one metric ton. He examined Danuta Czech's *Auschwitz Chronicle* which shows that about 103,000 non - registered prisoners disappeared after arriving at Auschwitz during this period of time. He added this number to 21,580 registered prisoners who died in the camp. He stated that there was not enough coke to cremate the corpses. In order to cremate this many corpses with the available coke, it would mean that each corpse was cremated using 4.1 kilograms of coke.<sup>97</sup> Therefore, he argued that 103,000 non - registered prisoners could not have been killed in the camp during this period of time. When he divided the 21,500 registered prisoner deaths by the amount of coke consumed from April 1943 to October 1943, he arrived at 22.7 kilograms per body.<sup>98</sup>

Mattogno did not explain what happened to the 103,000 non – registered prisoners

The Gusen file that Mattogno relied on shows the amount of coke in the form of wheelbarrows used to transport it to the ovens.<sup>99</sup> At the top of the page it states "karren koks", or wheelbarrows of coke. Below this heading it states that one wheelbarrow equals 60 kilograms. However, this weight is only stated for the period from September 26 to October 15, 1941. During this period 203 bodies were cremated using 153 wheelbarrows. This means that 9180 kilograms (60 kilograms times 153 barrels) incinerated 203 bodies at 45 kilograms per body. The 9180 number appears on a backup page of this

file where the 153 wheelbarrows are multiplied by 60 kilograms. There is some reason, however, to suspect that each wheelbarrow did not contain 60 kilograms of coke but that this was a generic number based on the theoretical maximum that each delivery could hold. In other words, 60 kilograms was attached to each wheelbarrow regardless of actual weight. For example, on October 3 eleven bodies were incinerated using 13 wheelbarrows. At 60 kilograms per wheelbarrow it would have taken 71 kilograms per body. However, on October 15, 33 bodies were incinerated using 16 wheelbarrows, or 29 kilograms per body.<sup>100</sup>

The ovens underwent an extensive overhaul from October 16 to 22. The period of time that Mattogno was analyzing, October 31 to November 12, shows that 345 wheelbarrows were used to incinerate 677 corpses. However, unlike the information prior to the overhaul of the ovens which attached a weight to each wheelbarrow, and an aggregate weight to all 153 wheelbarrows, there is no such information on wheelbarrow weight after the overhaul. Mattogno just assumed that each wheelbarrow weighed 60 kilograms without informing his readers that there could be problems in such an assumption and that even the original weight of 60 kilograms per wheelbarrow for the pre overhaul ovens could be erroneous.

Nevertheless, the Gusen file does provide some very valuable information. It shows that the more efficiently the ovens burned fuel the more bodies that could be burned in a much faster period of time. Thus, for the period prior to the ovens' overhaul, only 203 bodies could be burned in a 10 day period from September 26 to October 15 using 153 wheelbarrows of coke. However, over a continuous 13 day period after the overhaul was completed, 677 bodies were burned using 365 wheelbarrows of coke. It was during this period that 94 bodies were burned in two muffles on November 7 using 45 wheelbarrows of coke and 72 bodies burned the following day using 35 wheelbarrows. The implications of this fact for the 46 ovens in the four new crematoria at Auschwitz are important because the figures show that the more efficient the fuel usage the faster the bodies burned.

Mattogno admitted that the triple muffle ovens of Kremas II and III and eight muffle ovens of Kremas IV and V could burn bodies with greater fuel efficiency than the double muffle ovens of Crema I, and Gusen, but would not admit that this translated into faster body burning. He stated that the triple muffle furnace could burn a body with one third less coke than was needed in the double muffle furnace. He calculated the amount needed to be 16.7 to 20.3 kilograms per body. The eight muffle furnace could burn bodies at about half the fuel needed in the double muffle furnace, or 12.5 to 15.25 kilograms of coke per body.<sup>101</sup> Mattogno gave some calculations as to the reason for this phenomenon without mentioning that his figures are loosely based on data provided to the Bauleitung by Topf.

The only authoritative information available on the fuel efficiency of the triple and eight muffle ovens was provided to the Bauleitung by Topf. On March 17, 1943 the Bauleitung issued a memo under the heading: "Estimation of coke usage for Crematorium II K L [concentration camp] according to data [angaben] from Topf and Sons (maker of the ovens) from March 11, 1943." The memo goes on to describe the data in terms of fires. Crematoria II and III each needed ten fires for 350 kilograms of coke usage per hour. However, the number could be reduced by one third if they were used on a continuous basis, which meant that each crematorium would use 2800 kilograms of coke in a 12 hour period. In the eight muffle furnace the fuel savings were even greater. When those ovens were worked continuously they would burn 1120 kilograms of coke in a 12 hour period. This means that all four crematoria could operate on 7840 kilograms of coke in a 12 hour period (2800 each for Kremas II and III and 1120 each for Kremas IV and V). The Bauleitung concludes: "These are top achievements. It is not possible to give a number for usage for the year because it is not known how many hours or days it will be needed to heat it."<sup>102</sup>

Mattogno represented this information as meaning that "Crematoria II and III could have cremated about 240 bodies a day, and Crematoria IV and V about 130- a total of some 370 bodies. The estimate given in the memo thus indicates that a daily average of 370 emaciated adult corpses were expected for cremation"<sup>103</sup> This is simply a false characterization of the data. There is no mention of the number of bodies that could be burned. The key fact is that the fuel data given by Topf is based on the number of hours worked irrespective of the amount of bodies burned. This fact caused many problems for Mattogno because, as noted earlier, estimates on the number of bodies which could be burned in a twenty hour period in one oven ranged as high as 36. The real dilemma for Mattogno was in the Bauleitung figures given on June 28, 1943, discussed earlier, that 4416 bodies could be burned in a 24 hour period in the four new crematoria, or 2208 in a 12 hour period. When the 7840 kilograms of coke usage for a twelve hour period are divided by the 2208 bodies which could be cremated in a 12 hour period, the average comes out to about 3.5 kilograms per body. Mattogno never addressed this issue directly. However, he was aware of the problem that the June 28 Bauleitung figures could pose. To deal with this problem he reverted to a common denier tactic. He announced that "this document is a fabrication."<sup>104</sup> Thus, any document which deniers do not like is commonly explained as the result of forgery and conspiracy. He did not say who might have "fabricated" this report.

The issue is whether the crematoria were capable of burning a body in 15 minutes, the amount of time suggested in the Bauleitung report of June 28, 1943. As noted earlier, an oven could not incinerate a body in 15 minutes with any known technology of the period, but a different picture emerges when multiple body burnings are considered. The information from Dachau, cited earlier, mentions burning 7 to 9 emaciated bodies simultaneously in a period of two hours. In the Hartheim Castle in Austria, where there was a gas chamber, a crematorium worker testified after the war that two to eight bodies would be simultaneously cremated.<sup>105</sup>

The practice of multiple cremations was known outside of Germany well before World War II. In Osaka, Japan in the 1880s there were 20 cremation ovens each of which could incinerate three bodies simultaneously in a period of four hours.<sup>106</sup> In 1911, a Japanese oven was presented at the International Exhibition of Hygiene in Dresden, Germany which could burn five bodies simultaneously in a period of 2 to 2-1/2 hours.<sup>107</sup> The fact that ovens are not built for the purpose of multiple cremations is not determinative as to whether the practice is actually carried out. The best illustration is the United States where the practice is illegal. There was a major scandal in the early 1980s involving mortuaries in Southern California. Employees of a facility testified that it was common practice to burn several bodies together. An embalmer stated that he saw five bodies in one retort (an oven) while another saw seven or eight people being cremated simultaneously. The founder of one of the United States's first cremation companies stated that the burning of several bodies simultaneously results in their not burning "uniformly and the ashes come out very dark."<sup>108</sup> Interestingly, deniers are often critical of eyewitness accounts that describe black smoke belching from the crematoria. Burning that produced black ashes may very well have produced black particles in the smoke.

There was a great deal of testimony about the practice of multiple burnings at Auschwitz. Alter Feinsilber, a Sonderkommando — one who removed the dead bodies from the gas chambers to be cremated - stated that five bodies "burned more quickly in that quantity."<sup>109</sup> The SS guard Pery Broad wrote that four or five bodies could be held in each oven in Kremas II and III.<sup>110</sup> Sonderkommando Filip Muller stated that three or four could be incinerated at a time.<sup>111</sup> Sonderkommando Szlama Dragon testified that three bodies were incinerated at a time.<sup>112</sup> Two prisoners who escaped in April 1944, whose report was based on information received from Sonderkommandos, stated that three bodies would be burned at a time.<sup>113</sup> A Sonderkommando stated that tests done on the Birkenau

crematoria before they became fully operational showed that three bodies could be simultaneously burned in a period of 40 minutes in each of the 15 ovens in Krema II. He stated that these tests were conducted with a stopwatch by the SS.<sup>114</sup>

Mattogno was aware that the testimony about multiple body burnings would cause him trouble in making his coke arguments. He argued that such a procedure produced no benefits either in the time a body could be burned or the fuel savings. Thus, he argued that multiple burnings would simply take two times longer to burn two bodies which were simultaneously introduced and require two times more fuel. He argued that if there were multiple burnings they would have occurred on November 8, 1941, but there were no fuel savings or time saved on this day. <sup>115</sup> Recall from the prior section of this chapter that Mattogno claimed that on November 8 it took 24 hours and 30 minutes to burn 72 bodies, but that the actual time was between 16 and 17 hours. Actually, the Gusen information for November 7 which shows 94 bodies burned in 19 hours and 45 minutes, or about 25 minutes per body, would have been more compelling information for the argument he was trying to make. However, he was unwilling to admit that a body could be burned in 25 minutes under any circumstances.

The problem with Mattogno's argument is that we can be fairly certain that there were no multiple burnings on these days. An engineer's report for November 7 and 8 shows four hours of work was done on these ovens on each day, with four hours of work on November 6 and an additional 8 hours on November 9. These facts mean that there were repairs on the ovens on the same days they were burning bodies.<sup>116</sup> Under these circumstances it is highly unlikely that multiple burnings would have occurred. The engineer report for these days says nothing about multiple body burnings.

The most complete account of the operation of these ovens was given by Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber in his deposition of May 1945. Auschwitz was liberated in January 1945. It is as close as available to a contemporaneous document. Tauber began work in Krema I in February 1943 but was eventually moved to Kremas II and III. He also worked in Krema V. Tauber stated that it was common to burn five bodies simultaneously in an oven. He also stated that it took about an hour and a half to incinerate five corpses being burned simultaneously.<sup>117</sup> This time period is not unrealistic. Recall that a Japanese oven could burn five bodies simultaneously in a period of 2 to 2-1/2 hours in 1911.

Tauber also noted that under the right conditions it was possible to burn eight bodies simultaneously in an oven. He mentions the case when there were eight emaciated corpses. He also states that when children were incinerated the Sonderkommando would burn the bodies of five or six children with two adults.<sup>118</sup> He even described how the children's bodies were placed in the furnace to prevent their falling into the ash bin.<sup>119</sup>

Tauber also addresses the issue of fuel usage in the burning of the bodies. His testimony is important in this respect because he shows that it was an issue and the authorities had developed methods of dealing with it. He explains:

"As I have already said, there were five furnaces in Crematorium II, each with three muffles for cremating the corpses and heated by two coke-fired hearths. The fire flues of these hearths came out above the ash [collection] boxes of the two side muffles. Thus the flames went first [through] the two side muffles then heated the center one, from where the combustion gasses were led out below the furnace, between the two firing hearths. Thanks to this arrangement, the incineration process for the corpses in the side muffles differed from that of the center muffle. The corpses of ...wasted people with

no fat burned rapidly in the side muffles and slowly in the center one. Conversely the corpses of people gassed on arrival, not being wasted, burned better in the center muffle. During the incineration of such corpses, we used the coke only to light the fire of the furnace initially, for fatty corpses burned of their own accord thanks to the combustion of the body fat."<sup>120</sup>

Tauber's explanation of using the body fat of fat corpses as a source of fuel was emphasized elsewhere in his testimony. Thus early on he mentioned that "[t]he process of incineration is accelerated by the combustion of human fat which thus produces additional heat." This method was used in Crematoria II and III. Later on he mentioned that when a fat body "was charged into a hot furnace, fat immediately began to flow into the ash bin, where it caught fire and started the combustion of the body."<sup>121</sup>

Using the body fat of corpulent victims as a fuel was something that would require first hand knowledge. Tauber was a shoemaker and would not have been in a position to know this without actually observing it. The issue is how credible was this testimony. The German engineer Rudolf Jakobskotter, referred to earlier, wrote that body fat produces heat for burning in an oven.<sup>122</sup> Mattogno did not directly address the issue of using body fat in the ovens as a source of fuel. He had initially dismissed testimony about using body fat in cremation pits to accelerate the burning process. However, he subsequently withdrew his initial objection by writing that "I have discovered that such a procedure can be made to work if done in a determined fashion...."<sup>123</sup>

Tauber had also discussed how body fat was used in the cremation pits to accelerate burning.<sup>124</sup>

The process of using body fat in an oven was also described by Sonderkommando Filip Muller, who noted that the authorities had found ways to place the bodies in the ovens to maximize fuel efficiency:

"In the course of these experiments corpses were selected according to different criteria and then cremated. Thus, the corpses of two Mussulmans [camp slang for emaciated prisoners] were cremated together with those of two children or the bodies of two well nourished men together with that of an emaciated woman, each load consisting of three, or sometimes four, bodies. Members of these groups [SS men and civilian visitors to the crematoriums] were especially interested in the amount of coke required to burn corpses of any particular category...

"Afterwards all corpses were divided into the above mentioned four categories, the criterion being the amount of coke needed to reduce them to ashes. Thus it was decreed that the most economical and fuel saving procedure would be to burn the bodies of a well-nourished man and an emaciated woman, or vice versa, together with that of a child, because, as the experiments had established, in this combination, once they had caught fire, the dead would continue to burn without further coke being required."<sup>125</sup>

Similarly, Auschwitz camp commandant, Rudolph Hoess testified at Nuremberg that three bodies would be burned simultaneously and that the bodies of fat people burned faster.<sup>126</sup> He also mentioned

the burning of three bodies simultaneously in his memoirs.<sup>127</sup>

The Tauber deposition was given and Muller memoirs written years before anyone knew that coke would be an issue. Both accounts clearly show that fuel was a serious consideration in the running of the crematoria and that the authorities had found ways to deal with the problem.

Wood was also another fuel source available for the ovens. Topf had made ovens which could be fueled with wood but they were not as efficient as the coke models.<sup>128</sup> Tauber stated that wood and straw were used for the ovens when coke was in short supply.<sup>129</sup> Mattogno located records for the delivery of wood made in September and October 1943. He argued that the amount of wood delivered was the equivalent of 21.5 metric tons of coke, not nearly enough to solve the problem.<sup>130</sup> However, Mattogno is familiar enough with the Auschwitz surroundings to know that the camp authorities were not dependent on formal deliveries of wood. Photos of the Birkenau area during this period where the crematoria were located show it surrounded by a heavily forested area.<sup>131</sup> In fact, there was an abundant supply of wood in the surrounding area. It was only necessary to go out and cut it down. Photos of Krema III after its liberation show large piles of cut wood on its outside grounds.<sup>132</sup> A report on the strength of the crematoria detail for July 28, 1944 shows 30 wood unloaders [holzablader] attached to 870 fire stokers divided into two 12 hour shifts.<sup>133</sup>

#### Absence of Records

One of the points that needs to be emphasized is that to date no records have surfaced from any source documenting how the Auschwitz ovens worked (i.e. burning time for a body, fuel usage for the ovens, number of bodies burned in a given time period, etc.). In fact, to date there is only one documented instance of a single cremation occurring in the camp. Mattogno cited it in response to the author's complaint that no documents had surfaced showing even a single cremation in the camp. It is a report from 1940 stating that a body had been delivered to the ovens for a test cremation. Mattogno has examined all 88,200 pages of the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow, yet he was only able to cite one cremation.<sup>133a</sup> To date no records have surfaced showing cremations in any of the Birkenau 46 ovens. The absence of any evidence to date dealing with these matters is perhaps more incriminating than the evidence which does exist on Auschwitz.

There are thousands of documents in hundreds of files which contain the correspondence of the Bauleitung on plans for the crematoria before and during the construction stage. One would think that considering all of the effort that went into building the crematoria and the ovens that the camp authorities would have wanted to know how they functioned. Even in Gusen, with only two ovens, some records have survived, even though they are only for a limited period of time. Yet, to date there has only surfaced a documented record of one cremation at Auschwitz - and that cremation did not take place in any of the new ovens in the Birkenau area of the camp. Moreover, even that cremation says nothing about how the ovens actually functioned. Therefore, only one of two conclusions can be reached: (1) either only one body was cremated in the camp during the period Auschwitz was in existence or (2) the records were deliberately destroyed. Considering the scale of the building projects, there must have been many records on cremation and oven functioning. In fact, these records were kept in a section of the camp's Political Division administration. The full name of this section was the "Registry Office and Crematorium Administration" [Stand-samt und Krematorium - Verwaltung],

Therefore, it can be wondered why there are no records of cremation when there was an administrative office to deal with these matters.<sup>133b</sup>

In his memoirs, Auschwitz camp commandant Rudolf Hoess wrote that he was ordered by Reichsfuhrer Heinrich Himmler to destroy all information about the number of victims murdered after each action. He states that he personally destroyed the evidence and department heads did the same. He notes that while some information may have escaped destruction, they "could not give enough information to make a calculation."<sup>134</sup> Auschwitz SS guard Pery Broad wrote of destroying records which documented mass murder.<sup>135</sup> Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber recounted how he witnessed truckloads of documents which dealt with deaths being destroyed from time to time in the trash incinerator in the crematorium.<sup>136</sup> Tauber also noted that the shift boss on the crematoria detail kept records on the number of victims murdered. These numbers were checked by an SS man who removed the notebook with this information after each transport was cremated.<sup>137</sup> Tadeusz Paczula, who recorded deaths in the death books, writes that records of those burned in Krema I were kept in a volume entitled "The Book of the Burned" [Verbrennungsbuch].<sup>138</sup> Paczula also notes that the incriminating files in these matters were burned in the crematorium.<sup>139</sup> The lack of documentation on the working of the ovens or number cremated proves conclusively that the eyewitnesses are correct that camp authorities destroyed the records.

It is known that the destruction of incriminating documents in these matters was a policy of the Germans. As noted in Chapter 1, on March 15, 1945 the Gauleiter and Commissioner for Reich Defense, Sprenger, issued a secret order which stated:

"All files, particularly the secret ones, are to be destroyed completely. The secret files about...the installations and deterring work in the concentration camps must be destroyed at all costs. Also, the extermination of some families, etc. These files must under no circumstances fall into the hands of the enemy, since after all they were secret orders by the Fuhrer." <sup>140</sup>

The fact that the Auschwitz authorities destroyed all of the documents causes many problems for researchers because we have no information on how the triple muffle and eight muffle ovens in Birkenau actually functioned. The Bauleitung memo cited earlier on the amount of coke required for these ovens, which was based on data supplied by Topf, is the only contemporaneous information which has surfaced to date. The only other comprehensive information available is the Tauber deposition.

The destruction by the camp authorities of these documents has proved very beneficial for deniers because it has allowed them to engage in all kinds of speculations without any concrete data. Nevertheless, as will be seen, Mattogno ended up discrediting many denier arguments by offering an alternative method of body disposal at Auschwitz not dependent on the ovens.

Open Air Burnings, 1942 and 1943

A principal method for disposing of the bodies of mass murder victims was by open air burnings. The method was used in the Bergen Belsen concentration camp by the authorities when high death rates were occurring.<sup>141</sup> The practice was used in the Majdanek concentration camp, where gassings and mass murder occurred.<sup>142</sup> The Germans also used open air burnings to dispose of their own citizens who were killed as a result of the Allied bombings. There are photos of German fatalities from the Allied bombing of Hamburg being burned in pits and on pyres.<sup>143</sup>

The method of open air burnings was used in the Operation Reinhard camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka where the victims were gassed and burned. Until recently, the only surviving evidence from these camps was eyewitness testimony from perpetrators and victims to the burnings.<sup>144</sup> Nearly all of the incriminating evidence was destroyed. Odilo Globocnik, who had overall responsibility for Operation Reinhard, wrote a "Top Secret" memo on January 5, 1944, after these camps had been destroyed, which states that "[w]ith regard to the complete final accounts of 'Operation Reinhard' I must add that all vouchers should be destroyed as soon as possible, as has been done in the case of all other documents pertaining to this operation."<sup>145</sup> Just as with Auschwitz, the most incriminating evidence was destroyed. However, recent excavations on the site of the Belzec extermination camp by an archeological team revealed mass graves of thousands of unburned bodies and the ashes of some of those incinerated. The ashes of most of the incinerated were scattered after the burning. <sup>146</sup>

Another document that has come to light recently is a daily report dated from October 1942 from the Military Commander in the General Government, an administrative unit in German occupied Poland, about Treblinka. The report states: "Supreme Command...informs that the Jews in Treblinka are not adequately buried and that, as a result, an unbearable body stench befouls the air." <sup>147</sup> Treblinka camp commandant Franz Stangl testified at his trial that dead bodies were excavated at the beginning of 1943 to be burned along with those of recently gassed prisoners.<sup>148</sup>

Mattogno's journey into the open air burnings began with a problem he had with coke consumption. In his 1994 monograph, he did not address the issue of what happened to those registered prisoners who had died prior to the building of the four new Birkenau crematoria, the first of which went into operation in March 1943. Recall that he was arguing that only registered prisoners died in the camp and no non-registered prisoners were brought there to be murdered. The problem is with those registered prisoners. The Auschwitz death books show that from March 1942 through February 1943 - before any of the new 46 Birkenau ovens were available - about 51,000 registered prisoners died. The available information- which, as noted earlier, may be incomplete-shows 373.5 tons of coke delivered for the three double muffle furnaces during this period of time.<sup>149</sup> This averages to about 7.3 kilograms per body. Recall that Mattogno argued that it took 30 kilograms of coke to cremate a body in a double muffle furnace. Even within this information there are discrepancies. As noted earlier, 39 tons of coke were delivered in March 1942 and there were about 3000 deaths.<sup>150</sup> This comes to about 13 kilograms per body. In July 1942, 4124 prisoners died<sup>151</sup> while there were 16.5 tons of coke delivered for a little more than 4 kilograms per body. The biggest discrepancy was in October 1942 when there were 5900 registered deaths and only 15 tons of coke delivered for less than 3 kilograms per body.

Mattogno also faced another problem. He had accepted as valid coke deliveries of 93.6 tons for the period November 1941 through January 1942.<sup>152</sup> These figures were published by Holocaust denier David Irving. As noted earlier, Irving refuses to offer any substantiation for the coke numbers he published. The problem Mattogno had is with the number of deaths which occurred at Auschwitz during this period of time. There were 6745 deaths of Soviet prisoners and about 4000 deaths of other prisoners.<sup>153</sup> This means that when the alleged coke figures are divided by the number of deaths, the

consumption comes out to 8.7 kilograms of coke per body.

Mattogno never admitted directly that the above numbers were an issue. However, he was no doubt aware that at some point a researcher would compare the deaths of registered prisoners for the periods of time under discussion with the coke deliveries and conclude that his thesis did not work. Therefore, he did something no other denier had ever done: he admitted that there were open air burnings of bodies. His only other choice was to admit that these bodies were being disposed of in the ovens. However, if he did this he would invalidate his coke limitation arguments. His source for outdoor burnings was camp historian Danuta Czech. Mattogno wrote: "According to Danuta Czech's Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-1945, the incineration of exhumed bodies began on September 21, which seems quite credible, and ended in November."<sup>154</sup> The problem is that Mattogno concealed the source of Czech's information. She was relying for this information on the memoirs of the Auschwitz camp commandant, Rudolf Hoess.<sup>155</sup> As noted elsewhere, Hoess's memoirs are extremely reliable in that there is a good deal of independent documentation for most of the major statements he made in them.<sup>156</sup> Since his memoirs confirm that mass murder was taking place at Auschwitz and the means by which it was being carried out, deniers have excoriated them as being false. Obviously, therefore, Mattogno could not quote them directly. Nevertheless, what is particularly interesting is that he found them as reliable as many historians when attempting to solve a problem. However, Mattogno ignored the principal context in which Czech was relying on these memoirs and the context in which Hoess was presenting this information about open air burnings. Hoess was writing about the bodies of gassed victims. He wrote the following:

"During the spring of 1942 we were still dealing with small police actions. But during the summer the transports became more numerous and we were forced to build another extermination site [in addition to Crematorium I]... Five barracks were built, two near Bunker I and three near Bunker II. Bunker II was the larger one. It held about 1200 people. As late as the summer of 1942 the bodies were still buried in mass graves. Not until the end of the summer [September] of 1942 did we start burning them. At first we put 2000 bodies on a large pile of wood. Then we opened up the mass graves and burned the new bodies on top of the old ones from the earlier burials... The burning went on continuously - all day and all night. By the end of November all the mass graves were cleared. The number of buried bodies in the mass graves was 107,000. This number contains not only the first Jewish transports which were gassed when we started the burnings but also the bodies of prisoners who died in the main camp [Auschwitz I] during the winter of 1941 and 1942 because the crematory was out of order. The prisoners who died at Birkenau are included in this number."<sup>157</sup>

The two bunkers were located in a wooded area, several hundred yards apart, behind Birkenau, not far from where Kremas IV and V would later be built. They were known as the Red Bunker, or Bunker I, and the White Bunker, or Bunker 2. Four of the barracks mentioned by Hoess are referred to in a lengthy Bauleitung report on the camp from July 15, 1942 as "4 barracks for special treatment [sonderbehandlung] of prisoners in Birkenau."<sup>158</sup> As noted earlier, special treatment was a word used for murder.

The time line for Hoess's reference to dead prisoners in Birkenau as being buried and then burned in the open is unclear as far as these deaths occurring in winter of 1941 and 1942 is concerned. He may have been referring to the first few weeks of February because the coke figures start in the middle of the

month. If Mattogno's assertion that there were coke deliveries for November 1941 through January 1942 is correct, then the first half of February would be the time period. On the other hand, if there were no coke deliveries then the ovens of Krema I might have been down for two or three months. As noted earlier, there are no coke figures for any period prior to mid February 1942 - unless we are willing to accept Mattogno's November 1941 through January 1942 figures as being accurate.

Hoess's reference to the dead prisoners from Birkenau as being buried and then burned in the open is also unclear. Is he referring to all of the Birkenau prisoners who died in 1942 or only those who died in the period he defines as the winter of 1941 and 1942? Mattogno argued that all dead Birkenau prisoners from 1942 were buried in mass graves so he could salvage his coke arguments.<sup>159</sup> He did not, of course, mention that his source was Hoess - and it is not even certain that this is what Hoess meant.

The issue of how many prisoners were cremated in Krema I during the period which preceded the building of the four Birkenau crematoria - prior to March 1943 - is problematical. Any registered prisoner who was gassed in one of the two bunkers was obviously burned in the open. Many registered prisoners were killed by phenol injection in the hospital of the main camp where Krema I was located. There were also non - registered prisoners killed in the gas chamber of Krema I. According to Sonderkommando Alter Feinsilber, about 250 non - registered prisoners were brought into the main camp on a weekly basis and shot.<sup>160</sup> We do not know how many other non registered prisoners were killed in the gas chamber of the main camp and therefore how much coke was used to cremate each prisoner. Birkenau was about a mile and a half from the main camp and it is highly possible that any registered prisoner who died there was burned in the open prior to the building of the four crematoria. There is no concrete information on the issue.

Hoess's account of the outdoor burnings resulting mainly from the gassings in the two bunkers has been confirmed in the memoirs of Auschwitz SS private Pery Broad, which were written at about the same time as Hoess's.<sup>161</sup> These body burning activities and the context in which they occurred were also confirmed by Sonderkommandos Alter Feinsilber,<sup>162</sup> Szlama Dragon,<sup>163</sup> Henryk Tauber,<sup>164</sup> and Filip Muller;<sup>165</sup> and two prisoners who escaped in April 1944 and filed a report published with the War Refugee Board.<sup>166</sup> The gassings in the two bunkers were also confirmed by French prisoner doctor Andre Lettich,<sup>167</sup> and the post war testimonies of Auschwitz SS doctor Johann Kremer and SS men Karl Hoblinger and Richard Bock.<sup>168</sup> Mattogno attempted to co - opt all of this evidence to make it seem that the outdoor burnings were only of registered prisoners who had died of

typhus.

However, Mattogno had created a dilemma for his argument. He had now identified a body disposal method, confirmed by many witnesses, which was not dependent on the ovens. This means that even if every false limitation Mattogno was placing on the ovens was correct, it made no difference. Outdoor burnings were not dependent on coke and there was no need to worry about breakdowns or maintenance. Therefore, bodies could be burned in an unlimited quantity. This being the case, there was no reason that the number of bodies of murdered prisoners, which exceeded one million, could not be disposed of. In order to extricate himself from his own argument, he then claimed that the open air burnings ceased when the new crematoria became operational. He had to do this or else admit that his arguments about the limitations he was placing on the ovens were irrelevant. Mattogno's source was denier critic Jean - Claude Pressac, whose writings he had been attempting to discredit for some years.<sup>169</sup> However, Mattogno omitted to mention the context in which Pressac's remarks were made. Pressac had reproduced the testimony of Sonderkommando Szlama Dragon, who had discussed the gassing and burning of prisoners. Dragon then stated:

"After the construction at Birkenau of [C]rematorium II, the [undressing] huts situated next to Bunker 2 [the second of two gassing bunkers which is also known as the "White Bunker"] were also dismantled. The pits were filled with earth and the surface was smoothed. The bunker itself was kept until the end. It remained unused for a long time and then was started up again for gassing the Hungarian Jews [beginning in mid May 1944]. They then built new huts and dug new pits."<sup>170</sup>

Thus, in the final analysis, Mattogno was forced to rely on the Hoess memoirs, via Danuta Czech, and Dragon's testimony, via Pressac. However, he could not reveal the true sources for his argument or the context in which Hoess and Dragon made their comments. One major problem Mattogno had with Dragon's testimony is that he specifically mentions that Bunker 2 - also known as the White Bunker or Bunker V in some of the literature- was reactivated for the Hungarian operation in May 1944. Mattogno was arguing that no open air burnings took place in this area after the new crematoria became activated.

Dragon's statement that the open air burnings near the White Bunker ceased with the building of Crematorium n until the Hungarian operation was started needs some further comment. According to Hoess who, as noted above, Mattogno found very credible in these matters, the White Bunker was kept as a standby when Crematoriums II and III were not operating.<sup>171</sup> In his Nuremberg testimony Hoess stated that the two bunkers "were also used later on whenever the crematoriums were insufficient to handle the work." <sup>172</sup> His testimony only differs from his memoirs in that in the former he mentions both bunkers as being active when needed whereas in his memoirs he only mentions the White Bunker.

The White Bunker was in a wooded area outside the Birkenau camp. As will be shown later on, it can be seen on a photograph taken of the camp in 1944. Even Mattogno admits that there were four pits in the area where bodies were disposed of on pyres, though he placed the time of operation in 1942 and 1943, not 1944.<sup>173</sup> The continued usage of this area after the building of the crematoria is suggested by the testimony of Soviet prisoner Nicolai Vassiliev at the Auschwitz trials in Germany in the mid 1960s. He stated that in the summer of 1943 about 300 Soviet prisoners were "exterminated" in a wooded area outside of the camp. This description fits the area where the White Bunker was located.<sup>174</sup>

The continued usage after the building the four crematoria is the only explanation why the White Bunker was not destroyed until the camp authorities ceased all gassings. Bunker I, the Red Bunker, was dismantled at some point - though it is not known exactly when. The only conceivable reason for not destroying the White Bunker was because its continued usage was envisaged and indeed occurred for some periods following the completion of the first new crematoria in March 1943 up until the time of the Hungarian operation in mid May 1944. The structure could not have been kept after the building of the crematoria for the express purpose of the Hungarian operation because Germany did not seize control of Hungary until March 1944, one year after the first of the new crematoria were completed. At the time the first of the new crematoria went into service, the Auschwitz authorities could not have known that the Hungarian deportations would take place. As will be seen in the next part of this chapter, there is photographic evidence documenting the existence of the White Bunker.<sup>175</sup>

As noted earlier, Mattogno claimed that Crematorium II was down for 115 days from March 25 to July

18, 1943 and Crematorium III was down for 60 days in 1944, meaning that there were potentially 175 days following March 1943 when open air burnings could have occurred in the area of the bunkers. However, it was also noted that there is no support for the assertion about the down time of these ovens.<sup>176</sup> Nevertheless, it was noted that Krema II was down for a month from May to June 1943.<sup>177</sup> It is also reasonable to assume that there were periods when the ovens did not work to full capacity because of repairs or other factors. This interpretation would be consistent with Hoess's comments on the issue. On the other hand, the two prisoners who escaped in April 1944, before the White Bunker was reactivated for the Hungarian operation in mid May 1944, state that the gassings and burnings were discontinued there with the inauguration of the new crematoria.<sup>178</sup> Thus, their version agrees with Dragon's.

As will be seen in the next part of this chapter, the White Bunker was used for the Hungarian transports which began to arrive in mid May 1944. How often it was used between March 1943 and May 1944 is not known. The testimony suggests that it was closed down for a period of time, and reactivated in May 1944. The exact period of time it was closed down between March 1943 and May 1944 cannot be stated with certainty. Was it used when needed, as suggested by Hoess, or was closed down for 14 months, as stated by the escapees and Dragon? It is possible to reconcile both accounts by acknowledging that the White Bunker was officially shut down in March 1943, but that the area near the bunker was still used for open air burnings if problems arose with the crematoria. Mattogno's attempt to have the bunkers permanently closed down in March 1943 is based on testimony which he has (1) taken out of context, (2) contradicts the arguments he was making about there being no mass murder and gassing in Auschwitz, and (3) for which he refused to quote the original sources for his claims. The key point is that the outdoor facilities were always there if needed, as suggested by Hoess and Vassiliev, and the camp authorities need not be hampered by any limitations that might have been imposed by the new crematoria -assuming there were such limitations.

### Open Air Burnings and Photos, 1944

The issue of open air burnings in 1944 centers around the deportation of Hungarian Jews, which lasted from mid May to mid July. Deniers claim that no extermination of the Hungarian Jews occurred. The demographics of Hungarian Jewry were analyzed in Chapter 3. Recall that from mid May 1944 to mid July 1944, about 437,000 Jews were deported to Auschwitz from Hungary.

As noted earlier in this chapter, most of the primary evidence in the form of documents for the extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz was destroyed by the Germans. Deniers have argued that approximately 400,000 Jews could not have been exterminated in a two month period because of the body disposal problem. Some try to argue that it was not possible to cremate so many people in the ovens in such a short period of time. No one familiar with the problem argues that the crematoria could have disposed of so many people in a two month period. In fact, the capacity of the crematoria was limited at this time. The eight ovens of Krema IV went down permanently in April or May 1943 while the six ovens of Krema I were withdrawn in July 1943. The eight ovens of Krema V functioned off and on during 1944. This means that there were only 30 reliable ovens operating in Kremas II and III during the Hungarian operation.

The eyewitness testimony from those who were there states that there were two areas utilized for open air burnings. One was the area near the White Bunker which, as noted earlier, had been utilized in 1942

and 1943. It was reactivated on a full time basis for the Hungarian operation. The other area was located behind Krema V where pits were dug to burn the gassed. Hoess mentions pits in the wooded area outside of the camp where the White Bunker was located and pits near Krema V.<sup>179</sup> Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber told of the pits dug along Krema V and the wooded area near the White Bunker.<sup>180</sup> Sonderkommando Filip Muller wrote of the cremation pits at the White Bunker and Krema V.<sup>181</sup> Sonderkommando Alter Feinsilber testified as to the pits near the Bunker. The pits near Krema V "were expressly dug to burn the Hungarian Jews."<sup>182</sup> Two prisoners who escaped from Auschwitz on May 27, 1944, while the Hungarian operation was taking place, spoke of pits near the White Bunker that were 50 by 100 feet.<sup>183</sup> Miklos Nyiszli, a Hungarian Jewish doctor who arrived in May 1944 and had first hand experience with the work of the Sonderkommando, wrote of the ditch at the White Bunker being 18 by 150 feet with "a welter of burning bodies."<sup>184</sup> Paul Bendel, a French doctor and Sonderkommando, wrote of three pits of 20 by 40 feet each dug near Kremas IV and V because the crematoria could not handle the bodies. <sup>185</sup>

How credible was this testimony? The witnesses who knew first hand were the Sonderkommando, workers who burned the bodies of the gassed victims. Sonderkommando Filip Muller wrote that during the Hungarian operation their number increased from 450 to 900.<sup>186</sup> Feinsilber also placed the number at 900.<sup>187</sup> Tauber mentioned 1000. Nyiszli states that there were 860 such workers clearing the dead.<sup>188</sup> Unfortunately, no documentary evidence is available for mid May through mid July 1944, the time of the Hungarian deportations. However, a camp document dated July 28, 1944 lists 870 stokers [heizer] and 30 wood unloaders [holzablader] assigned in two 12 hour shifts to the four crematoria.<sup>189</sup> A similar report from August 29 shows 874 workers assigned to the four crematoria in two 12 hour shifts.<sup>190</sup> These two reports on the strength of the crematoria detail further reinforce the credibility of the eyewitnesses. This extremely high number is far beyond any amount that would be needed for a normal death rate. There is no benign explanation for this number, and deniers have never addressed the issue.

As shown in Chapter 3, a photo of the camp taken on May 31, 1944 shows smoke rising from the area behind Krema V. In 1994 Mattogno claimed that this photo did not show a "trace of smoke, no trace of pits, crematory or otherwise...no trace of dirt extracted from pits..."<sup>191</sup> However, when smoke was shown from the photo in a book published in 1994<sup>192</sup> Mattogno then claimed, in 1995, that the smoke was not from burning bodies but most probably from "trash incineration."<sup>193</sup> However, it is known that this is not the case because Kremas II<sup>194</sup> and III<sup>195</sup> each had a trash incinerator. Therefore, there would not have been a reason to burn trash in the open. Moreover, as will be seen, there are multiple pits near Krema V in the photo. In 1996 Mattogno once again gave a different version suggesting that there may have been outdoor burnings in 1944 near Krema V but "supposing that the smoke comes from a [outdoor] cremation facility" meant only that "there was a shortfall for coke in the crematory ovens or when the crematoria were shut down for repairs." Mattogno's problem was to explain why outdoor burnings would be needed if the ovens were functioning so he tried to argue that those ovens were probably not functioning.<sup>196</sup> No evidence was presented to support such an assertion and the available archival evidence suggests that the ovens were indeed functioning during the Hungarian operation.<sup>197</sup>

Mattogno stated that the Red and White Bunkers were not "designated" in any German documents and that the terms had "been created by postwar eyewitnesses."<sup>198</sup> While the Red Bunker had been dismantled by the time of the Hungarian operation, there is now documentary evidence of the White Bunker's existence. In the Spring of 1998 the author spoke with Dino Brugioni, the former intelligence photo expert who first analyzed the Auschwitz photos in 1979. Brugioni was also a photo analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency during the Cuban missile crisis and he appeared on the CNN

documentary "Cold War" to discuss how he located missiles in Cuba. Brugioni stated that the White Bunker was visible on the May 31 photo.

Late Holocaust History Project member and computer programmer Mark Van Alstine examined the May 31 photo for the author and confirms Brugioni's observation that the White Bunker is in the wooded area where the eyewitnesses said it was. He has identified three pits in the area of the White Bunker that could be used to burn and dispose bodies during the Hungarian operation, which lasted from mid May to mid July 1944.<sup>199</sup> Van Alstine was able to confirm from the photo the existence of three huts that were used for prisoner undressing near the White Bunker. Recall that Hoess wrote that there were three huts near the White Bunker.<sup>200</sup> Van Alstine also confirms the existence of the three pits near Krema V each of which he estimates to be about 1150 square feet each for a total of 3450 square feet of pit space.<sup>201</sup>

The author has also had Mr. Carroll Lucas, a photo imagery expert with 45 years experience, examine the May 31 photo and others taken by the Allies in 1944. Mr. Lucas's qualifications are discussed in the next section of this chapter dealing with denier John Ball. The full text of his report with an addendum appears in Appendix IV. In the addendum, Lucas confirms the existence of a "small farmhouse and a couple of storage buildings" outside of the Birkenau complex. This is the White Bunker, which had been a farmhouse before its conversion to a gas chamber, and the undressing installations for prisoners. Lucas also was able to find a connection between the structure and Birkenau.

"...the interesting thing that brought it to my attention was the existence of a small unimproved road/trail that begins at this structure and traverses southeast to the security barrier next to the Birkenau water/sewage processing plant, continues along the southernmost edge of this plant to the northwestern corner of the wall surrounding Crematorium III... The light snow in the December 21 [1944 aerial photo] image allows one to observe the extent of the trail although the resolution is much poorer than the May 31 coverage. This implies a definite connection at one time between the structure and the Birkenau complex."

The road that Lucas discovered leading to the White Bunker was probably the path victims took to the site after arriving at Birkenau. Also, Lucas identifies outside of the Birkenau complex on the May 31 photo:

"four, possibly five large, recently bulldozed linear excavations... The total length of these excavations is between 1200 and 1500 feet. All appear to have recently been covered over, since no shadows are evident. These excavations have the classic appearance of a mass grave site..."

Mattogno claimed that these gravesites had ceased being used in 1943 with the completion of the four crematoria. However, Lucas's observation about their recently being bulldozed shows that they were in current use.

Lucas also examined the land area around Kremas IV and V on the May 31 photo where he finds a

"series of narrow trenches excavated in echelon within a large area of bare soil. Twelve of the trenches (having a total length of approximately 800 feet) are open, whereas another 9 trenches (totaling approximately 650 feet) appear to have been filled in... They have all the appearances of a hand dug, mass grave sites used to dispense the residue of the adjacent crematoria"

Lucas does not specify a square footage amount for the mass grave sites outside or inside the Birkenau area. However, it would appear reasonable to conclude that these areas must have been at least several feet in width.

Lucas observes that on the August 25 photo "[t]here is no evidence of mass grave sites..." A similar observation is made for the September 13, 1944 photo. This indicates the transitory nature of the mass graves. The outdoor burning activity most likely ceased with the completion of the Lodz Ghetto operation in August 1944. This observation creates further complications for deniers because Mattogno had argued that the outdoor burning activity in the area of the White Bunker ceased in March 1943. If this was the case then the mass gravesites should have disappeared by the time that the May 31, 1944 photo was taken.

There has also been some question about whether there were railroad cars in the complex. May 31 was during the period when many Jews were arriving from Hungary. Lucas was able to identify "well over" 100 rail cars on the photo which are comprised of "long, wide passenger coaches, the slightly smaller freight (box) cars, and the smaller still, possible cattle cars." The receiving rail yard is "also heavily used."

Lucas was able to identify 21 separate formations of people on the May 31 photo. The author specifically asked him about the findings of Cal Tech's Dr. Nevin Bryant, discussed, in Chapter 3, about prisoners entering Krema V.<sup>202</sup> In an addendum to the report, Lucas writes:

"My notes indicate 'possible' lines of people moving between the open hand dug trenches toward Crematorium V. There is a broken line of four different irregular dark spots along the road. These may possibly be personnel assigned to digging the trenches or being marched into the Crematorium. The fact that one formation appears to be turning the corner into the area of the crematorium suggests the latter. However, the resolution of the photo is such that a clear call cannot be made. The call is strengthened by the independent analyses conducted by Cal Tech."

Another photo has recently surfaced from the National Archives that was taken towards the end of the Hungarian operation. It is a Luftwaffe photo taken on July 8, 1944. It shows heavy smoke coming from the area of Krema V where the pits are located.<sup>203</sup> Therefore, the evidence on the May 31 and July 8 photos confirms all aspects of the eyewitness accounts about the open air burnings at the White Bunker and Krema V. Open air burnings are an effective means of body disposal especially when liquid

flammables are used. In 1887, Dr. Hugo Erichsen, one of the world's leading experts in body disposal in the late 19th and 20th centuries, wrote of the Belgian government's efforts along these lines in a battle during the Franco- Prussian War in 1871. Erichsen commented on the efforts to dispose of these bodies in pits. The individual charged with body disposal was named Creteur:

"[Creteur] determined to cover the graves with a layer of chloride of

lime, and to pour diluted muriatic acid upon them subsequently. By this means he succeeded in laying bare the topmost layer of the corpses. He then had large quantities of coal poured into the pit... He then had more chloride of lime heaped upon the corpses, and finally had bundles of hay, previously saturated with kerosene thrown into the pit. Creteur declares that from 200 to 300 were consumed within 50 to 60 minutes.... About one fourth of all the contents remained in the pits, consisting of calcined bones and a dry mass. These were again covered with chloride of lime, and the trenches were closed. In this way 45,855 human and equine bodies were disposed of."

Dr. Erichsen then advocated using this technique in time of war: "Under the existing circumstances, I think Creteur's method would be best. By this means, several hundred bodies would be destroyed at once."<sup>204</sup> It stands to reason that if the Belgians could do this in 1871, Germany certainly had the capability to improve on the process 70 years later.

Many of the eyewitnesses to the outdoor burnings at Auschwitz stated that liquid flammables were used to dispose of the bodies.<sup>205</sup> The Germans used liquid flammables to dispose of bodies at Bergen Belsen,<sup>206</sup> Majdanek, <sup>207</sup> and the Operation Reinhard extermination camps.<sup>208</sup> Sonderkommando Filip Muller addressed the specific problem:

"...[I]n the pits the fire would burn only as long as the air could circulate freely between the bodies. As the heap of bodies settled, no air was able to get in from the outside. This meant that we stokers had constantly to pour oil or wood alcohol on the burning corpses..."

"About fifteen stokers had to place the fuel in the pit and to light and maintain the fire by constantly stoking in between the corpses and pouring oil, wood alcohol and liquid human fat over them."<sup>209</sup>

Sonderkommando Paul Bendel also mentioned using human fat to accelerate the open air burning process.<sup>210</sup>

When Mattogno finally did admit that outdoor burnings took place in order to salvage his coke arguments-discussed earlier- he stated that it was done on pyres.<sup>211</sup> Recall that he placed these burnings in the area of the White Bunker as all the eyewitnesses had done, but only for the period before the Birkenau crematoria were built. Once again he had co - opted eyewitness testimony which

spoke of using pyres near the White Bunker in the context of burning gassed victims.<sup>212</sup> Thus, it appears that while pyres were used in the pits near the White Bunker, bodies were simply placed in the pits near Krema V.

The best evidence of the outdoor burnings was captured in a photo taken by a Sonderkommando in August 1944, after the Hungarian operation. It shows the burning of a large number of corpses in back of Krema V. The area can be identified because it is consistent with the background of that area.<sup>213</sup> A high barbed wire fence can be seen with a forested area outside of it. The photo is well known and has been reproduced in many places, including the internet.<sup>214</sup> However, the best copy of the photo was published in a study done under the auspices of the Auschwitz State Museum in 1993. It has a width of about 18 inches and shows more of the photo than has been published elsewhere. It is possible to see 13 or 14 Sonderkommandos in uniform and about 50 naked corpses which are about to be burned. The total number of bodies actually being burned cannot be ascertained because heavy smoke is obscuring the pits.<sup>215</sup> Muller wrote that 25 Sonderkommandos would stack the corpses in the pits.<sup>216</sup> This photo was probably taken during the Lodz Ghetto operation in August 1944.

How many Jews were incinerated in open air burnings during the Hungarian operation? The answer will probably never be known. In the author's opinion, at least 75% of the Hungarian Jews killed were burned in the pits near Krema V or on pyres near the White Bunker while the remainder were burned in the ovens of Crematoria II and III. According to Hoess, about 9000 per day were murdered during this period of time.<sup>217</sup> Hoess's number is consistent with the number of victims who were arriving on trains. The train transport records from Hungary show about 1200 to 3400 victims on each train transport leaving Hungary.<sup>218</sup> Assuming that three trains per day arrived, it would have been possible to incinerate all 9000 victims in three operations without having to use either Krema II or III. However, it is probable that Kremas II and III were each used at least once per day.

This could be done as follows. The best information on the White Bunker is that it was sufficiently large enough to gas 1200 victims while Krema V had three gas chambers which totaled an area of 2500 square feet.<sup>219</sup> This means that about 1800 victims could be squeezed into the areas of Krema V designated for the gassing. Therefore, by using only the White Bunker and Krema V, an entire transport of 3000 could be incinerated and burned in the open. As noted earlier, the White Bunker and its pits were in a wooded area. This area would have been obscured from the view of newly arriving prisoners. Krema V was surrounded by trees and was often referred to as the forest Krema.<sup>220</sup> The photo of the prisoners being incinerated in the open by the Sonderkommandos in the back of Krema V, discussed above, shows the burning area not surrounded by trees, so it was visible. However, it was still further away from the railroad tracks where new prisoners arrived than any of the other crematoria. Also, Krema V was relatively close to the White Bunker. Consequently, by using the White Bunker and Krema V the authorities could keep the gassing and burning operations fairly close together while at the same time provide the best opportunity to conceal them from newly arriving prisoners.

Assuming Kremas II and III were used, which is probable, there could have been a transport of 3000 or less gassed in both installations. Alternatively, in a transport of 3000, some could have been directed to the White Bunker or Krema V while the remainder were incinerated in Kremas II and III.

There were certainly enough Sonderkommandos assigned to the operation to make it run efficiently. As noted above, camp records show 900 Sonderkommandos. They were divided into two 12 hour shifts. This means that when Kremas II and III were not being used, Sonderkommandos assigned to those facilities could be moved to Krema V and the White Bunker. As noted earlier, Krema IV was not operational so that Sonderkommandos assigned there could be used wherever needed. Thus, there were

450 Sonderkommandos on a shift to clear about 3000 bodies, the probable amount of prisoners from one transport gassed in an operation. The photo of the burning operation -discussed above - shows that a body was carried by one or two Sonderkommandos. It also shows that the burning started before all of the bodies were cleared from the gas chamber because corpses are being dragged to the area while smoke is obscuring the view of the pits.<sup>221</sup>

It is likely that as each transport arrived some of the victims were directed to Kremas II and III. The vast majority, however, were directed to the White Bunker and Krema V. This is the only logical scenario since the crematoria could not possibly have disposed of the number the victims who were being murdered on a daily basis. The camp authorities were already aware that the crematoria would not be able to dispose of the number of victims that would arrive every day from Hungary. This is why they utilized the White Bunker's pits and dug pits behind Krema V.

### John Ball's Photos

A discussion of open air burnings would not be complete without mentioning John Ball, the principal denier "expert" on photo analysis. In 1992 Ball published what he purported to be an analysis of photos taken of the various extermination sites of the Nazi "Final Solution." He had examined these photos in the United States National Archives. The following discussion examines his analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau photos that were taken by the United States Air Force in 1944. Two of these photos, from May 31 and June 26, were discussed in the prior section of this chapter and Chapter 3.

Ball claimed in several places that the air photos do not show fences around the crematoria. He was arguing that they could not have been homicidal facilities if they were not secure.<sup>222</sup> However, earlier he claimed that a fence had been drawn around the crematoria. Here he is saying that the original photo had been altered by forgers to make it look as if there was such a fence.<sup>223</sup> Ball's claims in this regard should be considered rather fantastic since he reproduced a well known ground level 1944 photo taken by a member of the Bauleitung which shows prisoners arriving at Auschwitz and a photo of Krema II in the background. A high barbed wire fence is shown immediately outside of Krema II.<sup>224</sup> Ball did not claim that this photo was a forgery. In fact, a number of contemporaneous photos from the period show high barbed wire fences near the four Birkenau crematoria.<sup>225</sup> How Ball could either not find these fences on the aerial photographs or claim they were forgeries is beyond comprehension. They are at least 10 feet in height if not higher. Ball was making a far fetched claim even for a denier.

A Bauleitung memo from April 1943, as the crematoria were being completed, requested electrified fencing for 30 prisoner barracks and Elbe crematoria.<sup>226</sup> A "Top Secret" memo from the chief of the SS Economic and Administrative Main Office from April 1944 describes the three areas which comprised Auschwitz. Birkenau was known as Auschwitz II or Camp II.

"...Camp II is also surrounded by an electrically charged wire fence; there are also watch towers...

"Apart from the direct security of camp I and II by manned watch towers and electrically chargeable wire fences, a line of bunkers has been constructed as an inner ring which will be manned by SS men."<sup>227</sup>

A Bauleitung report from June 1944, during the Hungarian operation, lists among the construction tasks: "three barracks for immediate measures 'Jewish Action,'" "building six rooms for corpses in BA I and II [Birkenau Sectors I and 2]", and "camouflaging [tarnung] crematorium."<sup>228</sup> Why would the Bauleitung need more space for corpses? There was no typhus epidemic. Also, why would it be necessary to camouflage the crematoria during the Hungarian operation? Hoess wrote that during the summer of 1944 the camp authorities attempted to camouflage the crematoria to hide mass murder.<sup>229</sup>

Ball claimed that there was no smoke from pits on the May 31 photo.<sup>230</sup> As discussed earlier, the photo does show smoke rising from an area near Krema V that many witnesses described as having burning pits. Ball's original claims were made in 1992, but the photo finally got exposure when it was published in 1994. Ball then backtracked, after the smoke was identified, by claiming that there really was not very much smoke at all on the photo without explaining how he missed it in the first place.<sup>231</sup>

Ball used a similar technique when he "analyzed" the Luftwaffe photo of July 8, 1944. As noted earlier, this recently discovered photo shows a great deal of smoke coming from the pits near Krema V. However, Ball did not acknowledge that there was any smoke on the photo when he reproduced it. In fact, he had "cropped" out the smoke from the photo so that the reader would not see it.<sup>232</sup>

Ball was also not very familiar with the crematoria. He questioned whether there could have been burnings in the crematoria during the Hungarian operation because there is no coke, the fuel used to charge the ovens, visible on the photos.<sup>233</sup> He does not appear to have been aware that oven fuel was stored inside of the crematoria.<sup>234</sup> He also claimed that there was no fuel delivery system from the railroad tracks to the crematoria.<sup>235</sup> However, the railroad ramp was about 100 feet from Krema II.<sup>236</sup> It would not have been difficult for coke to be unloaded from the trains onto trucks which could then deliver the fuel to the crematoria. Alternatively, trucks could have carried the coke into the camp directly. Ball would apparently have us believe that there was no way to deliver fuel to the crematoria. If this is correct, then they never functioned at all! Why would the authorities build so many ovens with no means of fueling them?

After the publication of Ball's photo book in 1992, Mattogno acknowledged that there were open air burnings. As discussed earlier in the present chapter, he did this because he was trying to explain what happened to the registered prisoners who died. He could not say that they were burned in the ovens because it would have destroyed arguments he was making about coke usage. These arguments were examined earlier in the chapter. Mattogno stated that there were four huge parallel gravesite pits where bodies had been burned on pyres and buried, but did not mention the White Bunker. He attempted to put the right spin on this information by saying that they were only there to dispose of bodies before building the new crematoria, but not used during the Hungarian operation.<sup>237</sup>

Ball never addressed the issue about the burnings in the wooded area where the White Bunker was located. He said there were open air burnings, but did not identify a geographic location.<sup>238</sup> In fact, this tells us a great deal about Ball's dishonest methodology. Ball must have already known that there were gravesites in the area of the White Bunker since he had examined the photos when he wrote his 1992 book. However, he did not mention them until Mattogno needed to show that such areas existed.

Ball must have also seen the White Bunker on the May 31 photo when he wrote his 1992 book. Yet there has never been so much as a mention of it from him

Ball's most controversial allegation is that these photos were tampered with. The issue of the May 31 photo has already been addressed. The August 25 photo has also caused a great deal of problems for deniers. The CIA analysis published in 1979 shows four vents on Krema II - identified as Birkenau Krema I in the report 239 which are "vents used to insert the Zyklon B gas crystals."<sup>240</sup> This confirmed Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber's testimony in 1945 that there were four openings for inserting the gas.<sup>241</sup> Jean - Claude Pressac found a document for Krema II which mentioned "four wire mesh introduction devices" and "4 wooden covers."<sup>242</sup>

The CIA analysts also wrote that a rail transport of 33 cars could be seen at the Birkenau railroad. The report states: "[t]he selection process [for gassing] is either under way or completed. One group of prisoners is apparently being marched to Gas Chamber and Crematorium II [known in most literature as Krema III]."<sup>243</sup> The report also discusses the September 13 photo as showing 85 boxcars on the railroad. "A large column of prisoners, estimated at some 1500 in number, is marching on the camp's main north-south road. There is activity at the Gas Chamber and Crematorium IV [known in most literature as Krema V], and the gate is open; this may be the final destination of the newly arrived prisoners."<sup>244</sup>

Ball claimed that the gas chamber vents and people moving in the photos were drawn on by the CIA, so that the photos were essentially fake.<sup>245</sup> Ball repeated these claims several years later.<sup>246</sup> He then offered \$100,000 to anyone who could prove him wrong. The condition was that three experts would have to agree that the photos were not fake. The challenge was accepted by Nizkor, an internet group that monitors Holocaust denial. However, when the group attempted to contact Ball, he did not respond. Ball is a Canadian citizen. John Morris, of the University of Alberta, explains the attempts to contact Ball. A letter was sent to Ball:

"The letter was returned by Canada Post a few weeks later marked as 'unclaimed'. Canada Postal also noted that a pick up card was placed in Ball's post office box on April 12, 1997 and that they returned the letter a week later on April 19, 1997."

"Two copies of a second letter were sent on May 10, 1997, one to Ball's home address as listed by the Internet Yellow Pages, and one to the post office box advertised on Ball's web page."

"In addition, I sent an e mail message to the address advertised on the web page advising Ball that the letters had been sent."

"In the second and third letters, the requests for clarification were reiterated, and Ball's challenge was tentatively accepted on condition that some show of good faith was forthcoming. In addition, the name of an 'aerial photo expert' was offered as our first nominee."

"No reply to the e mail was ever received, and the letter sent to the supposed home address was returned by Canada Post as "Moved, Address Unknown."

"More alarmingly, the third letter, sent to the advertised post office box, was returned June 10, 1997 marked by Canada Post as 'Moved Address.'" 247

Ball had vanished, and his hoax exposed. It is clear that Ball's challenge was nothing more than a publicity gimmick. This is not surprising. Dr. Nevin Bryant, supervisor of cartographic and image processing applications at Caltech/NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, had already examined these photos before Ball issued the challenge. Dr. Bryant used digital enhancement techniques not available to the two CIA analysts who wrote the report in 1979. He found that the photos were not tampered with.<sup>248</sup> Ball was probably aware that he had already been exposed by Dr. Bryant by the time that Nizkor attempted to contact him.

The author also had his own expert examine Ball's claims of photo tampering. Carroll Lucas - discussed in the prior section of this study -has a long and distinguished career as a photo analyst with over 45 years experience in the area. He spent 25 years with the CIA in the development, evaluation, comparison, and effective exploitation of products from strategic, tactical and civil imaging programs. He received a CIA commendation for outstanding service during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. He spent 14 years as the Deputy Chief of the Imagery Applications division of Autometric Incorporated. An examination of his extensive resume shows that he has, in effect, done it all in the area of photo imagery. Mr. Lucas carried out his research in the National Archives, where he was able to obtain the original negatives of photos taken by the Allies.<sup>249</sup> The full text of the Lucas Report is reproduced in Appendix IV. The following are some key excerpts from that report:

"All frames containing the Auschwitz complexes could be accounted for, based on header data and on the lack of gaps in the number sequences. No splicing was observed between frames that would indicate that someone had cut out a frame containing the Auschwitz complexes and replaced it. Since the overlap between frames ranges from 55 to 80 %, it is easy to observe whether a gap occurred in the coverage because of a frame being edited out. Procedures used to cut out frames from the original film in the 1940's, and still used in the 1970's was to place a metal straight edge in the metered area between frames, and cut the film... No evidence of such editing/removal of original data, was observed over the sites of interest."

" ...There is no evidence of the cutting and splicing of film in the original negative film rolls that would isolate frames covering the Auschwitz-I / or Auschwitz II/Birkenau facilities."

"...all frames containing the Auschwitz I/ Auschwitz II/Birkenau target areas were compared with their

surrounding frames, under magnifications of 60X, to determine if a quality difference occurred between objects within the targets and similar objects on adjacent frames. In all cases, the quality did not appear to change. If duplicate negatives had been inserted for the originals in some esoteric way that produced invisible splices, changes in image quality would still give the deception away. No such quality degradation was observed during this detailed analysis.

"...When making duplicate negatives, if the original negative isn't precisely aligned to the duplicate negative stock during the printing process, a thin black edge will occur that would not be on the negative. The presence of this black edge... is a positive sign that a duplicate negative has replaced the original negative of the affected frames. No such indications were observed on the original negatives reviewed."

"...The bottom line is that the cans of aerial reconnaissance film extracted from the DIA files, provided to the CIA and finally presented to the National Archives, unequivocally contain unedited and untainted original negatives of U.S. aerial reconnaissance missions flown over targets adjacent to the Auschwitz I/Auschwitz II/ Birkenau facilities."

In 1992 Ball claimed that he had been interpreting aerial photos in his position as a mineral exploration geologist for 16 years.<sup>250</sup> However, nowhere in any of Ball's writings does he specify the tests he did to determine whether the Auschwitz photos were tampered with. In fact, it is probable that he is not even familiar with the type of tests that Lucas did, otherwise he would have certainly mentioned them. The Lucas Report shows that John Ball is either incompetent, dishonest or both.

# John C. Zimmerman

## Holocaust Denial

### APPENDIX I

A comparison of Dutch Jews deported to Auschwitz with camp registration numbers from August 28, 1942 to September 3, 1944. Note that the Chronicle lists the registration numbers given for the men and women. The Chronicle also gives a breakdown between the men and the women. Date of deportation and number deported are from the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation and Netherlands

Date of Deportation	Number Deported	Date of Arrival	Amount Registered	Labor
8/28/42	608	8/30	0	170
8/31/42	560	9/1	0	200
9/4/42	714	9/5	53	200
9/7/42	930	9/8	32	110
9/11/42	874	9/12	60	140
9/14/42	902	9/16	73	120
9/18/42	1004	9/19	277	191
9/21/42	713	9/22	183	112
9/25/42	928	9/26	179	138
9/28/42	610	9/30	156	64
10/2/42	1014	10/3	62	160

10/5/42	2012	10/7	98	550
10/9/42	1703	10/11	442	461
10/12/42	1711	10/14	420	344
10/16/42	1710	10/18	116	570
10/19/42	1327	10/21	497	677
10/23/42	988	10/25	53	170
10/26/42	841	10/27	429	251
10/30/42	659	11/1	0	200
11/2/42	954	11/4	50	260
11/6/42	465	11/7	0	110
11/10/42	758	11/12	51	180
11/16/42	761	11/18*	30?	100
11/20/42	726	11/21	82	73
11/24/42	709	11/26	42	70
11/30/42	826	12/2	77	170
12/4/42	812	12/6	16	69
12/8/42	927	12/10	42	60
12/12/42	757	12/14	121	-

\*Not Accounted For.

APPENDIX I (Continued)

Date of Deportation	Number Deported	Date of Arrival	Amount Registered	Labor
1/11/43	750	1/13	189	-
1/18/43	748	1/20	9/5	
1/22/43	921	1/24	35	
1/23/43	516	1/24	52	
1/29/43	659	1/31	20	
2/2/43	890	2/4	69	
2/9/43	1184	2/11	100	
2/16/43	1108	2/18	179	
2/23/43	1101	2/25	261	
8/24/43	1001	8/26	87	
8/31/43	1004	9/2	280	
9/7/43	987	9/9	506	
9/14/43	1005	9/16	292	
9/21/43	979	9/23	427	
10/14/43	1007	10/21	591	
11/15/43	1149	*	517	

11/16/43	995	11/17		
1/25/44	949	1/27	464	
2/8/44	1015	2/10	259	
3/3/44	732	3/5	243	
3/23/44	599	3/25	255	
4/5/44	240	4/7	360	
5/19/44	453	5/21	129	
6/3/44	496	*	350	
9/3/44	1019	9/5	470	
TOTAL	49010		9784	6078

\*Not Accounted For

# John C. Zimmerman

## Holocaust Denial

### APPENDIX II

Train transporter of Jews from Salonika to Auschwitz and their registration as recorded in the Auschwitz Chronicle for 1943, Note that the Chronicle lists the registration numbers and gives a breakdown between men and women.

Date Arrived	Number in Transport	Number Registered
March 20	2,800	609
March 24	2,800	874
March 25	1,901	685
March 30	2,501	453
April 3	2,800	592
April 9	2,500	479
April 10	2,750	783
April 13	2,800	864
April 17	3,000	927
April 18	2,501	605
April 22	2,800	668
April 26	2,700	638
April 27	3,070	541
May 4	2,930	538
May 7	1,000	68
May 8	2,500	815
May 16	4,500	677
June 8	880	308
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,733</b>	<b>11,704</b>

## Foreword to Appendix III

### A Study of the Cyanide Compound Content in the Walls of the Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps: An Introduction

By Richard J. Green, Ph.D

The agent of mass murder in the homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz and Birkenau was a product known as Zyklon B. The active ingredient in Zyklon B was the highly toxic compound hydrogen cyanide (HCN). In 1994, the Institute for Forensic Research Cracow (herein referred to as the IFFR, elsewhere as the IFRC) published a detailed study of the cyanides present in the homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz and Birkenau. This study showed unequivocally the presence of cyanide in all the facilities tested in which the historical record shows that gassing took place. In contrast, they found no traces of cyanide within their detection limits (3-4 µg/kg) in prisoner barracks in which no homicidal gassing occurred. This introduction to the report will attempt to give some context for the lay reader to better understand the implications of the report.

Holocaust deniers often claim that the so-called forensic reports of Leuchter, Rudolf and others prove the impossibility of homicidal gassings at Auschwitz and Birkenau. A central point of their argument is that their studies apparently show that delousing chambers, in which Zyklon B was used, have much higher concentrations of cyanide compounds present than do the homicidal gas chambers. Of course such presumes that their studies were conducted honestly and with good technique. Zimmerman,<sup>1</sup> Pressac,<sup>2</sup> and perhaps others have shown that such a presumption is unwarranted. Even if one takes the reports of Leuchter and others at face value, however, there is a crucial problem with their studies that is addressed in the study of the IFFR. This problem centers around a class of compounds called the iron blues, a representative example of which is Prussian blue.

Hydrogen cyanide and most of its salts are readily soluble in water and thus extremely susceptible to weathering, Prussian blue on the other hand is extremely insoluble. If Prussian blue were to form in a building exposed to hydrogen cyanide, it would remain present at high concentration while other compounds of cyanide would gradually weather away. It has long been known that some of the delousing chambers exhibit obvious blue staining, whereas the remains of the homicidal chambers at Auschwitz and Birkenau do not. Comparing the cyanide content of material from the delousing chambers that exhibits this blue staining and material from homicidal chambers that do not exhibit this staining, may show that the blue staining is indeed a cyanide compound, but it does not show the homicidal gas chambers were not exposed to HCN. This issue is explored in some depth in several articles available at the website of the Holocaust History Project (THHP).<sup>3</sup> Here I only summarize those findings and explain their implications for the IFFR study.

It is shown in great detail in the above-mentioned articles that the conditions in the gas chamber would have made the formation of Prussian blue in significant quantities improbable. A building in which Prussian blue formed would have much higher levels of detectable total cyanides than a building in which Prussian blue did not form. Recall the Prussian blue is much less susceptible to weathering than other cyanides; so it is no surprise if buildings with blue staining have more cyanides than those without.

What is the right experiment to do? Detecting total cyanides appears to be a probe for the likelihood of Prussian blue formation and not a probe for exposure to cyanide. The correct procedure is to use a method of detecting cyanides that discriminates against the detection of Prussian blue. If any cyanides other than Prussian blue have survived the weathering process, they will be present in small concentrations. They need to be detected with an extremely sensitive technique. The IFFR conducted an experiment according to the correct procedure. They write:

"J. Bailer [see IFFR ref. 1] writes in the collective work "Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit" that formation of Prussian blue in bricks is simply improbable; however, he takes into consideration the possibility that the walls of the delousing room were coated with paint. It should be added that this blue coloration does not appear on the walls of all the delousing rooms.

We decided therefore to determine the cyanide ions using a method that does not induce the breakdown of the composed ferrum cyanide complex (this is the blue under discussion) and which fact we had tested before on an appropriate standard sample."

It should be noted that whereas formation of Prussian blue was unlikely in the homicidal gas chambers owing to conditions such as the frequent washing with water, exposure to carbon dioxide, and the short exposure time, the conditions in the delousing chambers were quite different and it is not improbable that exposure to cyanide could be responsible for the blue staining there. These issues are discussed in more detail in the aforementioned articles on the Holocaust History Project web site. The important point is that detection of total cyanides is not a reliable marker for exposure to cyanides owing to the complexities of Prussian blue formation. In other words, by discriminating against the detection of Prussian blue, the IFFR did the correct experiment. Note also the necessity of using a much more sensitive method of detection of cyanides. Leuchter and Rudolf report a detection limit of about 1 mg/kg and in fact dispute the reliability of some of their own measurements showing cyanide concentrations above that. Recall that the bulk of the cyanides that they detected were in a form similar to Prussian blue. The IFFR used a much more sensitive method. Their sensitivity was 3-4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ , i.e., 300 times more sensitive. Even so, beforehand they were not confident that they would detect any cyanides other than the Prussian blue compounds because of the likelihood that these other cyanides would have weathered away.

To insure the reliability of their measurements, the IFFR introduced standards with a known cyanide content into each set of determinations. As well as samples from the homicidal gas chambers they collected control samples from dwelling accommodations "which were probably fumigated with Zyklon B only once (in connection with the typhoid [sic] epidemic in 1942)." The samples were collected and analyzed by two different teams to insure objectivity. The results of the study are definitive:

"The results of the analyses are presented in Tables I-IV. They unequivocally show that the cyanide compounds occur in all the facilities that, according to the source data, were in contact with them. On the other hand, they do not occur in dwelling accommodations, which was shown by means of control

samples."

Thus the chemical claims of the Leuchter Report are utterly refuted. The IFFR did some additional studies to understand why some construction materials kept their (non-Prussian blue) cyanides whereas other materials did not. They found that mortar and/or wet materials tended to accumulate cyanides, whereas brick was less likely to do so. Perhaps, the important point to realize here is that the IFFR had legal access to collect samples and could scrape their samples from areas likely to have been sheltered from weathering.

Before concluding it is worth mentioning a couple of minor issues.

First, the IFFR referred to a typhoid epidemic when they doubtlessly meant a typhus epidemic. Second, the support for Zyklon B is referred to unambiguously as diatomaceous earth. Zyklon was manufactured with many different solid supports.<sup>4</sup> of note was the use of "Erco" a gypsum material.<sup>5</sup>

The conclusion is obvious. Leuchter and other Holocaust deniers performed a "forensic analysis" that even had it been conducted straightforwardly and honestly was based upon incorrect premises. When real scientists approached the problem using appropriate methods and reasoning they were able to detect unambiguously, what we already knew to be the case from the historical record, viz., the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Birkenau were indeed exposed to cyanide. The Report of the IFFR is presented here. Some minor editing has been done, but no substantive changes have been made.

#### Endnotes

1. Zimmerman, John C., in the present work.
2. Pressac, Jean-Claude, "The Deficiencies and Inconsistencies of 'The Leuchter Report'" in Shapiro, S. Truth Prevails: Demolishing Holocaust Denial: The End of the Leuchter Report, NY: The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation (1990).
3. See Chemistry is Not the Science, by Richard J. Green and Jamie McCarthy at <http://www.holocausthistory.org/auschwitz/chemistry/not-the-science>. Leuchter, Rudolf, and the Iron Blues, by Richard J. Green at <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/blue/>. and The Chemistry of Auschwitz by Richard J. Green at <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/>
4. See The Chemistry of Auschwitz, *ibid.*, and note 13 therein.
5. Imscher, R., Nochmals: "Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausäure bei tiefen Temperaturen" (Once More: "The Efficiency of Prussic Acid at Low Temperatures"), Zeitschrift für Hygienische Zoologie und Schädlingsbekämpfung, Feb/Mar 1942, pp. 35-37. Available on the web at <http://www.holocaust-history.org/works/irmscher-1942/>.

Richard J. Green earned his PhD in physical chemistry from Stanford University in California in 1997. He is currently a volunteer with The Holocaust History Project.

## APPENDIX III

### A Study of the Cyanide Compounds Content In The Walls Of The Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps

by Jan Markiewicz, Wojciech Gubala, Jerzy Labedz Institute of Forensic Research, Cracow

**ABSTRACT:** In a widespread campaign to deny the existence of extermination camps with gas chambers the "revisionists" have recently started using the results of the examinations of fragments of ruins of former crematoria. These results (Leuchter, Rudolf) allegedly prove that the materials under examination had not been in contact with cyanide, unlike the wall fragments of delousing buildings in which the revisionists discovered considerable amount of cyanide compounds. Systematic research, involving most sensitive analytical methods, undertaken by the Institute confirmed the presence of cyanide compounds in all kinds of gas chamber ruins, even in the basement of Block 11 in Auschwitz, where first, experimental gassing of victims by means of Zyklon B had been carried out. The analysis of control samples, taken from other places (especially from living quarters) yielded unequivocally negative results. For the sake of interpretation several laboratory experiments have been carried out.

This article was first published in the journal *Z Zagadnien Sqdowych* z. XXX, 1994, 17-27. It appears here with the permission of the Institute for Forensic Research. Some minor editing has been done. This editing has not changed the content (even in the case of small errors) but has been done to increase the readability on the net. We also offer a foreword to place this work in context.

#### IFFR REPORT

As early as the first years after the end of World War II single publications began to appear in which the authors attempted to "whitewash" the Hitlerite regime and to call various signs of its cruelties into question. But it was not till the fifties that the trend may be defined as "historical revisionism" arose and started developing; its supporters claim that the history of the World War II has been fabricated for the purposes of anti-German propaganda. According to their statements there was no Holocaust, i. e. no mass extermination of Jews and in that case the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp could not have been an extermination camp — it was only a "common" forced labour camp and no gas chambers existed in it.

Historical revisionism is now put forward by members of various nations, who already have their own scientific circles, own publications and also use the mass media for their purposes. Up to 1988, the "revisionists"<sup>1</sup> most frequently manipulated historical sources or simply denied the facts. Then, after the appearance of the so-called Leuchter Report (2), their tactics changed distinctly. The above-mentioned Report, worked out on the basis of a study of the ruins and remains of the crematoria and gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau, has been considered by them to be specific evidence in support

of their allegations and evidence of judicial validity at that, since it was commissioned by the court of law in Toronto (Canada). F. Leuchter, living in Boston, worked on the design and construction of gas chambers still in use to execute the death penalty in some States of the USA. This is considered to give him authority to take the role of expert as regards gas chamber issues. In this connection Leuchter came to Poland on 25 February 1988 and stayed here for 5 days, visiting the camps at Auschwitz-Birkenau and at Majdanek. In his report based on this inspection he states that "he found no evidence that any of the facilities that are usually alleged to have been gas chambers were actually used as such". Moreover, he claims that these facilities "could not be used as gas chambers for killing people" (Item 4000 of the Report).

Leuchter tried to confirm his conclusions with the help of chemical analysis. For this purpose he took samples of material fragments from the chamber ruins to subject them to an analysis for hydrogen cyanide, the essential component of Zyklon B, used — acc. to the testimony of witnesses — to gas the victims. He took 30 samples altogether from all the five structures used formerly as gas chambers. At laboratory analyses performed in the USA the presence of cyanide ions at concentrations of 1.1 to 7.9 mg/kg of material examined was found in 14 samples. He also took one sample from the debusing building at Birkenau, which he treated as a "control sample", and in which cyanides were found to be present at a concentration of 1060 mg/kg of material. The positive results of the analyses of samples from the former gas chambers are explained by Leuchter by the fact that all the camp facilities were subjected to a fumigation with hydrogen cyanide in connection with a typhoid epidemic which really broke out in the camp in 1942.

A later investigation, carried out by a G. Rudolf (4), confirmed the

high concentrations of cyanogen compounds in the facilities for clothes disinsectization. This may be so since, being undamaged, these facilities were not exposed to the action of weather conditions, especially rainfall. Moreover, it is known that the duration of disinsectization was relatively long, about 24 hours for each batch of clothes (probably even longer), whereas the execution with Zyklon B in the gas chambers took, according to the statement of the Auschwitz Camp Commander Rudolf Hoess (7) and the data presented by Sehn (6), only about 20 minutes. It should also be emphasized that the ruins of these chambers have been constantly exposed to the action of precipitation and it can be estimated, on the basis of the climatological records, that in these last 45 years or so they have been rinsed rather thoroughly by a column of water at least 35 m in height (!). In our correspondence with the Management of the Auschwitz Museum in 1989, not knowing the Leuchter Report then, we expressed our anxiety as to the chances of detection of cyanogen compounds in the chamber ruins; nevertheless, we offered to carry out an appropriate study. At the beginning of 1990 two workers of the Institute of Forensic Research arrived on the premises of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp and took samples for screening analysis: 10 samples of plaster from the delousing chamber (Block No 3 at Auschwitz), 10 samples from gas chamber ruins and, in addition, 2 control samples from the buildings which, as living quarters, had not been in contact with hydrogen cyanide. Out of the 10 samples from the delousing chamber, seven contained cyanogen compounds at concentrations from 9 to 147 µg in conversion to potassium cyanide (which was used to construct the calibration curve) and 100 g of material. As far as the ruins are concerned, the presence of cyanide was demonstrated only in the sample from the ruins of Crematorium Chamber No II at Birkenau. Neither of the control samples contained cyanides.

When the dispute on the Leuchter Report arose, we undertook a closer study of the problem, availing ourselves, among other publications, of J. C. Pressac's comprehensive work (5). In consequence, we decided to start considerably more extensive and conscientiously planned researches. To carry them out, the Management of the Auschwitz Museum appointed their competent workers, Dr. F. Piper

(custodian) and Mr. W. Smrek (engineer) to join the commission, in which they co-worked with the authors of the present paper, representing the Institute of Forensic Research. Under this collaboration the Museum workers were providing us on the spot with exhaustive information concerning the facilities to be examined and — as regards the ruins — a detailed topography of the gas chambers we were concerned with. And so they made it possible for us to take proper samples for analysis. We tried to take samples — if at all possible — from the places best sheltered and least exposed to rainfall, including also as far as possible — fragments of the upper parts of the chambers (hydrogen cyanide is lighter than air) and also of the concrete floors, with which the gas from the spilled Zyklon B came into contact at rather high concentrations.

Samples, about 1-2 g in weight, were taken by chipping pieces from bricks and concrete or scrapping off, particularly in the case of plaster and also mortar. The materials taken were secured in plastic containers marked with serial numbers. All these activities were recorded and documented with photographs. Work connected with them took the commission two days. The laboratory analysis of the material collected was conducted — to ensure full objectivity — by another group of Institute workers. They started with preliminary work: samples were comminuted by grinding them by hand in an agate mortar, their pH was determined at 6 to 7 in nearly all samples. Next the samples were subjected to preliminary spectrophotometric analysis in infrared region, using a Digilab FTS-16 spectrophotometer. It was found that the bands of cyanide groups occurred in the region of 2000-2200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  in the spectra of a dozen samples or so. However, the method did not prove to be sensitive enough and was given up in quantitative determinations. It was determined, using the spectrographical method, that the main elements which made up the samples were: calcium, silicon, magnesium, aluminum and iron. Moreover, titanium was found present in many samples. From among other metals in some samples there were also barium, zinc, sodium, manganese and from non-metals boron.

The undertaking of chemical analysis had to be preceded by careful consideration. The revisionists focussed their attention almost exclusively on Prussian blue, which is of intense dark-blue colour and characterized by exceptional fastness. This dye occurs, especially in the form of stains, on the outer bricks of the walls of the former bath/delousing house in the area of the Birkenau camp. It is hard to imagine the chemical reactions and physicochemical processes that could have led to the formation of Prussian blue in that place. Brick, unlike other building materials, very feebly absorbs hydrogen cyanide, it sometimes does not even absorb it at all. Besides, iron occurring in it is at the third oxidation state, whereas bivalent iron ions are indispensable for the formation of the  $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$  ion, which is the precursor of Prussian blue. This ion is, besides, sensitive to the sunlight.

J. Bailer (1) writes in the collective work "Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit" that the formation of Prussian blue in bricks is simply improbable; however, he takes into consideration the possibility that the walls of the delousing room were coated with this dye as a paint. It should be added that this blue coloration does not appear on the walls of all the delousing rooms.

We decided therefore to determine the cyanide ions using a method that does not induce the breakdown of the composed ferrum cyanide complex (this is the blue under discussion) and which fact we had tested before on an appropriate standard sample. To isolate cyanide compounds from the materials examined in the form of hydrogen cyanide we used the techniques of microdiffusion in special Conway-type chambers. The sample under examination was placed in the internal part of the chamber and next acidified with 10% sulfuric acid solution and allowed to remain at room temperature (about 20°C) for 24 hrs. The separated hydrogen cyanide underwent a quantitative absorption by the lye solution present in the outer part of the chamber. When the diffusion was brought to an end, a sample of lye solution was taken and the pyridine-pyrazolone reaction carried out by Epstein's method (3). The

intensity of the polymethene dye obtained was measured spectrophotometrically at a wavelength equal to 630 nm. The calibration curve was constructed previously and standards with a known CN<sup>-</sup> content were introduced into each series of determinations to check the curve and the course of determination. Each sample of materials examined was analyzed three times. If the result obtained was positive, it was verified by repeating the analysis. Having applied this method for many years, we have opportunities to find its high sensitivity, specificity and precision. Under present circumstances we established the lower limit of determinability of cyanide ions at a level of 3-4 µg CN<sup>-</sup> in 1 kg of the sample.

The results of analyses are presented in Tables I-IV. They unequivocally show that the cyanide compounds occur in all the facilities that, according to the source data, were in contact with them. On the other hand, they do not occur in dwelling accommodations, which was shown by means of control samples. The concentrations of cyanide compounds in the samples collected from one and the same room or building show great differences. This indicates that the conditions that favour the formation of stable compounds as a result of the reaction of hydrogen cyanide with the components of the walls, occur locally. In this connection it takes quite a large number of samples from a given facility to give us a chance to come upon this sort of local accumulation of cyanide compounds.

To complete this research on the cyanide compound content in various camp facilities, we decided to carry out several pilotage experiments. The renovation of the Institute building, just in progress, provided us with materials for this investigation. We divided particular constituents of these materials (bricks, cement, mortar and plaster) into several 3-4 gram pieces and placed them into glass chambers, in which we generated hydrogen cyanide by reacting potassium cyanide and sulfuric acid. We used high concentrations of this gas (about 2%) and wetted some of the samples with water. Fumigation took 48 hours at a temperature of about 20°C (Table V). Another series of samples were treated with hydrogen cyanide as well, but now in the presence of carbon dioxide. According to calculations, in the chambers in which people had been gassed the carbon dioxide content produced in the breathing process of the victims was rather high and in relation to hydrogen cyanide may have been even as high as 10:1. In our experiment we applied these two gases (CO<sub>2</sub> and HCN) in the 5:1 ratio. Having been subjected to gassing, the samples were aired in the open air at a temperature of about 10-15°C. The first analysis was conducted 48 hours after the beginning of airing.

This series of tests allows the statement that mortar absorbs and/or binds hydrogen cyanide best and also that wet materials show a noticeable tendency to accumulate hydrogen cyanide whereas brick, especially old brick, poorly absorbs and/or binds this compound.

TABLE I. Concentration Of Cyanide Ions in Control Samples Taken From Dwelling Accommodations, which Were Probably Fumigated with Zyklon B Only Once (In Connection With Typhoid Epidemic in 1942)

Site
Block No
Sample No
Concentration of CN <sup>-</sup> in µg/kg
Auschwitz 3 9 0
10 0
8 11 0
12 0

Birkenau 3 60 0  
61 0  
62 0  
63 0

Note: In screening tests of 1990 two control samples also produced 0 results.

TABLE II. Concentration of Cyanide Ions In Samples Taken in the Cellars in Which the First Gassings of Camp Prisoners Took Place on November 3rd, 1941

Site  
Place  
Sample No  
Concentration of CN- in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$   
Auschwitz cellars of Block 11  
13 28, 24, 24  
14 20, 16, 16  
15 0

Note: The CN- content in a sample of diatomaceous earth — a component of Zyklon B (material from the Museum, sample No 24) — was 1360  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ , 1320  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  and 1400  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ .

TABLE III. Concentrations of Cyanide Ions in Samples Taken From the Crematorium Chambers (Or Their Ruins) in Which the Victims Were Gassed.

A - Sample No;  
B - Concentration of CN- ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ).

Crematorium I

A 17 17 18 19 20 21 22  
B 28 76 0 0 288 0 80  
28 80 0 0 292 0 80  
26 80 0 0 288 0 80

Crematorium II

A 25 26 27 28 29 30 31  
B 640 28 0 8 20 168 296  
592 28 0 8 16 156 288  
620 28 0 8 16 168 292

Crematorium III

A 32 33 34 35 36 37 38  
B 68 12 12 16 12 16 56  
68 8 12 12 8 16 52  
68 8 8 16 8 16 56

Crematorium IV

A 39 40 41 42 43

B 40 36 500 trace 16  
 44 32 496 0 12  
 44 36 496 0 12

Crematorium V

A 46 47 48 49 50 51 52  
 B 244 36 92 12 116 56 0  
 248 28 96 12 120 60 0  
 232 32 96 12 116 60 0

Notes: Crematorium I at Auschwitz — building preserved but reconstructed several times Crematorium II-V at Birkenau — ruins. Only the ceiling of the chamber of Crematorium II is in part fairly well preserved.

TABLE IV. Concentrations of Cyanide Ions in Samples Collected in The Facilities For the Fumigation of Prisoners' Clothes

Site  
 Place  
 Sample No  
 Concentration of CN- in µg/kg  
 Auschwitz Block No. 1 (1)  
 1 4,4,4  
 2 0  
 3 , iron hook 0  
 4, piece of wood from a door 0  
 Block No.3(2)  
 5 0  
 6 900,840,880  
 7 0  
 8 16,12,16  
 Two series of determinations were made in block No 3 in 1990  
 I. 70,30,74,142,422  
 II. 118,52,80,60,214  
 Birkenau Bath-house Camp B1-A  
 53 (3) 24, 20, 24  
 53a (3) 224, 248, 228  
 54 (3) 36, 28, 32  
 55 (3) 736, 740, 640  
 56 (4) 4, 0, 0  
 57 (5) 840, 792, 840  
 58 (5) 348, 324, 348  
 59 (6) 28, 28, 28

Notes:

Dwelling quarters next to cobbler workshop and disinfection chambers.  
 Disinfection facilities

Materials taken from the outer side of the building wall  
 Mortar taken from the outer side of the building wall  
 Plaster taken from dark-blue stains on the inner side of the building wall  
 Plaster from white walls inside the building

TABLE V. Concentrations of Hydrogen Cyanide and/or Its Combinations in Materials Sampled 48 Hours After Fumigation

Material	Sort of material	Concentration of CN- in µg/kg
Fresh plaster	dry	24
Old mortar	wetted	480
New brick	dry	176
Old brick	wetted	2700
	dry	4
	wetted	52
	dry	20
	wetted	0

After a lapse of one month the concentration of hydrogen cyanide and its combinations in the materials examined decreased on the average by 56% (from 28% to 86%). An apparent rise in the concentration occurred only in single samples. That is so because the samples used for examination were not always the same. When they had been used up in the first run, they had to be replaced by new samples taken from the same bigger lumps of material. This supports the thesis on the local binding of hydrogen cyanide.

The results obtained in the next series of tests, in which the materials were subjected to gassing with a mixture of HCN + CO<sub>2</sub> are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI. Concentrations of Hydrogen Cyanide and Its Combinations in Materials Sampled After Fumigation With HCN + CO<sub>2</sub>

Material	Sort of material	Concentration of CN- in µg/kg
Fresh plaster	dry	5920
Old mortar	wetted	12800
Fresh mortar	dry	1000
New brick	wetted	244
Old brick	dry	492
	wetted	388
	dry	52
	wetted	36
	dry	24
	wetted	60

In this case the CN- content in mortar (old and fresh) and in new brick was for the most part lower in the wetted materials than in the dry ones. It seems that here a tendency is revealed towards the competitive action of carbon dioxide, which dissolves in water. In this series of tests fresh plaster showed an exceptionally high affinity to hydrogen cyanide.

After an interval of a month the mean decrease of hydrogen cyanide content in this material was 73% and so it was markedly greater than in the run with hydrogen cyanide only. In as many as four samples that loss ranged from 97% to 100% and then airing was nearly complete. This statement is significant in as much as in their reasoning the revisionists did not take into consideration certain circumstances, namely, the simultaneous action of cyanides and carbon dioxide on the chamber walls. In the air exhaled by man carbon dioxide constitutes 3.5% by volume. Breathing for 1 minute, he takes in and next exhales 15-20 dm<sup>3</sup> of air, comprising on the average 950 cm<sup>3</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>; consequently, 1000 people breathe out about 950 dm<sup>3</sup> of carbon dioxide. And so it can be estimated that, if the victims stayed in the chamber for 5 minutes before they died, they exhaled 4.75 m<sup>3</sup> of carbon dioxide during that period. This is at least about 1% of the capacity, e.g. of the gas chamber of Crematorium II at Birkenau, the capacity of which was about 500 m<sup>3</sup>, whereas the concentration of hydrogen cyanide virtually did not exceed 0.1% by volume (death occurs soon at as low HCN concentrations as 0.03% by volume). Therefore, the conditions for the preservation of HCN in the gas chambers were not better than in the

delousing chambers, despite what the revisionists claim. Besides, as has already been mentioned, the chamber ruins have been thoroughly washed by rainfall.

The following experiment illustrated to what extent water elutes cyanide ions. Two 0.5-gram plaster samples, previously subjected to a fumigation with hydrogen cyanide (after the determination of cyanide combinations in them) were placed on filter paper in glass funnels and either of them was flushed with 1 liter of clean, deionized distilled water. The results of the test are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII. Results of Examination Concerning the Effect of Water Upon the Concentration of Cyanide Ions in Plaster

Sample	Initial concentration (CN- in µg/kg)	Concentration after flushing with water (CN- in µg/kg)	Loss, in %
I	160	28	82.5
II	1200	112	90.7

Consequently, water elutes cyanide compounds in considerable measure. The fact that they have survived so long in the chamber ruins is probably due to the possible formation of cyanide combinations in the walls of those chambers at the time of their utilization from about mid-1943 to the last weeks of 1944 (except for Crematorium IV, which was blown up earlier). The significance of rainfall in the process of elution of these combinations out of the ruin walls is exemplified by Crematorium II in the Birkenau camp, where we have found the highest (mean) concentrations of cyanide compounds, because many fragments of the gas chamber were to a great degree protected from precipitation.

#### FINAL REMARKS

The present study shows that in spite of the passage of a considerable period of time (over 45 years) in the walls of the facilities which once were in contact with hydrogen cyanide the vestigial amounts of the combinations of this constituent of Zyklon B have been preserved. This is also true of the ruins of the former gas chambers. The cyanide compounds occur in the building materials only locally, in the places where the conditions arose for their formation and persistence for such a long time. In his reasoning Leuchter (2) claims that the vestigial amounts of cyanide combinations detected by him in the materials from the chamber ruins are residues left after fumigations carried out in the Camp "once, long ago" (Item 14.004 of the Report). This is refuted by the negative results of the examination of the control samples from living quarters, which are said to have been subjected to a single gassing, and the fact that in the period of fumigation of the Camp in connection with a typhoid epidemic in mid-1942 there were still no crematoria in the Birkenau Camp. The first crematorium (Crematorium II) was put to use as late as 15 March 1943 and the others several months later.

#### Footnotes:

1. The terms "historical revisionism" and "revisionists" in the sense used there have been introduced into the literature of the field under discussion.

## References

1. Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit. Praca zbiorowa (B. Gallanda, J. Bailer, F. Freund, T. Geisler, W. Lasek, N. Neugebauer, G. Spann, W. Wegner). Bundesministerium fuer Untenicht und Kultur Wien 1991.
2. Der erste Leuchter Report, Toronto 1988, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1988.
3. Epstein J., Estimation of Microquantities of Cyanide, Analytical Chemistry 1947, Vol. 19, p. 272.
4. Gauss E., Vorlesungen ueber Zeitgeschichte, Grabert Vlg. Tuebingen 1993.
5. Pressac J. C., Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers, B. Klarsfield Foundation, New York 1989.
6. Sehn J., Oboz Koncentracyjny Oswiecim-Brzezinka. Wydawnictwo Prawnicze, Warszawa 1960.
7. Wspomnienia, Rudolf Hoessa, komendanta obozu oswiecimskiego. G1owna Komisja Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce. Wydawnistwo Prawnicze, Warszawa 1956.
8. The study was performed and funded by the Committee for Scientific Research under the scheme of Research Project No. 2 P 30 3088 04. Leader of the Project Prof. Jan Markiewicz.

Foreword to the Lucas Report, Appendix IV  
By John C. Zimmerman

In the Spring of 1998 I began to search for someone who could analyze the Auschwitz photos taken by the Allies in 1944. It was quite by accident that I had the good fortune to run across Carroll Lucas. His 45 years of experience with the Central Intelligence Agency and private industry make him one of the world's foremost experts in the field of photo interpretation. I was interested in the contents of the photos and whether they had been tampered with as alleged by Holocaust deniers. Mr. Lucas agreed to undertake the project and what follows is his comprehensive analysis of the photos. He worked many uncompensated hours in the National Archives gathering the information for the report. In essence, the contents of the photos are consistent with all of the eyewitness testimony about the events which transpired in Auschwitz at the time the photos were taken.

After submitting his report to me, I had some follow up questions concerning whether he had spotted the "White Bunker", discussed in Chapter 10, and whether he was able to identify prisoners being marched into Krema V on the May 31, 1944 photo. In response to these questions, Mr. Lucas sent me an e mail which is attached as an addendum to the report. The key parts of the report and addendum are discussed in Chapter 10. Mr. Lucas's report can essentially be broken out into two parts. The first part addresses the issue as to whether the photos were tampered with. The second part and addendum deals with the photos' contents. The Lucas Report should be read in conjunction with the Brugioni and Poirer study, completed in 1979, discussed in Chapter 10. Needless to say, Carroll Lucas had access to imaging technologies in 1999 not available to Brugioni and Poirer 20 years earlier.

I also want to acknowledge the efforts of the late Mark Van Alstine, who examined the May 31 photo for content and whose findings are also discussed in Chapter 10. Mark was also able to identify the White Bunker and mass grave sites.

## APPENDIX IV

### AN ANALYSIS OF THE

### AUSCHWITZ-I, II / BIRKENAU COMPLEX

By Carroll L. Lucas

#### Purpose

Verify or refute previous photographic interpretations derived from analyses of U.S. World War II, 1944/1945 aerial reconnaissance photographs acquired over two sites within the Auschwitz complex.

#### Objective

Document the validity and history of the photographic products, and the observable activities on these products, that took place at the two Auschwitz camps during the photographic collection period.

#### Introduction

In February of 1979, The Central Intelligence Agency released an unclassified report entitled "the Holocaust Revisited"<sup>1</sup>, which contains a photographic analysis of the Auschwitz-I and Auschwitz-II/ Birkenau prison sites acquired unintentionally on U.S. aerial reconnaissance photography during the last phases of World War - II. Its content focuses on the activities that were taking place within these camps, and the conclusion emphasizes the role that aerial photography can play in supporting research conducted by professional historians. Few have taken issue with that conclusion, however the specific interpretations of the observed site activities has raised a significant amount of controversy.

The report was the result of analyses conducted by two National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) CIA analysts, Messrs. Dino Brugioni, and Robert Poirier, who were responding to their personal interest in the history of the Holocaust. Auschwitz was selected as the facility for study, primarily because of its proximity to a military target that had a high probability for coverage by military aerial reconnaissance missions. The report was produced on their own time, and was not a requirement levied on them by the CIA. However the CIA saw fit to publish the report, and later, to provide the original negatives acquired from the archives of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and used in the analysis, along with several enlargements they had produced of the sites, to the U.S. National Archives.

In response to the growing furor whenever the name and functions of

Auschwitz surfaced, and at the request, encouragement and support of Professor John C. Zimmerman, JD, CPA, MS from the University of Nevada Las Vegas, I decided to conduct an independent analysis of the aerial photography given to the National Archives. I want to establish up front that I was employed by NPIC during the time that the Auschwitz report was being produced. However, I was not involved in the analyses, and have only recently become familiar with its contents. I have used every means possible to produce my own analysis of what activities were taking place on the photography

and have purposely focused on what can be observed from the imagery, leaving to the historians how this data can be extrapolated to support their research. For example, I will not attempt to extrapolate the results of my analyses into numbers of people who passed through these camps, or were disposed of during their stay. Whether the number is one or 4 million, it does not affect what the camps were designed to do, nor the rationale behind interpreting observed activities.

## Analysis

During the latter days of World War - II, Germany was desperate for petroleum and rubber to maintain their war machine, and the allies were just as determined to destroy not only their stored reserves, but the facilities used in the refining and manufacturing of these products. The I.G. Farben synthetic oil and rubber manufacturing plant in the Vistula valley south of Krakow, in Southern Poland near the border of Czechoslovakia, became a primary target in that region, both for bombing raids and reconnaissance. Archival photographic coverage of the plant and its surrounds is now available at the U.S. National Archives, for the period between 4 April, 1944 and 14 January, 1945. Previous extensive coverage from German aerial reconnaissance may well exist, but I could find little evidence of it within the time limit of my analysis. However, the National Archives does have at least two paper print photographs from German coverage, annotated in German, that label Auschwitz I as barracks.

The approach taken was first to assure that the film products given to the National Archives did indeed contain the original negatives from U.S. aerial reconnaissance missions, and second, to review various photo-interpretation analyses that have been conducted in order to determine if I could provide additional input. I have divided the analysis into two sections, primarily to save readers of this report time, by separating the technical analysis of the film products, which may not be of great interest to historians, from the actual photo-interpretation of the Auschwitz I and Auschwitz II- Birkenau facilities.

Section-1: The evaluation of aerial reconnaissance film products covering the Auschwitz-1, Auschwitz II- Birkenau facilities.

In order to assure myself that the film contained the actual original negatives acquired on the reconnaissance missions, I went to the U.S. National Archives, Archive-2 building, asked for, and received, all 18 original cans of film that had been provided to them by Mr. Dino Brugioni.<sup>2</sup> A close observation of the cans and reels, each designed to hold a minimum of 150 feet of nine inch wide roll film, revealed that they both contained the conventional labels used by the military to identify cans of original negative film. The cans were in deplorable shape, scratched, bent, and with several other labels containing control numbers used by field units and other organizations that may have stored the film for a short time, before it was placed in the DIA archives. Some of the cans contained film from more than one mission, and the labels were marked accordingly. Using the Richards light table at the Archives, equipped with a Zoom 240 microscope containing 10x oculars and a maximum 3X zoom capability, I began to view the negative rolls in each can, frame-by-frame.

Each film segment contained blank leaders and trailers attached to the front and back of the film rolls

after the film was processed, in order to protect the original photography from damage to the ends that could occur from the reels on the light tables. Many of the leaders contained written identification, documenting and identifying the mission and the frame sequence in the roll. These numbers are used to easily identify can contents and as a security measure, assure that frames have not been deleted from the can. The film showed signs of extensive usage, probably under field conditions, having ink transfers from leader data and inked frame numbers, (caused by rolling the film too quickly after annotating it), creased edges which occurred after film processing, (indicating poorly aligned light tables), scratches and digs from the use of field-type Photo-Interpretation (PI) tools, and tears and abrasions from multiple usage under careless handling conditions. There were several splices throughout each mission, where analysts had cut frames from the roll to conduct their analyses and then returned them in place. Most frames covering the I. G. Farben complex had been removed for analysis and then spliced back after their work was completed. Scotch tape was used to repair tears and to produce splices. The edges of the film contained the Eastman Kodak identification for standard safety film, assuring that the emulsion was on an acetate base that was mass produced in the late 1930's rather than the flammable nitrate base used during the early part of the War, or the improved polyester bases of today.

Unfortunately, when the CIA sent the film to the National Archives, they failed to accent the fact that both original negatives and duplicate negatives were in the shipment. The National Archives did not realize this and subsequently assigned a set of index numbers that did not differentiate the originals from the duplicates. Consequently, all cans that contain the mission number that one wishes to review must be ordered to assure that the original negative will be among them. Once the cans are reviewed, the original negatives can be reliably separated from the duplicate negatives by thorough inspection and comparison. This was conducted during the initial phase of the analysis to assure that the original was indeed in the hands of the National Archives, and that analyses would be conducted using the best quality imagery available. Feeling confident that I was looking at the original negative and not a

subsequent duplicate negative, my next step consisted of looking for missing frames that would indicate blatant censoring of the mission coverage. All frames containing the Auschwitz complexes could be accounted for, based on the header data and on the lack of gaps in the number sequences. No splicing was observed between frames that

would indicate someone had cut out a frame containing the Auschwitz complexes and replaced it. Since the overlap between frames ranges from 55-80%, it was easy to observe whether a gap occurred in the coverage because of a frame being edited out. Procedures used to cut out frames from the original film in the 1940's, and still used in the 1970's was to place a metal straight edge ruler in the metered area between frames, and cut the film, with a sharp knife on each side of the frame of interest. Many times, cuts were made in haste without a straight edge, resulting in unique cuts that would be very difficult to align with the edge of another frame.. Since even the straight edge is

oriented by hand, the two cuts are seldom, if ever, precisely aligned. Regardless the type of splicing used, this misalignment can be physically observed, and would be positive proof that a portion of the original film is missing. No evidence of such editing/ removal of original data was observed over the sites of interest.

Since both original and duplicate negatives were available, one can easily review them frame-by-frame to determine if they both contain the same frame numbers and images. If the original and duplicate negatives were produced by the same laboratory in nearly the same time frame, obvious changes to the originals can be easily detected by comparing the duplicate image to the original.

Because of the possibility that individual frames acquired over the Auschwitz I, and Auschwitz II/Birkenau sites may have been tampered with by the CIA, as some historical analysts have maintained<sup>3</sup>, I paid close attention to those frames mentioned. First, I looked for evidence of scribing or inking, or of deletions produced by scraping the emulsion from its base, or splicing that would indicate a missing portion of film. I used the Zoom 240 microscopes attached to the light tables in the National Archives at their maximum magnification (30X) to view the target area within each of the frames in question. Aside from many small scratches and abrasions that could be easily identified as accidental, there were no indications of tampering within the target areas. Each adjacent frame was reviewed (since frame overlap provided a minimum of two, and usually three coverages of the same frame target within the sequence) and no evidence of similar abrasions and scratches was observed. Obviously, if one tampered with a target on one image, one would have to precisely change the matching target images on the adjacent frames. If this was not done, one would not even have to view these targets in stereo to see that tampering had occurred. Stereo analysis would allow one to see the tampering since it would not be three-dimensional unless it was precisely configured in terms of position on all target coverages.

A possibility remained that the original frames covering Auschwitz/Birkenau, as differentiated from the I.G. Farben target area, were cut from the roll, objects added, imbedded or deleted by painting or scribing, then duplicate negatives produced, and inserted into the original negative roll, replacing the original negatives of those frames. The first indications that such tampering had occurred would be the presence of splices in the original negative roll at the beginning and end of the frames covering the target. In the 1940's the splicing material used to attach the headers and trailers was transparent 1/4 or 1/2 inch wide tape with serrated end tears, so any such splices are easily recognized on the original rolls. If the splices occurred in the 1970's, and efforts were made to conceal the cuts and splices, a similar transparent material would probably have been used. There is no evidence of the cutting and splicing of film in the original negative film rolls that would isolate frames covering the Auschwitz-I or Auschwitz II/ Birkenau facilities.

It is a known fact that there is a loss in quality (primarily in contrast and spatial resolution) in reproductions that are made from the original roll film negatives derived from aerial cameras. During World War-II, field units usually analyzed the original negatives from reconnaissance missions, due to better image quality and time constraints in preparing for follow-on missions<sup>4</sup>. Annotated duplicate positive paper prints of priority targets were produced to provide military commanders and mission planners with the intelligence derived and to allow a determination whether additional missions must be flown. These positive, paper reproductions presented a more realistic image than negative products, in terms of tonal fidelity but with a significant loss in image quality. Such paper prints were also used by bomber pilots and navigators as visual aids during their bombing runs.

In order to protect the original negative at that time, a duplicate positive transparency was usually made of each original film roll, and from that positive, a third generation duplicate negative was produced and used to support the film reproduction needs of other field units. Multiple duplicate positive transparencies allowed greater dissemination of the reconnaissance mission photography at the expense of some loss in quality. Obviously the quality of second, third and fourth generation products was significantly poorer than that of the original negative. A "rule of thumb", used in the 1960's, was an eight to ten percent quality loss for each generation away from the original negative. In later years, direct reversal films were developed, reducing (by a generation) the number of reproduction steps needed to produce working duplicate positives and negatives. However, quality losses remain evident between any original negatives and any reproductions.

With this background in mind, all frames containing the Auschwitz I/Auschwitz II/Birkenau target areas were compared with their surrounding frames, under magnifications of 60X to determine if a quality difference occurred between objects within the targets and similar objects on adjacent frames<sup>5</sup>. In all cases, the quality did not appear to change. If duplicate negatives had been inserted for the originals in some esoteric way that produced invisible splices, the changes in image quality would still give the deception away. No such quality degradation was observed during this detailed analysis.

While viewing the negatives under maximum magnification, particular attention was paid to the positions, quantity and disposition of multitudinous, shallow, thin parallel scratches that did not penetrate the film emulsion. These are caused by rolling the film across the surface of a light-table with the emulsion side down, thereby allowing dust particles and accumulated emulsion build-up debris on the rollers and glass surface of the table to produce continuous fine scratches in the soft emulsion. Many of these scratches will extend throughout the roll. Similar scratches also occur on the anti-halation backing bonded to the film base if the film has been viewed with the emulsion side up. If someone removed frames from the roll, and replaced them with new materials, these previously produced fine scratches will obviously not appear on the replaced film, but will disappear at one end of the inserted film and reappear at the other end. No evidence of such interruptions were observed on the frames containing images of Auschwitz I, Auschwitz II/Birkenau or their adjacent frames.

While observing the original negative under high magnification, particular care was taken to closely monitor the film edges. When making duplicate negatives, if the original negative isn't precisely aligned to the duplicate stock during the printing process, a thin continuous black edge will occur that would not be on the negative. The presence of this black edge beginning and stopping at frame ends, is a positive sign that a duplicate negative has replaced the original negative of the affected frames. No such indications were observed on the original negatives reviewed.

A final test determined that the designated duplicate negatives of these missions, provided to the National Archives by the DIA, showed no discontinuities between them and the original negatives, in terms of frame numbers, unusual splices or unusual quality changes. The cans and some of the reels bore the traditional yellow labels that the military used, and still uses, to identify duplicate negatives.

The bottom line is that the cans of aerial reconnaissance film extracted from the DIA files, provided to the CIA, and finally presented to the National Archives, unequivocally contain unedited and untainted original and duplicate negatives of U.S. aerial reconnaissance missions flown over targets adjacent to the Auschwitz I/ Auschwitz II/ Birkenau facilities.

Section-2: Interpreting activities occurring at the Auschwitz I, and Auschwitz II- Birkenau facilities between April 1944, and January, 1945 as recorded on U.S. aerial reconnaissance flights.

## Auschwitz I

The first facility established within the Auschwitz complex was constructed approximately 1 mile south of the center of the Polish town of Oswiecim (German name, Auschwitz), and was given the name of Auschwitz I<sup>6</sup>. It was initially the barracks of a Polish artillery unit, until the Germans arrived in 1940,

expanded the facility, and made it into one of several concentration camps within the area. It initially functioned as a penal camp for German political prisoners, but once expanded it principally housed Jewish prisoners.

On the fourth of April, 1944, U.S. military aerial reconnaissance aircraft unintentionally flew over the Auschwitz-1 facility, for the first time with cameras rolling, on their way to photograph the I.G. Farben industrial complex-approximately 8 kilometers to the northeast. Mission 60PR288 60SQ was flown at an altitude of approximately 26,000 feet, using cameras with a maximum focal length of 20 inches, thereby producing photography at a scale of approximately 1: 16,000. Since the facility was not within the targeted industrial complex, the photo-interpreters assigned to report on the status of the Farben plant, were not be responsible for recording its presence. The point is moot, since the analysis, if it occurred, was not archived. However, since it is the earliest recorded archived aerial photography of Auschwitz-1, it is important to document not only its existence, but to describe its components and whatever activities can be observed<sup>7</sup>. Rather than producing a detailed photo-interpretation analysis of each the acquisitions between 4 April, 1944, and January of 1945, I used the imagery to composite the data into observations that are critical to the refutation or verification of activities being performed at the camps. At first glance, the facility can be identified as secure housing for personnel- a prison-containing 30 approximately 135 foot long, 45 foot wide, single story barracks type buildings, 28 of which are nearly identical with two smaller rectangular buildings constructed in the spacing between adjacent barracks. They are surrounded by heavy barbed wire fencing, and monitored by at least 9 high, enclosed guard towers scattered around its perimeter.<sup>8</sup>

The camp is serviced by a well maintained but unsurfaced two lane road, leading off a main road that parallels the Sola River. The road entrance into the prison is controlled by a guard tower with what appears to be a small guard shack adjacent to it and having access to the road. Across the road, is a large multistory residence with well groomed yards and a small vehicle parking lot between the front entrance to the building and the road. This building is outside the guarded perimeter of the prison but appears to have a solid wall surrounding all but the area adjacent to the road. Collateral information from many reports identify this as the Commandant's residence, and I agree. Close examination of the three barracks-type buildings lining the entrance road across from the Commandant's residence, reveals that they are separated from the main facility by the heavy barbed wire fencing that surrounds the prison and which appears to be monitored by at least one tall guard tower. It is evident that these buildings are not inhabited by prisoners and their proximity to the Commandant's residence provides credence to their being used for administrative purposes. An area of approximately 27,000 square feet adjacent to the Commandant's residence is under construction and will probably become an expansion of the administrative area.

Between the construction area and beyond what appears to be a small park/garden area, is a long rectangular peaked roof building which is perpendicular to the main road, and with an entrance to the road. Attached in an "L" shaped configuration, at the opposite end of the building, are two low, flat roofed buildings. There is little visual evidence of the use of these buildings, but the lack of vents, chimneys, or other roof structures implies that they were designed for storage rather than human occupancy. Next to the road, but separated from it by a narrow strip of vegetation, and between the two legs of the "L" shaped buildings, is a small, low rectangular building with a ridge roof which slants down at both ends. The shadow at the end of this building is squared because of the slant. This has led others to misidentify it as a flat roofed building. A chimney can be seen in the center of the building along the ridge line. There appears to be two sidewalk entrances from the road, toward either end of the building. Between this building and the low buildings making up the "L" shaped storage buildings is a courtyard with an entrance into the larger of the storage buildings, and another into the above

mentioned building. A small square, flat roofed storage shed appears approximately in the center of the courtyard. An open entrance connects the courtyard to one of the main streets. This building has been identified as a gas chamber and crematorium by other sources<sup>9</sup>. Since the available photography was taken well over a year after the reported cessation of the suggested activities, and the building was being used for an air raid shelter (according to other sources) there is little photographic evidence to establish, or refute, its original activities. Required stored fuel sources could have been removed from the courtyard or surrounding areas; new entrances provided for quick access during air raids; etc.

The central chimney, isolation from the barracks area, an isolated courtyard, and nearby storage buildings lends credence to the suggested activities, but is not proof that such activities occurred. The lack of security, proximity to the main road, and lack of observable fuel supplies makes it difficult to determine from the available photography alone that such gas chamber and crematorium activities did occur.

Diagonally across the major barracks area, in the southeastern corner of the Auschwitz-1 complex, is another controversial group of buildings. Two long rectangular barracks-type buildings are connected together by high solid walls, providing an enclosed courtyard between them. The southernmost barrack has been identified in various texts as "Block 11", a building that once housed problem prisoners. This building is bordered on the south and east by the camp's barbed wire perimeter fence. A tall perimeter guard tower is situated at the corner of the fence and has complete visual access over these buildings. Between the east fence, and the barracks aligned along it, is a thin line of small trees that may have been initially planted as a vertical screen between the camp, the main road between the camp and the Sola river, and a bridge crossing the river close to the southeastern corner of the camp.

The barrack identified as "Block 11" is similar in size to the other barracks in the complex. It has a rectangular hipped roof that is slanted at both ends. A dormer is visible in the center of the roof, facing the south. There is a large stain on the roof, emanating from the dormer toward the northwest. It is probable that the dormer had been used as a vent for smoke or gases that left deposits on the roof. None of the other barracks have such a stain, although several have one or two dormers.

The barrack identified as "Block 10", the medical building is the same size as the Block 11 barrack, and has a hipped roof that extends the full length of the building. It does not contain a dormer but at least four pairs of small vents can be observed along its ridge line. There is little to indicate from photography that this building was used for medical purposes.

An open space, approximately 140 feet long and 50 feet wide, occurs between these two buildings. This has been enclosed by the construction of two tall, thick walls at either end of Block 10 and 11. There is no evidence of gateways in either of the walls, so access must be from the buildings. This area has been identified by collateral information as an area where prisoners were executed by firing squads. The photography shows only that the area is isolated, that the walls are thick enough to absorb bullets, and that the space can accommodate a firing squad. It cannot identify whether such executions actually took place, without other collateral.

Along the southwestern edge of the Camp, but outside the barbed wire perimeter fence, is a large "C" shaped building that has been identified in collateral as the prisoner registration building. Its configuration and physical position are such that there is little doubt about its function; as an administrative building which could be used for registration purposes.

On the 25 August 1944 photography, now held at the U.S. National Archives, a long winding line of

people can be observed moving towards an entrance in the northeastern corner of the registration building. Only the shadows of the people can be observed, but stereo coverage shows actual movement in the line, and previous coverage shows only a bare area. The sinuous line is approximately 350 feet long, may begin at the exit from the westernmost arm of the "C" shaped building, enters the shadows of some small trees, and ends in the shadow of the easternmost arm of the building. It is impossible to determine whether this is a single or double line, so establishing the number of personnel in the line would be difficult to prove.

## Auschwitz II / Birkenau

The Birkenau complex lies approximately 1-1/2 miles to the northwest of Auschwitz I, separated by what appears to be a large warehouse area, a small industrial park, and a multiple track rail line containing a large receiving and classification yard. The complex itself is massive, heavily secured, well planned and well engineered, with symmetrical lines of barracks and storage buildings separated into units by well kept surfaced roads. Approximately 1/3 of the complex appears to be under construction during the initial aerial coverage.

Birkenau consists of approximately 350 separate functional buildings, of which 265 appear to be barracks, the others being storage and utility buildings. The barracks appear to be of similar in size and shape to those observed at Auschwitz I, ( approximately 135 feet long and 45 feet wide). Most of the storage and utility buildings appear similar to the barracks buildings but with small observable differences in length and width. Others, such as the identified crematoriums, have unique shapes. There are also two water/sewage processing plants inside the western perimeter fence.

Perimeter security consists of multiple tall guard towers separated from each other by 270-470 feet, depending on line-of-site and the position of facility entrances. The towers appear to be outside, but adjacent to, a fence consisting of multiple strands of barbed wire that completely encircle the facility. The main entrance to the facility accommodates both a rail line and a major surfaced road. Both penetrate a two story building with a large guard tower on its roof. An east/west running rail spur, a small depot, and a large receiving yard separate the southern third of the facility from the main portion of the camp. Its eastern entrance is guarded by the main gate tower, whereas its west end appears still under construction in the September photographs.

To the north of the main entrance, separate from, but adjacent to the facility, is a long rectangular area that consists of a large multi-wing administrative building and two rows of five barracks, separated by a well kept field bisected by two surfaced paths intersecting a circular area containing a small monument. Separated by a fence from the barracks are six storage buildings. The entire area appears bounded by a thin fence, with no indications of barbed wire or guard towers. All indications point to this being the headquarters area for the facility. The administrative building would be the nerve center of the facility and the barracks would house permanent guards that maintain control over the occupants.

On the western border of the facility are four multifaceted buildings, two in the southwestern corner and two in the northwestern corner. The two in the northwestern corner appear to be at various stages of construction. They are of similar size and construction. The fully constructed buildings have a tall chimney and appear separated from the surrounding area by solid walls. The areas within the walls are bare and able to accommodate hundreds of people at a time. They are adjacent to the sewage plants. These buildings have been identified by collateral data as crematoriums. Photography corroborates this

data by the existence of chimneys and their isolation and positioning to conceal odors. The number of crematoriums appears excessive for the size of the Birkenau facility.

Rather than describing the functions and construction phases of all the buildings within the Birkenau complex, the above descriptions may suffice to orient the activities that were observed while analyzing the photography. It is important to realize that photographs document small instances in time and that the combined activities observed in all the available photography represents but a few seconds in the history of Birkenau.

Following is a chronology of significant activities observed on the photography and identified by the date of the reconnaissance. Since many of the photos were too poor in quality to observe activities of interest, they will not appear in this analysis. Again, analyses were conducted up to December 21, 1944, when it became obvious that the complexes had ceased most of their activities.

I) 31 May 1944 Photographic Coverage Acquired on Mission 60PRS/462 60 SQ, by the 15th U.S. Army Air Force for Planning and Bomb Damage Assessment (BDA).

The camera focal length was 6 inches, and the flight altitude was approximately 27,000 feet, making the scale of the photography approximately 1: 54,000. The resolution of the photo appears to be on the order of 6-8 feet.

The analysis conducted was produced by reviewing Mission Frame Numbers 1508-1510 on the original negatives of the mission, along with available positive print enlargements. The frames covered the Birkenau complex and the surrounding area, including a large classification and receiving rail yard.

## A) Activities

### 1) Railroad Yards

The classification rail yard is nearest to Birkenau and is filled to near capacity with two, possibly three, different types of rail cars - long, wide passenger coaches, the slightly smaller freight (box) cars, and the smaller still, possible cattle cars. Although the resolution of the image does not allow an accurate count of the number of parallel rail tracks in the yard, there appears to be room for at least eight tracks. Likewise resolution does not allow for an accurate count of the rail cars but the number appears to be well over one hundred cars. The receiving rail yard is also heavily used, containing primarily the smallest rail cars (possible cattle cars). Again, the track count is approximately eight, and the car count over one hundred.

A large passenger terminal, and several liquid storage tanks service the classification yard. Two hard surfaced roads lead directly from the classification yard to the main gate in the eastern perimeter of the Birkenau complex. A third surfaced road crosses the tracks between the classification and receiving yards and also proceeds to the main gate. A possible fourth road is under construction (more about this construction later), which may eventually intersect the road crossing between the yards and reach the

eastern perimeter of Birkenau several hundred yards to the north of the other roads, close by the entrance to the major area under construction at the Birkenau complex. A probable two track rail spur under construction traverses under the tower of the main gate connecting the classification yard to another receiving yard that is under construction within the Birkenau complex. There are five possible rail cars in this yard, but, since the tracks are not in place, they may have been transported to the site by vehicle and are being used to support construction crews. Once completed, at least 4, possibly six, parallel tracks will be able to accommodate hundreds of rail cars.

## 2) Personnel Management

The resolution of the photography does not allow the detection of individual persons, however groups of people cast a shadow that is easily detected if it is not obscured by obstructions, and the shadows are cast upon a light smooth surface such as a road. Obviously the shadows must be aligned with shadows of other obstructions to the sun's rays, and they must coincide in extent to the height relationship of other known objects casting shadows at that time of day. Overlapping photographs of the same image can be viewed stereoscopically to detect movement of groups of people and future coverage of the same area negates the possibility that the proposed shadows are permanent dark areas such as would be caused by road maintenance or vegetation. Credibility is strengthened by the positioning of the shadows relative to their surrounds. For example, a spot on the roof of a building may well indicate roof repair and not a group of personnel. All the above clues were used to identify personnel formations within Birkenau and its surrounds. Following are statements of what can be observed on the original negatives of the 31 May, 1944 photographic coverage of Birkenau and the surrounding area:

Within the perimeter of the complex, 21 separate formations of people can be observed. The formations are of different size and shape, some lined up alongside of barracks, and some marching down the various roads to unknown destinations. The direction of the moving formations can be observed stereoscopically, whereas the formations lined up at the barracks are motionless. Resolution of the photos is not sufficient to accurately determine the number of individuals in a line or the number of lines within a formation. However, the thinness of the shadows adjacent to most of the barracks appear to be made by single lines of personnel. The total length of these single lines is in the order of 1,200 feet, whereas the multiple line formations, possibly containing 2 to 4 lines, total approximately 600 feet. As some of the lines at the barracks appear to be still forming, these figures are only representative of activities within the few seconds of time in which the photographs were taken.

One of the annotated paper photographic enlargements provided by the CIA, has an arrow pointing to "prisoner formations" outside the perimeter of the complex, along what appears to be a long linear scar similar to that of a road under construction ( see comment on possible road in earlier paragraph). The line of "prisoners" appears to be approximately 1,400 feet long. The construction scar cuts across several flat cultivated fields, with one end terminating at a deep ditch and the other at a large warehouse type building outside of, but adjacent to the perimeter of the Birkenau complex. The annotated "prisoner formations" stop precisely at both scar termination points, providing no hint on how the "prisoners" arrived at this destination. The "formations" are all very small, square shaped, and cast easily detected shadows precisely aligned throughout the length of the scar. The shadows are more solid looking than the other identified personnel formations. It is more likely that the scar is a defensive measure being constructed to discourage military tanks/vehicles from crossing through these cultivated fields, and that the designated "formations of prisoners" are actually vertical obstructions similar to dragons teeth.

However, near the terminus of this linear scar, nearest to the Birkenau complex, there is a long formation of personnel marching north along the road paralleling, but outside, the complex perimeter. The line is approximately 650 feet long. These are probably the workers that are constructing the defensive tank obstructions. Apparently the annotation arrow indicating the position of "prisoner" formations was misplaced.

### 3) Smoke Plume

A long thin smoke plume can be observed emanating from disturbed earth alongside a long rectangular building adjacent to the northwestern perimeter of the Birkenau complex. The plume is drifting to the northwest and is most noticeable where it crosses over the perimeter fence. This building has been identified as Crematorium IV in several reports. However, there is also dissension concerning whether it is indeed a crematorium, because of its lack of fencing and isolation<sup>10</sup>. Disturbed earth around this building and piles of open storage nearby indicate that construction is continuing, and though the buildings appear to be outwardly complete, lesser priority internal construction may yet be occurring. This building is more isolated than the other three probable crematoriums. Although crematoriums do not have a standard outside photographic signature, this building can be identified as having the same functions as the two buildings identified as Crematorium II and III to the south of these buildings, and a fifth building still under construction adjacent to the building in question (this building has been designated as Crematorium V). All have signatures that are consistent with the functions of a crematorium .

The 31 May 1944 photography provides evidence that what has been identified as Crematorium IV may not be functional, but activity in the form of smoke, adjacent to the building , is consistent with collateral data on body disposal by incineration prior to the crematoriums becoming functional.

### 4) Mass Grave Sites

Situated within the northwestern perimeter of the Birkenau complex, across the road from a line of barracks and adjacent to, but south of, the two buildings designated as Crematoria IV & V, are series of narrow trenches excavated in echelon within a large area of bare soil. Twelve of the trenches (having a total length of approximately 800 feet) are open, whereas another 9 trenches (totaling approximately 650 feet) appear to have been filled in. The open trenches appear to be shallow but precisely oriented, with little scattered soil. They appear to have been dug by hand, with the excavated soil stored between the trenches. These have all the appearances of hand dug, mass grave sites used to dispense the residue from the adjacent crematoria.

Outside the Birkenau complex, situated in a vegetated area near the northwest corner of perimeter fence, are four, possibly five large, recently bulldozed, linear excavations. They are connected to the complex by a bulldozed trail leading to, and through, the perimeter fence to the area of the above mentioned hand dug trenches. The total length of these excavations is between 1,200 and 1,500 feet. All appear to have been recently covered over, since no shadows are evident. These excavations have the classic appearance of a mass grave site, and their connection with the trenches within the perimeter fence lends credence to their affiliation with the crematoria.

II) 26 June 1944 Photographic Coverage Acquired on Mission 60 PR/522 60SQ, by the 15th U.S. Army Air Force for planning and BDA.11

The camera focal length was 6 inches, and the flight altitude was approximately 30,000 feet, making the scale of the photography approximately 1:60,000 at nadir. However, Birkenau is near the edge of the photograph, where atmospheric haze and obliquity reduced the resolution to approximately 10-12 feet. At this resolution it is not possible to see the shadows of personnel formations, or to accurately count rail cars in the classification yard. However, it can be stated that there are no lines of rail cars in the Birkenau rail yard, indicating that the spur to the yard has yet to be completed. A short line of possible vehicles in convoy can be detected at the end of the rail yard closest to the main gate, and another in the classification yard outside of Birkenau. The primary reasons for believing these to be convoys are their linear configuration and the fact that they cannot be observed on previous or later photography.

The mass grave sites observed on the 31 May photography appear to be covered, with low vegetation beginning to obscure the scars. Haze, scale and obliquity do not allow any further observation of activity.

III) 25 August 1944 Photographic Coverage was Acquired on Mission 60PR/694 60SQ by the 15th U.S. Army Air Force for Planning and BDA.

The camera focal length was 36 inches, and the flight altitude was approximately 30,000 feet, making the scale of the photography approximately 1:10,000 at nadir. The best photographic resolution was on the order of 4-6 feet. Stereo coverage of Birkenau was available. The complex was covered twice during the mission. The first images cover only the southernmost portion of the complex but include the railroad classification yard outside Birkenau as well as the railroad yard within the facility. It provided the best quality photography acquired over the site during the time frame studied. The second coverage recorded the whole facility but is severely degraded by heavy haze, and smoke from the operating smoke generators protecting the targeted industrial facility. The following comments are on activities observed only on the first coverage, because of the poor quality of the subsequent coverage.

## A) Activities

### 1) Railroad Yards

The classification yard outside of the Birkenau complex is operational and busy, containing well over 100 rail cars. The receiving yard appears as busy as the June coverage. The rail spur to, and the rail yard within, the Birkenau complex are now complete and operational. Approximately 33 freight cars

are aligned on the main rail. Two short formations, and one long irregular formation of personnel are moving west along the northern edge of the yard toward an open gate to one of the buildings identified by collateral as Crematorium II. The total length of these formations is approximately 200 feet. Their width is difficult to determine since only the shadows are observed, but indicate a minimum of two abreast in the short formations and as many as five abreast in the long formation.

There is some controversy about these and other formations being spurious marks intentionally scribed on the film.<sup>12</sup> After viewing both the original and duplicate negatives of this coverage, I find no evidence of spurious scribed or inked markings, no indication of original or duplicate negative replacement, and no unexplainable film splices that would be visible if film replacement occurred<sup>13</sup>.

## 2) Personnel Movement

There are at least four concentrations of personnel within that portion of Birkenau that were on the initial coverage (approximately the southern 1/3 of the complex). Two of the formations appear to be composed of single or double lines of marching personnel. Their total length is approximately 360 feet. The other wider formations have a total length of 240 feet. These formations are at the extreme edge of the photograph and can only be observed on one frame. Close inspection and analysis of these formations was conducted due to aforementioned concerns that they may be spurious. The formation that appears to cover a portion of a barracks was viewed under high magnification and the edge of the building can be seen separating a repair stain on the roof of the building from the formation adjacent to the building. The original negative shows no evidence of having been tampered with.

## 3) Other Activities

There is no evidence of smoke emanating from that portion of Birkenau covered by the good quality photography and no evidence of mass grave sites, new construction, or dismantling activities. There is no activity around the three crematoriums that were covered by the good photography.

Crops surrounding the facility have been recently harvested, and no activity is now occurring in the fields.

## IV) 13 September 1944 Photographic Coverage Acquired on Mission 464 BG: 4M97.

The original negatives have been used for BDA and display ink marks on craters around industrial areas. There do not appear to be any craters in or near Birkenau. The complex was covered three different times during the flight, twice by its 12 inch focal length camera (once at an altitude of 23,000 feet and once at 22,900 feet) and once by its 24 inch focal length camera at an altitude of 23,500 feet. The scale of the photography taken by the 12 inch camera was approximately 1: 23,000, whereas the 24 inch camera contained imagery at 1: 11,750. Unfortunately, the larger scale coverage was seriously degraded by haze, from smoke originating from defensive smoke pots activated to conceal industrial areas, and from debris and smoke in the atmosphere caused by saturation bombing of the nearby industry. The resolution of the best coverage from the 12 inch cameras was approximately 5-7 feet.

## A) Activities

### 1) Railroad Yards

The classification yard near Birkenau appears active and contains well over 100 rail cars. The receiving yard appears nearly full of rolling stock. The rail yard within the Birkenau complex appears nearly empty of rolling stock, with only six box cars that can be reliably detected.

### 2) Personnel Movement

One long line of possibly double filed personnel appear to be heading north along a road from the main gate, outside of, but parallel to, the eastern perimeter of the complex. It stretches for approximately 675 feet. Another long line of people, probably in single file, appear to be moving north along the central main road within the complex, away from the rail yard. It is approximately 750 feet long. A third line of marchers, probably two abreast, appear to be crossing the road that separates the occupied half of the complex from the part under construction. The formation appears to be approximately 200 feet long. Perpendicular to that line is another probable two column formation stretching east/west along the above mentioned road. It is approximately 400 feet long. It is interesting to note that these lines of personnel were marching along during an air raid. In fact, a cluster of bombs is imaged as they fell toward a nearby industrial complex. At least six military supply type trucks, probably with canvas covered beds, can be detected within the complex. Two are at what has been identified by collateral as the Disinfection Building; two others at what has been called Gas Chamber IV; and the others are scattered about the complex.

### 3) Other Activities

The bulldozed mass grave site and connecting road adjacent to the complex, noted on the 31 May coverage, appears nearly overgrown with vegetation, as is the hand dug site within the complex. No new sites were detected.

Completion of several barracks buildings that appeared under construction in prior coverage indicates that plans are continuing for the enlargement of the complex. In fact, it appears that a few of the buildings may actually be occupied at the westernmost edge of the construction area.

Just to the east of Auschwitz I, along the main road, a miles long row of smoke pots have been ignited and smoke is beginning to drift east toward the rail classification yard, Birkenau, and the industrial complex to its west. However, bombs are already falling and the only effect will be to make BDA less reliable.

Many of the cultivated fields adjacent to Birkenau have been harvested, with some still containing

stacks of the harvested crops.

V) 21 December 1944 Photographic Coverage Acquired on Mission 15SG/994 15PG for BDA.

The camera focal length is 24 inches and the altitude is 25,000 feet providing a scale of 1/12.500. A light snow has fallen over the area with the lack of tracks on the roads, and lack of snow melt on the roofs of barracks indicating that the southern quarter of the complex is not being used. However, snow melt in the central portion does indicate it to be occupied.

## A) Activities

### 1) Railroad Yards

The main classification yard appears active but only approximately 25% full. At least five steam locomotives can be identified by their emissions. The receiving yard is also active, containing more rolling stock than what is in the classification yard. The rail yard within Birkenau contains only seven rail cars, and the light snow does not appear disturbed, indicating that no traffic had moved since the snowfall.

### 2) Personnel Movement

No formations of personnel were observed within the complex or at the rail yard

### 3) Other Activities

Several barracks that had been under construction in the northern quarter of the complex in September, have now been dismantled. Only 16 barracks now exist within the area. Trackage throughout this locality indicates that dismantling continues.

Three small personnel air raid ditches have been dug in the northwestern- most corner of what collateral has identified as the SS barracks and administration area.

Main roads and railroads appear clear of snow, whereas the cultivated fields surrounding Birkenau show no evidence of trackage.

Smoke rises from a small industrial site to the east of Birkenau, indicating that it is still functioning. There are no craters or observable damage to the surrounding buildings, negating the possibility that the smoke was caused by bomb damage.

## Conclusion

The purpose behind this analysis was to review World War II aerial reconnaissance missions that were known to have acquired images of the Auschwitz I and Auschwitz II/ Birkenau complexes, and, if possible, to add to the verity and completeness of previous analyses of the complexes. The advantages derived from the photographic interpretation of aerial image acquisitions are those of being able to conduct detailed analyses of a moment frozen in time, and to produce a permanent database that others may view, interpret, and agree or disagree with the results. The subjective association of features with activities provide clues on what is occurring during the time of photographic acquisition. The disadvantages include the fact that each photograph represents only a fraction of a second's time in which target activities are recorded; that the quality of the photographs varies according to the conditions of acquisition; and the degree of experience and skill of the analysts reviewing the products impacts the quality of the analyses conducted. . Regardless, photography can, and does, play an important role in establishing the validity of historical activities and analyses.

Following, in bullet-form, are the conclusions derived from this analysis.

- The original negatives and duplicate negatives of World War II aerial imagery over the Auschwitz I and II/ Birkenau complexes reside at the National Archives, Archive II building in the State of Maryland.
- Both the negatives and the duplicate negatives are available to all researchers requesting them, for viewing and analysis at Archives II.
- Although the negatives acquired over targeted military installations have been damaged from extensive use at the time of initial field analyses, the photographs of the Auschwitz complexes display only minor degradation due to handling, and provide a useful source of data for analysis.
- To assure that one has access to the original negatives, all copies of the film must be, and were, reviewed and the original isolated.
- A detailed microscopic analysis was conducted of all frames suspected of being tampered with or replaced.
- There is no evidence of false practices such as the tampering, scribing, inking or obliteration of images on the original or duplicate negatives of frames covering the Auschwitz complexes.
- There is no evidence of falsified frame replacements in either the negative or duplicate negative film rolls.
- At the time of photography, Auschwitz I was a fully secured operational prison camp, containing barracks, kitchens, etc. which was serviced by an unsurfaced road.
- On 4 April 1944, a long sinuous line of people can be observed moving into the administration building at Auschwitz I.
- Auschwitz II/Birkenau was a large heavily secured prison, serviced by surfaced roads, and

eventually a rail spur and rail yard.

- By 25 August 1944, the rail yard within Birkenau was operational and was in operation until shortly before 21 December 1944.
- Multiple personnel formations were observed on several aerial photographs of the complex.
- Four buildings that can be identified as crematoriums were observed within the complex, two of which may have not have been completely functional during the time of coverage.
- The number of crematoriums at Birkenau is excessive when compared to other prison facilities.
- A plume of smoke is visible on one of the aerial images adjacent to one of the identified crematoriums.
- Two areas of mass grave sites can be identified, one within the confines of the complex, the other outside, but adjacent to, the facility.
- Expansion of the prison continued through the September 1944 time frame.
- By December 21, 1944, there were signs that the complex was closing down, with unused barracks evident and dismantling begun.
- The rail yard within the complex was empty of rolling stock on 21 December 1944.
- There are no craters or other indications of bomb damage within the Auschwitz I and Auschwitz II/ Birkenau complexes throughout the time frame of the air reconnaissance flights, whose film is now available at the U.S. National Archives.
- All the available imagery acquired by aerial reconnaissance over the Auschwitz complexes represents only a few seconds of time within the history of their existence.
- Photography can neither verify or refute, without collateral, the type of prisoners being held within the facility.
- The photography does not record data that would negate the fact that the prison was used as indicated by recorded historical Holocaust data.

The photography does contain image data that is compatible with the identification of Birkenau as a death camp

## SOURCE NOTE ABBREVIATIONS

AA      Auschwitz Archives From Moscow.

AM      Mauthausen Archiv der Gedenkstätte Konzentrationlager

APMO    Archiwum Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu. Archives of the Auschwitz State  
Museum

AJYB    American Jewish Yearbook

BA doc   Bundesarchiv document. File NS 4 Ma/54

IMT      International Military Tribunal, Trials of Major War Criminals,  
42 Volumes. Popularly known as the Blue Series.

JHR      Journal of Historical Review

NCA      Office of the United States Counsel for Prosecution of Nazi  
Criminality, Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression (Washington: 1946) 10 Volumes. Popularly  
known as the Red Series.

Nizkor    Internet Service of Nizkor.Org/, an organization which monitors Holocaust denial on the  
internet.

NMT Nuremberg Military Tribunal, Trials of War Criminals (Washington: 1947) 15 Volumes.

Popularly known as the Green Series.

THHP <http://www.holocaust-history.org>. Website of The Holocaust History Project.

YVS Yad Vashem Studies.

## SOURCE NOTES

### INTRODUCTION

1. See Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein and Adalbert Ruckerl, *Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas* (Yale: 1993); Jean - Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (New York: 1989); Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Washington: 1994); Shelley Shapiro ed., *Truth Prevails, Demolishing Holocaust Denial: The End of the Leuchter Report* (NY: 1990); David D. Brodeur, "Auschwitz Gas: Medical and Chemical Origins," *102 Faith and Thought*, No.3 (1975), pp. 197-216; Auschwitz State Museum, *Death Books From Auschwitz: Remnants* (London: 1995), Vol. I; Robert - Jan Van Pelt and Deborah Dworkin, *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present* (NY: 1996); Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer: The Memoirs of the SS Kommandant at Auschwitz* (NY: 1992); Franciszek Piper and Teresa Swiebocka, *Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp* (Oswiecim: 1996)

2. See the figures compiled from the AJYB 1933-1948 as reproduced in the table by Abraham Edelheit and Herschel Edelheit, *History of the Holocaust* (Boulder: 1994), 226.

3. C. C. Aronsfeld, *The Text of the Holocaust* (Marblehead: 1985), 53.

4. Some of his writings have been translated and published as *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (Torrance: 1978), 377, 390, see also pp. 325, 345-49 and *The Real Eichmann Trial or The Incurable Victors* (Silver Spring: 1979). For an analysis of Rassinier's writings see Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (New York: 1993), 51-64. Lipstadt's book is the best study to date on the history of Holocaust denial. A good introductory study is Randolph Braham's, "Revisionism: Historical, Political and Legal Implications," in Asher Cohen, Joan Gelber, and Charlotte Ward, eds., *Comprehending the Holocaust* (NY: 1988), 61-96.

Recently, Rassinier has been the subject of a nearly 800 page biography in French by Nadine Fresco, *Fabrication d'un antisemite* (Paris: 1999). See the excellent review of this work in English by Professor Samuel Moyn in *H-Judaic*, *H-Net Reviews* at <http://www.hnet.msu.edu/reviews/showrev.cgi?path=>

3012924727570.

5. Bradley F. Smith, "Two Alibis for the Inhumanities", 1 German Studies Review (Oct. 1978), 329-30.
6. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1978), 219
7. Also published as *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986, first published in 1979).
8. This conclusion is based on the vague biographical information published on Sanning in 6 JHR (Spring 1985), 128. All references to Sanning's *Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* in the first three chapters will be cited in the text.
9. Dan Desjardins, "Critique of John S. Conway's Review of Walter Sanning's.. ." 7 JHR (Fall 1986) 375-78. Conway's review of Sanning's book is reproduced on pp. 380-1. It originally appeared in *The International History Review* (August 1985).
10. Keith Stimely's introduction to Frank H. Hankins, "How Many Jews Were Exterminated by the Nazis," 4 JHR (Spring 1983), 63.

#### CHAPTER 1: POLAND'S DEMOGRAPHICS

1. For a comprehensive demographic breakdown see 2 *Contemporary Jewish Record* (Sept./Oct. 1939), 74-78; Bernhard Kahn, "The Jews in Reconstituted Poland", 16 *Jewish Social Services Quarterly* No.3 (March 1940), 262; Tadeusz Piotrowski, *Poland's Holocaust* (London: 1998), 305, fn. 79. The 1931 census count of Jews was actually understated. The real number was 3,250,000. Joseph Marcus, *Social and Political History of Jews in Poland, 1919-1939* (NY: 1983), 173.
2. It is probably no coincidence that this is the same number Rassinier used. Paul Rassinier *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (Torrance: 1978), 349.
3. Hermann Graml, "Die Auswanderung Der Juden Aus Deutschland Zwischen 1933 und 1939" [The Emigration of the Jews from Germany Between 1933 and 1939] *Gutachten des Instituts fir Zeitgeschichte* (Munich, 1958), 79-85. The article only lists two sources in its bibliography. One of these sources is Mark Wischnitzer's, *Die Juden in Der Welt* [The Jews in the World] (Berlin: 1935). However, Wischnitzer's figures on Polish-Jewish emigration deal with the period from 1921 and do not support the Institute's figures. *Die Juden in Der Welt*, 204-207, 212-215. Wischnitzer had used the official numbers when discussing Polish-Jewish emigration. (Source cited in note 5 herein.) It is possible that Herman Graml, the author of the Institute's article, misunderstood Wischnitzer's data.
4. Arie Tartakower, "Jewish Emigration from Poland in Post War Years," 16 *Jewish Social Service Quarterly* No.3 (March 1940), 274-275. The official Polish statistics upon which Tartakower's figures are based are reproduced in Jacob Lestschinsky, "National Groups in Polish Emigration," 5 *Jewish Social Studies* (April 1943), 109.
5. Marcus, *Social and Political History of Jews in Poland 1919-1939*; Celin Heller, *On the Edge of Destruction: The Jews of Poland Between the Two World Wars* (NY: 1977); Joshua Fishman, ed.,

Studies on Polish Jewry, 1919-1939 (NY: 1974); Yisrael Gutman et. al eds., The Jews of Poland Between Two World Wars (Hanover: 1989); Harry M. Rabinowicz, The Legacy of Polish Jewry, 1919-1939 (NY: 1965); Ezra Mendelsohn, The

Jews of East Central Europe Between the World Wars (Indiana: 1983), 10-84; Antony Polonsky et. al, Jews in Independent Poland, 1918-1939 (Washington: 1994). This study forms Volume 8 of the annual publication Polin; Antony Polonsky ed., From Shtetl to Socialism (London: 1993) Part 3; Mark Wischnitzer, "Migrations of the Jews," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia Vol. 7 (1942), 553; Bernard Weinryb, "Poland" in Peter Meyer, ed. The Jews in Soviet Satellites (Syracuse: 1953), 207-326.

6. Marcus *ibid.* , 388; Heller *ibid.* 281, Weinryb *ibid.* , 210-211; Wischnitzer, *ibid.* 552; Mendelsohn *ibid.* , 79; Marcus and Wischnitzer estimate that about 50,000 Jews left Poland from 1937-1939.

7. Stephen Horak, Poland and Her National Minorities (Indiana: 1961), 97-98.

8. Josef Tomaszeuski, "The Role of Jews in Polish Commerce, 1918-1939" in Gutman et al. note 5 herein, pp. 156-7; Heller, *On the Edge of Destruction*, p. 136; see also Edward P. Wynth, Jr., "A Necessary Cruelty: The Emergence of Official Anti-Semitism in Poland, 1936-1939", 76 *American Historical Review* (Oct. 1971), 1052-3; Franciszek Adamski, "The Jewish Question in Polish Religious Periodicals in the Second Republic: The Case of *Przeglad Katolicki*" in Polonsky et.al. *Jews in Independent Poland, 1918-1939*, 144-5.

9. Marcus, *Social and Political History of the Jews in Poland*, 390-1,402-4; see also Heller *On the Edge of Destruction*, 282.

10. I wrote to the Institute on April 18, 1996 citing the official statistics. I asked how the Institute arrived at the 100,000 annual number and where these Jews immigrated to. In the reply of May 22, 1996 I was only referred to the article, which the Institute sent me. However, as noted above, the article does not address these issues.

11. The Institute is a repository for much documentation on the Third Reich and the Holocaust. This does not make it "pro-Zionist."

12. 50 *AJYB* 1948/49, p. 754.

13. This number is gathered from the annual *AJYB* issues published from 1934-1946, Vols. 36-47. The Yearbook received its information from official United States immigration agencies.

14. Marcus, *Social and Political History of the Jews in Poland*, 516 fn. 8.

15. Sources cited in note 13 herein. Lestschinsky, note 4 herein, p. 113 writes that only one of every four Polish-Jewish applicants could satisfy the stringent requirements of the U.S. Consul in Poland. However, the fact that only 9,300 actually entered the United States gives an idea as to how many were trying to enter.

16. Natural increase was arrived at by subtracting net immigration (total immigrants less departures) from the census figures for total increase in 1927 and 1937. Annual immigration figures from 1921-1943 are in 48 *AJYB* 1946/1947, p. 613. Immigration figures for 1918-1920 are in 21 *AJYB*

1919/1920, p. 611 and 23 AJYB 1921/1922, p. 294. Census figures are in 46 AJYB 1944/1945, p. 494.

17. 46 AJYB 1944/1945, p. 494. This information comes from the United States Census of Religious Bodies taken in the seventh year of each decade, not to be confused with the United States Census, which occurs at the beginning of each new decade. See H.S. Linfield, "The Jews of the United States: Number and Distribution", 41 AJYB 1939/1940, p.181.

18. 16 AJYB 1914/1915, p. 358.

19. Mark Wischnitzer, "The History of the Jews in Russia in Recent Years," 35 Jewish Quarterly Review (1944/1945), 393.

20. H.S. Linfield, "The Jewish Population of the United States", 46 AJYB 1944/1945, note on p. 491.

21. Cited in note 5 herein.

22. 5 JHR (Winter 1984), 370.

23. Maurice Davie, *Refugees in America* (NY: 1947), 28.

24. *Ibid.*, 26.

25. 41 AJYB 1939/40 p. 598; Vol. 42, 1940/41 p. 615; Vol. 43, 1941/42 p. 681. In 1939 and 1940 a slight majority of all immigrants were Jews.

26. Sanning never explained how all these Polish-Jews got into the United States.

27. *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 6, 1942, p. 175. Early in 1942 the Germans began preventing outside food aid from reaching Jews in the General Government and Germany. Christopher Browning, *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office* (NY: 1978), 85.

28. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (NY: 1985), Vol. 1, p. 189. On the total Jewish population in Poland on the eve of the war see Philip Friedman, *Roads to Extinction: Essays on the Holocaust* (Philadelphia: 1980), 211-212. The actual number was probably closer to 3.5 million. Professor Stefan Szulc of Poland's Statistical Office arrived at 3,474,000. This number allows for emigration of 116,000 Jews following the 1931 census. "The Accuracy of the Registration of Births and Deaths" *Polish Statistics, Series C Pt 41*, p. 130 cited in *Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, German Crimes in Poland*, (NY: 1982, first published in 1947), Vol. I, pp.125-6. He places 2,317,000 in German Poland after the invasion and 1,157,000 in Soviet Poland.

29. Hilberg, *ibid.*, 195.

30. Maciej Siekierski, "The Jews in Soviet Occupied Eastern Poland at the End of 1939: Numbers and Distribution," in Norman Davies and Antony Polonsky, eds. *Jews in Eastern Poland and the USSR, 1939-1946* (NY: 1991), 110-113 (300,000), probably the best analysis to date; Dov Levin, *The Lesser of Two Evils: Eastern European Jewry Under Soviet Rule, 1939-1941* (Phil: 1995), 180 (300,000); Weinryb, note 5 herein, p. 342 (300,000); Ben Cion Pinchuk, "Sovietization of the Jewish Community in East European Poland," 56 *Slavonic and East European Review* (July 1978), 390 (300,000-350,000);

Pawel Korzec and Jean Charles Szurek, "Jews and Poles Under Soviet Occupation 1939-1941: Conflicting Interests," in Antony Polonsky ed. *From Shtetl to Socialism*, p. 389

(300,000-400,000); Shimon Redlich, "The Jews in Soviet Annexed Territories." *1 Soviet-Jewish Affairs* (June 1971), 83 (300,000-350,000).

31. *German Crimes in Poland* Vol. I, p.127.

32. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 14, p. 473.

33. Ben Cion Pinchuk, *Shtetl Jews Under Soviet Rule* (Oxford: 1990), 105. On the condition of Polish Jews under Soviet occupation see Yosef Litvak, "Jewish Refugees From Poland in the USSR, 1939-1946" in Zvi Gitelman, ed., *Bitter Legacy: Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR* {Bloomington:1997}, 123-150.

34. *Treatment of Jews by the Soviets*, 17th Interim Report of Hearings before the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. House of Representatives 83rd Congress, New York, September 22 and 23, 1954 p. 61.

35. Cited in Weinryb, "Poland", note 5 herein, p. 348.

36. *Jewish Affairs*, August 1941, p. 6.

37. Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton, eds., *Archives of the Holocaust* (NY: 1990), Vol. 8, Doc. 62, p. 228.

38. *The Jewish Communities of Nazi Occupied Europe* (NY: 1982, first published in 1944), 2 under the section on Poland.

39. Jan Ciechanowski, *Defeat in Victory* (NY: 1947), 120.

40. *Communist Takeover and Occupation of Poland*. Special Report No. 1 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress p. 11.

41. Keith Sword, *Poles in the Soviet Union, 1939-48* (London: 1994), 25-27, citing the study *Polska Wschodnia, 1939-1941*. For a comprehensive analysis of this study see Z.S. Siemaszko, "The Mass Deportations of the Polish Population to the USSR, 1940-1941," in Keith Sword, ed., *The Soviet Takeover of the Polish Eastern Provinces 1939-1941* (NY: 1991) 217-235.

42. *Documents on Polish Soviet Relations 1939-1945*, Vol. 1, 1939-1943 (London: 1961), 573.

43. Jan Gross, *Revolution from Abroad: The Soviet Conquest of Poland's Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia* (Princeton: 1988), 199.

44. *Documents on Polish Soviet Relations*, 574. This source summarizes the various studies. Sanning must have been aware of these findings since this source lists the Congressional hearings which Sanning quoted. Sanning probably learned of these hearings from this source. See also Piotrowski,

Poland's Holocaust, 297, fn. 48 for an overview of the various studies.

45. *Polskie Sily Zbrojne*, III, pp. 33-34 cited in Jozef Garlinski, *Poland in the Second World War* (NY: 1985), 36.

46. *Documents on Polish-Soviet Relations*, 180.

47. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (NY: 1953), 409.

48. Figures for total immigration to Palestine and Polish-Jews drawn from AJYB, Vols. 43-49.

49. NG-2586-G in NMT, Vol. 13, pp. 210-217; Text also in Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (West Orange: 1976), 73-82.

50. Lucjan Dobroszycki, *Survivors of the Holocaust in Poland* (NY: 1994), 19,25 based on figures by Poland's Jewish Central Committee.

51. *Danziger Vorposten*, May 13, 1944 cited in Leon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate* (NY: 1986), 211.

52. See Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Vol I, pp. 188-269, Vol. 2, pp 482-541; see also Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, 32-67, 244-299; Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate*, 84-107, 149-157, 191-223; Arthur Eisenbach, "Operation Reinhard: Mass Extermination of the Jewish Population in Poland," *3 Polish Western Affairs* (January 1962), 80-124.

53. Hilberg, *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 269, citing monthly statistics from the Warsaw ghetto and population data compiled from the Lodz municipal administration files. For a breakdown of the monthly statistics on Warsaw from January 1941 to May 1942 see Yisrael Gutman, *The Jews of Warsaw 1939-1943* (Bloomington: 1982), 64.

54. Hilberg, *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 1212; Jeremy Noakes and Geoffrey Pridham, *Documents on Nazism*, (London: 1974), 1071; Cz Madajcek, *Polityka Trzeciej Rzeszy*, cited in Franciszek Piper, "Number of Deportees to and Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp," *21 YVS* (1991), 74; Zdenek Lederer, *Ghetto Theresienstadt* (NY: 1983, first published in 1953), 200.

55. Noakes and Pridham, *ibid.*, 990-991. On the problems of food and deprivation see Hilberg, *ibid.*, Vol. I, 259-269; Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews* (NY: 1975), 208-215; Gutman, *The Jews of Warsaw*, 66-67; Christopher Browning, *The Path to Genocide* (Cambridge: 1992), 45-53; Jan T. Gross, *Polish Society Under German Occupation: The General Government* (Princeton: 1979), 100-107, 111-113. Gross cites data on p. 102 which shows that tuberculosis among the non-Jewish population tripled. See also PS 1189, a German directive that Jews were only to receive one-half of the normal food allotment. *NCA*, Vol, 3, p. 833.

56. Noakes and Pridham, *ibid.*, 1071.

57. Entry of Sept. 9, 1941, *German Crimes in Poland*, Vol. 2, p. 35.

58. Helmut Krausnick, "Persecution of the Jews" in Krausnick, et al. eds., *Anatomy of the SS State* (NY: 1968), 103.

59. Entry of August 24, 1942 in German Crimes in Poland, Vol. 2, p. 35 and Krausnick, *ibid.*, 103.
60. Entry of Sept. 9. 1941 in German Crimes in Poland, Vol. 2, p. 40.
61. *Ibid.*, 42.
62. The full text of the Stroop Report may be found in Sybil Milton, ed., *The Stroop Report: The Jewish Quarter of Warsaw Is No More* (NY: 1979). The original German, and English translation are provided. Abridged text in Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, 120-130. Text is also online at THHP.
63. Text of NO-2494 Himmler order of February 16,1943 in Yitzhak Arad, Yisrael Gutman, Abraham Margalio, *Documents on the Holocaust* (Jerusalem: 1981), 292.; Michael Berenbaum, *Witness to the Holocaust* (NY: 1997), 236. Hans Frank placed the Jewish population of Warsaw at 480,000. Speech of November 18, 1941 in Yitzhak Arad et.al, *Documents on the Holocaust*, 246-247; see also Josef Wulf, *Das Dritte Reich und seine Vollstrecker: Die Liquidation von 500,000 Juden im Ghetto Warsaw* (Berlin: 1961).
64. L 18 in NCA, Vol. 7, pp. 756, 760, 763; Arad, et.al, *ibid.*, 336, 339.
65. The complete texts of the Korherr Reports and all correspondence concerning them has been published in the original German with an English translation in Serge Klarsfeld ed., *The Holocaust and Neo Nazi Mythomania* (NY: 1978), 165-210. An English translation also appears in Stephen Challen, *Richard Korherr and His Reports* (London: 1993), 14-40. Challen is a denier. Nevertheless, his translation substantively agrees with Klarsfeld's.
66. Friedlander and Milton, *Archives of the Holocaust*, Vol. 8, Doc. 65, p. 238. Memo to the American Embassy in Switzerland dated Nov. 24, 1942.
67. NMT, Vol. 13, pp. 212, 213; Text also in Arad et.el, *Documents on the Holocaust*, 249-261.
68. NG2586-J in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 249
69. Krausnick, *Anatomy of the SS State*, 123.
70. Leni Yahil, *The Holocaust* (NY: 1990), 448.
71. Doc. 2233-F-PS in NCA, Vol. 4, p. 902.
72. September 9, 1941 in German Crimes in Poland, Vol. 2, p. 41.
73. Text of PS 1469 in NMT, Vol. 5, pp. 381-2.
74. Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps* (Bloomington: 1987), 381-398.
75. Mark Weber and Andrew Allen, "Treblinka," 12 JHR No.2 (Summer 1992), 139.
76. Published in NMT, Vol. 5, pp. 693-728.

77. NO 1257, Report by the Inspector of Concentration Camps, February 6, 1943 in NMT, Vol. 5, pp. 699-700.
78. NO 060 undated in NMT, Vol. 5, pp.704-5.
79. Yitzhak Arad, "Treblinka," Encyclopedia of the Holocaust (London: 1990), Vol. 4, p. 1482; Raul Hilberg, "German Railroads/Jewish Souls," Society (Nov/Dec. 1976), 66. See also German Crimes in Poland, Vol. I, pp. 103-4.
80. Text with explanation in Raul Hilberg, Documents of Destruction (NY: 1971), 106, 111. See also Arad, Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka, 131-135, 396 for transport from Bialystok to Treblinka.
81. Reitlinger, The Final Solution, 257.
82. Butz, Hoax of the Twentieth Century, 219. The other source cited by Weber and Allen is Steffen Werner's, Die Zweite Babylonische Gefangenschaft: Zum Schicksal der Juden im Ostern Seit 1941 [The Second Babylonian Captivity: On the Fate of the Jews in the East Since 1941] (Tubingen: 1991), 70-71, 171.

In fact, nowhere in his book was Werner able to substantiate the denier claim that he had assembled "an impressive amount of documentation" to show that hundreds of thousands of Jews who were supposed to have been gassed in Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka were deported to Soviet occupied territory. 13 JHR No. 6 (Nov/Dec, 1993), 26. If he had, the Institute of Historical Review would have translated it into English, or at the very least the book would have received far more attention from the JHR than the passing reference it did receive. Much of the demographic data in the book does not even deal with Jews.

The "evidence" Werner cited to show that Treblinka bound Jews ended up in Minsk in White Russia was a letter from General Wilhelm Kube, Commissioner for White Ruthenia, dated July 31, 1942 where he mentions that 1,000 Warsaw Jews arrived in Minsk (PS 3428 in NCA, Vol. 6, p. 133 and Arad, et.al, Documents on the Holocaust, 411-413). However, Werner ignored the report itself in which Kube states tha "we have liquidated in the last ten weeks about 55,000 Jews in White Ruthenia... In Minsk - City approximately 10,000 Jews were liquidated ... 6,500 of them Russian Jews, predominantly aged persons, women and children. . ." In fact, Kube's report is about the extermination of the Jews in Minsk and White Russia, not resettlement. Moreover, nowhere in the report does it say that these 1,000 Jews arrived from Treblinka. Most Warsaw Jews were killed in Treblinka.

The way in which Werner used this report is probably the best illustration of how deniers ignore and fabricate evidence. (For more on Werner see note 109 herein.)

83. See Heiner Lichtenstein , "Punctually on the Ramp: The Horizon of a German Railroad Worker", in Jorg Wollenberg, ed., The German Public and the Persecution of the Jews (NJ: 1996), 159-162.
84. A comprehensive breakdown of all the dates and transport destinations is in Joods Historisch Museum Amsterdam, Documents of the Persecution of the Dutch Jewry, 1940-1945 (Amsterdam: 1979), 115-120.
85. NO 064 in NMT, Vol. 5, p. 715; see also Rachel Auerbach, "In the Fields of Treblinka," in Alexander Donat, ed. The Death Camp Treblinka (NY: 1979), 54.

86. Text in Arad, Documents on the Holocaust, 274-5.
87. Leni Yahil, "Hitler's Impact on the Nazis Jewish Policy," 23 YVS (1993), 285-6 citing several such orders.
88. D-728 in NCA, Vol.7, p.175. See also Richard Breitman, *The Architect of Genocide: Himmler and the Final Solution* (NY: 1991), 7 on the destruction of documents which incriminated Himmler.
89. NG-183 in NMT, Vol. 13, p.233.
90. PS 1472 in NCA, Vol. 4, p. 49 dated December 16, 1942.
91. NO 2207 cited in Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, 257; Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews*, Vol. 2, p. 491.
92. Text in Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 52.
93. Text in Hilberg ed., *Documents of Destruction*, 106-111.
94. Photocopy of the original German reproduced in Janusz Gumkowski, *Poland Under Nazi Occupation* (Warsaw: 1961), between pp. 64 and 65.
95. Text in Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 145.
96. Text of report dated September 14, 1942 in Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen and Volker Reiss, eds. *The Good Old Days* (NY: 1988), 232-235; Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 250. On the archeological excavation see Robin O'Neill, "Belzec: The Forgotten Death Camp", 28 *East European Jewish Affairs*, No.2 (Winter 1998-9), 52. O'Neill was a member of the excavation team.
97. Stanislaw Piotrowski, *Hans Frank's Diary*, (Warsaw: 1961), 249; Arad, Documents on the Holocaust, 247-248; *German Crimes in Poland*, 41-42.
98. Omer Bartov, *The Eastern Front, 1941-1945, German Troops and the Barbarisation of Warfare* (London: 1985), 80-81.
99. Text in Arad, et al. *Documents on the Holocaust*, 275; Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, 97; Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 47; Berenbaum, *Witness to the Holocaust*, 217.
100. NO 626, July 28, 1942 in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 240. 100a. Richard Breitman, *Official Secrets* (NY: 1998), 101
101. From 1939 to 1943 Hitler made six references to the extermination of the Jews in Europe. These are cited in C.C. Aronsfeld, *The Text of the Holocaust* (Marblehead: 1985) 33-37. Many of the significant speeches and private utterances of Hitler and others have been dealt with in Eberhard Jackel, *Hitler's Weltanschauung: A Blueprint for Power* (Conn: 1972), 47-66; Andreas Hillgruber, "Extermination of the Jews in the East" in Michael Marrus, ed., *The Nazi Holocaust* (Westport: 1989), Part 3, Vol. I, pp.85-114. Martin Broszat, "Hitler and the Genesis of the Final Solution," 13 YVS (1979), 87-125 reproduced in Marrus, *The Nazi Holocaust*, Part 3. Vol.1, pp115-167.

102. D - 736 in NCA, Vol. 7, pp. 190-1. Notes of the meeting of April 17, 1943 recorded by Hitler's interpreter on April 18. This account has been confirmed by Horthy, who later wrote that Hitler was shouting that "the Jews must either be exterminated or put in concentration camps." Nicholas Horthy, *Memoirs* (NY: 1957), 205.

103. Photocopy of the original report appears in Michael Shermer, *Why People Believe Weird Things* (NY: 1997), 220. The report was originally cited in David Irving, *Hitler's War* (London: 1977), 867. For an in depth analysis of Irving's book see Charles Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler: David Irving's *Hitler's War*" *12 Central European History* No. 2 (June 1979), 169-199 and chapter 8 herein.

104. PS 1944, in Kogon et al, *Nazi Mass Murder*, 5, 6.

105. PS 905 in *ibid.*, 6.

106. PS 3040 in *ibid.*, 6.

107. NO 1365, Feb. 16, 1944 in Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate*, 271.

108. NO 3414, July 17, 1941 in NMT, Vol. 4, p. 131.

108a. Text of memo dated January 26, 1942 in Nico Rost, *Concentration Camp Dachau* (Brussels: nd.), 32.

109. NO 2607 in NMT, Vol. 13, pp.304-5. Steffen Werner (see the discussion in note 82 herein) argued that "special treatment" meant something other than killing based on a report by the Security Police dated March 29, 1943. (PS 3943 in NCA, Supp. A, 668). The report deals with guerrilla activity. It states: "Losses of the enemy: 2,219 dead; 7,378 persons who received special treatment..." Werner's argument was that this document showed that special treatment was different than killing otherwise these 7,378 persons would have also been listed as killed. (Werner, note 82 herein, p. 82.)

His argument ignores the fact that "special treatment" meant killing by execution. The 2,219 dead were killed as part of regular military operations. They were not executed. All of the illustrations cited in this study show that special treatment killing had nothing to do with people killed in the course of military engagement. This fact should have been obvious to Werner because a German report on February 27, 1943, which is part of the same series of documents, (NCA, Supp. A, p. 667) states that 805 armed enemy were killed while "1,165 persons received special treatment, because they took sides with the guerrillas, 34 prisoners were brought in". Therefore, these 1,165 persons were not killed in an armed confrontation as the 805 were and were not taken prisoners. The Germans frequently executed enemy sympathizers.

The first document in this series, dated May 22, 1942, discusses the annihilation of the Jews and gypsies in the Crimea. (NCA, Supp. A, 662.)

110. NO 4317 in NMT, Vol.13, pp.523-5.

111. Yitzhak Arad, Shmuel Krakowski and Shmuel Spector, eds. *The Einsatzgruppen Reports* (NY: 1989), 206. USSR Report No. 124

112. PS 501 in NCA, Vol. 3, pp. 420-422. For the predictable denier claim that this document is a forgery see the discussion in note 13 in Chapter 9 herein.
113. Ibid., 418-419. See also the report dated June 5, 1942 to Walter Rauff, the head of Group II for the Reich Main Security Office, describing the operation of gas vans. Photocopy of the original German text and translation in Kogon et. al, *Nazi Mass Murder*, 228-235; see also photocopy of a report on gassing in Serbia from SS Major General Dr. Harald Turner dated April 11, 1942 in *Archives of the Holocaust*, Vol. 11, Pt. 2, Doc. 397, pp 284-285. Text with English translation is at THHP. These documents are discussed in more detail in Chapter 9 herein pp. 177, 178, 200.
114. NO 2363, NO 2361 and NI 9909 in Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction*, 220-1. Photocopy of the original order in *Deathbooks From Auschwitz*, Vol. I, Appendix, p. 144. See also copies of five deliveries of Zyklon B, totaling 1900 cans, to Auschwitz in April, May and June, 1944, NI 9913-A in John Mendelsohn, *The Holocaust* (NY: 1982), Vol. 12, pp. 148-157.
115. NO 4634 in NMT, Vol. 4, pp.1166-7.
116. Jean - Claude Pressac with Robert-Jan Van Pelt, "The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz" in Gutman and Berenbaum eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, 223; see also Gerald Fleming, "The Auschwitz Archives in Moscow," *143 Jewish Quarterly* (Autumn 1991), 9-12.
117. Photocopy of the Declaration of SS Corporal Gotfried Wiese made on May 24, 1944 during the Hungarian operation in *Archives of the Holocaust*, Vol. 11, Pt. 2, Doc. 405, p. 300. Text also at THHP.
118. NO 365 in Jenő Levai, *Eichmann in Hungary: Documents* (NY: 1987), 203; Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* (Berkeley: 1982), 70-71. Photocopy of the original German with an English translation on THHP. Brack was manager for euthanasia of children and adults. Henry Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (Chapel Hill: 1995), 68, 69.
119. Louis P. Lochner, ed. *The Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943* (NY: 1948), 147, 148.
120. Abridged text in Arad et al. *Documents on the Holocaust*, 344-5; Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, 133; Berenbaum, *Witness to the Holocaust*, 178. Deniers allege that Himmler never made this speech or if he did the offending words are forgeries inserted into the text. An actual verbal recording of the speech is in the United States National Archives. There are also Himmler's handwritten notes for the speech dealing with the Jewish evacuation. See Robert Wolfe, "Nazi Paperwork for the Final Solution," in James Pacy and Alan Wertheimer, eds., *Perspectives on the Holocaust* (Boulder: 1995), 24-30. Wolfe was the National Archives Specialist for captured German documents. It has also been claimed that if Himmler actually said this, he did not mean physical killing of Jews. Mitchell Jones, an independent researcher in Texas, writes:
- "... I purchased a copy of the recording from the National Archives and had two native Germans listen to it. Both are over 50 and lived in Germany during World War II. They agreed that the translation is excellent, and confirmed that there is no possible ambiguity as to what the speaker was saying. Himmler was discussing the ongoing extermination of the Jews of Europe. . ." *The Leuchter Report: A Dissection* (Cedar Park: 1992), 62. An audio recording is at <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/people/h/himmler-heinrich/posen/oct 04-43/>

121. Krausnick, *Anatomy of the SS State*, 123. Himmler returned to this theme in his speech of May 24, 1944. "I did not feel justified- and this concerns the Jewish women and children - to allow the children to grow up as avengers, who will then kill. . .our grandchildren." Hillgruber, "Extermination of the Jews in the East," 113. Himmler made the same point about killing women and children in his speech of December 16, 1943. Cited in Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory* (NY: 1992), 22. He again stated this in another Posen speech on January 26, 1944. David Irving, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich* (London: 1996), 455-6, 670 fn. 17.
122. See Wolfgang Scheffler, "The Forgotten Part of the "Final Solution": The Liquidation of the Ghettos," in *Simon Wiesenthal Center Annual*, Vol. 2 (NY: 1985), 31-51.
123. Colonel Erwin Lahousen's journey report for October 23, 1941 cited in Irving, *Hitler's War*, 325.
124. OSR 128 of November 2, 1941 in Yitzhak Arad et.al. *The Einsatzgruppen Reports*, 217.
125. NO 2362, October 2, 1942 in Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction*, 220. Photocopy of the original order in Auschwitz State Museum, *Death Books From Auschwitz* (London: 1995) Vol. I, Appendix, p 145.
126. Heinz Liepmann, *Death From the Skies* (London: 1937), 212, 213, 216, 217.
127. Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide*, 73.
128. *New York Times*, November 19, 1996, p. A6; See also Breitman, *Official Secrets* , 67, 68. Deniers have argued that the absence of German radio intercepts on Auschwitz about gassings shows that there was no mass murder in the camp. However, the mass murder of Jews by gassing began in the spring of 1942, long after this order was issued. The complete record of intercepts has not yet been released by the British.
129. Letter of May 1, 1942. Text in Gotz Aly, *Final Solution: Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews* (NY: 1999), 267. On March 7, 1944 Greiser reported to Himmler that the Jewish population of the Warthegau, a German administrative unit in Poland, had disappeared. NO 5503 cited in Jacob Robinson and Henry Sachs, *The Holocaust: The Nuremberg Evidence* (Jerusalem: 1976), 114.
130. *German Crimes in Poland*, Vol. 2, p. 43.
131. Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, 76-77. For a comprehensive discussion of the Madagascar Plan see Aly, *Final Solution*, 88-104

## CHAPTER 2: SOVIET UNION DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Solomon Schwarz, *The Jews in the Soviet Union* (NY: 1972, first published in 1951), 220. Schwarz's figures for Lithuania of 135,000 do not include numbers for Vilna. See *Jewish Affairs*, August 1941, for figures on Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina. The figures for Latvia and Lithuania should be reduced by 16,000 and 30,000 because of Soviet deportations. Dov Levin, *Baltic Jews Under the Soviets, 1940-1946* (Jerusalem: 1994), 101, 102, 127.

2. Joshua Rothenberg, "Jewish Religion in the Soviet Union," in Lionel Kochan, ed. *The Jews in the Soviet Union Since 1917* (Oxford: 1970), 171-2.
3. 44 AJYB, 1942/1943, p. 240.
4. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 11, p.386.
5. See Shimon Redlich, *Propaganda and Nationalism in Wartime Russia: The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in the USSR* (Boulder: 1982), Intro, p. XV.
6. Sanning obtained these quotes from Gregor Aronson, *Soviet Russia and the Jews* (NY: 1949), 18. See also Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory* (NY: 1992), 36-37.
7. Eynikeyt, Nov. 25 and Dec. 2, 1943 in Aronson *ibid.*, 15. The author of the report was the famous Russian Jewish writer Vassily Grossman. See also Frank Ellis, *Vasily Grossman: The Genesis and Evolution of a Russian Heretic* (Oxford: 1994), 64-70.
8. Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors* (NY: 1946), 166.
9. Schwarz, *The Jews in the Soviet Union*, 195-238; Ben-Cion Pinchuk, "Soviet Media on the Fate of the Jews in Nazi-Occupied Territory, 1939-1941," 11 YVS (1977), 221-233; Dov Levin, "Rescue Attempts During the Holocaust" *Yad Vashem* (Jerusalem: 1977), 225-236 reprinted in *Baltic Jews Under the Soviets*, 159-171; Ben Cion Pinchuk, "Was There a Soviet Policy for Evacuating the Jews?: The Case of the Annexed Territories," 39 *Slavic Review* (March 1980), 44-55; Mordechai Altshuler, "Escape and Evacuation of Soviet Jews at the time of the Nazi Invasion: Policies and Realities," in Lucjan Dobroszycki and Jeffrey S. Gurock, *The Holocaust in the Soviet Union* (NY: 1993), 77-104. Schwarz's harsh criticisms have not been totally shared by subsequent studies.
10. Moshe Kahanavich cited in Levin, *Baltic Jews Under the Soviets*, 160. On the evacuation priority see also Daniel Romanovsky, "Nazi Occupation in Northeastern Belarus and Western Russia", in Zvi Gitelman, *Bitter Legacy: Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR* (Bloomington: 1997), 233 where it is also noted that there was no evacuation priority for Jews.
11. Schwarz, *The Jews in the Soviet Union*, 310; Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (NY: 1985), Vol.1, p. 316.; see also Levin, *Lesser of Two Evils*, 281. During the period of the German-Soviet alliance, Soviet-Jews were dismissed from their positions in foreign affairs, trade, the navy, the press agency, international posts, airlines and railways. "For the first time since the founding of the Soviet state anti-Semitism was becoming official policy..." Mikhail Heller and Aleksandr M. Nekrich, *Utopia in Power* (NY: 1986), 364. A State Department document dated February 3, 1953 stated that "among certain categories of prisoners the number of Jews was higher than in proportion to their strength in Russia." Cited in Louis Rappaport, *Stalin's War Against the Jews* (NY: 1990), 244 m. 60.
12. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 12, p. 368.
13. *Ibid.*, 57.
14. *Ibid.*, 1327.

15. Ibid., Vol. 11, p. 17.
16. Joshua Rothenberg, "How Many Jews Are There in the Soviet Union," 29 *Jewish Social Studies* (Oct. 1967), 240. Studies undertaken in Israel of Jews who participated in the 1959 census suggest that few concealed their Jewish identity from the census takers. Mordechai Altshuler, *Soviet Jewry Since the Second World War* (NY: 1987), 17-24.
17. A complete breakdown appears in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1905) Vol. 10, pp. 529-533.
18. See Mark Wischnitzer, *To Dwell in Safety* (Philadelphia: 1948), 98-99. The emigration figures also include Galicia and Rumania.
19. Arthur Ruppin, *The Jews of Today* (London: 1913), 37. See also Salo Baron, *The Russian Jews Under Tsars and Soviets* (NY: 1976), 64, 65, 74; *Encyclopedia Judaica* Vol. 14, p. 450.
20. Baron, *ibid.*, 65.
21. Arthur Ruppin, *The Jews in the Modern World* (London: 1973, first published in 1934), 26-27. The areas were the Ukraine (1,574,000), White Russia (407,000), Central Russia (589,000) and Asiatic Russia (110,000). The Ukraine and White Russia came under German control in 1941.
22. Benjamin Pinkus, *The Soviet Government and the Jews* (Cambridge: 1984), 22, 23. The 1926 census noted that "the determination of one's nationality has been left up to the respondent. . . Persons who have lost the ties with the nationality of their ancestors may indicate the nationality which they consider themselves to be." Thomas E. Sawyer, *The Jewish Minority in the Soviet Union* (Boulder: 1979), 33.
23. Harry Lipset, "A Note on Yiddish as the Language of Soviet Jews in the Census of 1939," 12 *Jewish Journal of Sociology* (No.1, 1970), 56.
24. Yitzhak Arad, Shmuel Krakowski and Shmuel Spector, eds. *The Einsatzgruppen Reports* (NY: 1989), 354. Report No. 9 from the Occupied Eastern Territories, June 26, 1942.
25. Mark Wischnitzer, "The History of the Jews in Russia in Recent Years," 35 *Jewish Quarterly Review* (1944/1945), 393, fn.
26. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, (Los Angeles: 1978), 200. On the captured German documents see the essays in Robert Wolfe, ed. *Captured German and Related Documents* (Athens: 1974).
27. See George F. Kennan, "The Sisson Documents," 28 *Journal of Modern History* (June 1956), 130-154.
28. See Charles Hamilton, *The Hitler Diaries: Fakes that Fooled the World* (Kentucky: 1991).
29. Alfred M. deZayas, *The Wehrmacht War Crimes Bureau* (Lincoln: 1989), xvi. The International Military Tribunal refused to assess blame for Katyn in its final judgement. Whitney Harris, *Tyranny on Trial* (Dallas: 1999), 264.

30. Wilhelm Staglih, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986), 19, 43, 65; David Irving, "Revelations from Goebbels' Diary," 15 JHR No. 1 (Jan/Feb 1995), 15-16.
31. NO 1128 in NMT, Vol. 13, pp.269-270.
32. NO 3414 in NMT, Vol. 4, p. 130.
33. D-411 (same as UK-81) Order of October 10, 1941 in NCA, Vol. 8, p. 585. See also Charles Sydnor, *Soldiers of Destruction* (Princeton: 1977), 153, 316; Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors*, 207, 210.
34. NOKW 2357 cited in Willi DreBen, "The Role of the Wehrmacht and the Police in the Annihilation of the Jews," 23 YVS (1993), 303.
35. Report of October 1 - November 10, 1941, cited in Jurgen Forster, "The Wehrmacht and the War of Extermination Against the Soviet Union," 14 YVS (1981), 30. On the role of the Wehrmacht see generally Hannes Heer, "Killing Fields: The Wehrmacht and the Holocaust in Belorussia," 11 *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, No. 1 (Spring 1997), 79-101.
36. OSR 31 and OSR 67 in Arad, et al. *Einsatzgruppen Reports*, 42-44, 119.
37. PS 3257 in Yitzhak Arad, Yisrael Gutman, Abraham Margalio, eds. *Documents on the Holocaust* (Jerusalem: 1981), 417-419; NCA, Vol. 5, 994-997.
38. PS 3663, November 15, 1941 and PS 3666 Dec. 18, 1941 in NCA, Vol. 6, pp. 401-402; Arad, *ibid.*, 394-395.
39. PS 2273 in NCA Vol. 4, pp. 944, 947. Undated but apparently covers 1941.
40. PS 3428 in NCA Vol.6, p. 131; Arad et al, *Documents on the Holocaust*, 411.
41. NOKW 2129. Report for October 1-10, 1941 in NMT, Vol. 10, pp. 1257-1258.
42. OSR 125, October 26, 1941 in Arad, et al, *Einsatzgruppen Reports*, 208-209.
43. OSR 80 and 101 in *ibid.*, 129, 168.
44. Report of August 12, 1941 in Arad, et al., *Documents on the Holocaust*, 414-415. This policy was the result of an order by Himmler transmitted by radio on August 1: "Express orders for RF-SS. All Jews must be shot. Drive Jewish women into the swamps." Christian Gerlach, "German Economic Interests, Occupation Policy, and the Murder of the Jews in Belorussia, 1941-1943", in Ulrich Herbert, ed. *National Socialist Extermination Policies: Contemporary German Perspectives and Controversies* (NY: 2000), 220
45. OSR 117 in Arad, et al. *Einsatzgruppen Reports*, 194.
46. Report of December 1, 1941 in Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction*, 47-57; text also appears in Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen, Volker Riess, *The Good Old Days* (NY: 1991), 46-58.

47. L 180 October 15, 1941 in NCA, Vol. 7, pp. 984-985. See also Andrew Ezergailis, *The Holocaust in Latvia, 1941-1944* (Washington, D.C.: 1996), 51, 52, 101-106, 180-191.
48. Memo of February 27, 1942 in NCA, Supp. A, 619. 48a Ernst Klee et al., *The Good Old Days*, 201,202.
49. Ronald Headland, *Messages of Murder* (Rutherford: 1992), 105-106; Hilberg, *Destruction of European Jews*, Vol. 3, p. 1219; see also the summary in Hermann Graml, *Anti-Semitism in the Third Reich* (Oxford: 1992), 171-172. In addition to Headland's book, an excellent overview of the killing activities is provided by Yitzhak Arad, "The Holocaust of Soviet Jewry in the Occupied Territories of the Soviet Union," 21 YVS (1991), 1-46.
50. See Sergei Maksudov, "The Jewish Population Losses of the USSR from the Holocaust: A Demographic Approach," in Dobroszycki and Gurock, eds. *The Holocaust in the Soviet Union*, 207-213, probably the best attempt to date. See also, Arad, "The Holocaust of Soviet Jewry," *ibid.*, 7-9; Wolodymyr Kosyk, *The Third Reich and Ukraine* (NY: 1993), 440-442; George Wellers, "Reply to Neo-Nazi Falsification of Historical Facts Concerning the Holocaust" in Serge Klarsfeld, ed. *Holocaust and Neo-Nazi Mythomania*, (NY: 1978), 150-161; Willa Orbach, "The Destruction of the Jews in the Nazi Occupied Territories of the USSR," 6 *Soviet-Jewish Affairs* (No. 2, 1976), Tables pp. 32-50 gives a breakdown of the locations and dates of liquidation.
51. Carlo Mattogno, "The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews Part I," 8 JHR No. 2 (1988), 158-163. An earlier part of the article also deals with German statements about moving Jews to the East. Mattogno, like Butz, accepts these statements at face value. Nevertheless, Mattogno has the same problem as all deniers: he cannot trace the missing Jews to any geographical location.
- Mattogno's research on this, however, is more important than Butz's because the former has done archival research. An analysis of Mattogno's writings on the Holocaust shows that he has never been able to explain what happened to the Jews even though he appears to have examined all of the relevant documents on the issue.
52. Ulrich Herbert, *Hitler's Foreign Workers: Enforced Foreign Labor in Germany Under the Third Reich* (Cambridge: 1997), 394 and see labor table at 462.
53. Suzanne Heim and Gotz Aly, "The Holocaust and Population Policy: Remarks on the Decision on the Final Solution," 24 YVS (1994), 64-65.
54. Wolf Gruner, "Terra Incognita? the Camps for "Jewish Labor Conscription" (1938-1943) and the German Population," 24 YVS (1994), 23.
55. L-061 in NCA, Vol. 7, pp 816-17.
56. NOKW 3292 in NMT. Vol. 10, p. 1211.
57. Arad, et. al, *Documents on the Holocaust*, 287-8; Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (West Orange:1976), 101-102. German historian! Christian Gerlach has argued persuasively that there was really not much of a need for Jewish skilled labor in Belorussia and that "most Jewish workers were by no means difficult to replace, despite historiographical assumptions to the contrary." "German Economic Interests...", 219-220.

58. See page 20 of the present work.
59. NO 1611, October 9, 1942, in NMT, Vol. 5, p. 617; Dawidowicz, A Holocaust Reader, 103-104.
60. NO 1882 in NMT, Vol. 5, pp. 618-19.
61. L-156 in NCA, Vol. 7, p. 905.
62. L-53, in NCA, Vol. 7, pp.814-15.
63. Report of October 11, 1942 cited in Walter Laqueur, The Terrible Secret (Boston: 1980), 50.
64. Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 133-4.
65. Memo of February 3, 1942 cited in Yitzhak Arad, "Alfred Rosenberg and the Final Solution in the Occupied Soviet Territories" 13 YVS (1979), 281-282.
66. Original German Text in IMT, Vol, 29, p582. Translation in Raul Hilberg, The Destruction of the European Jews (NY: 1985), Vol. 2, p. 529. This statement and its significance has been overlooked by other historians even though it may be the most important entry in Frank's diary concerning German policy towards the Jews.
67. Joseph Goebbels, Die Tagebuecher von Joseph Goebbels (Munche: 1995), Teil II Diktate-1945, Band 5, p. 606. Entry for September 30, 1942.

### CHAPTER 3: HUNGARIAN DEMOGRAPHICS

1. International Committee of the Red Cross, Annual Reports 1939-1947 (Geneva: 1948), Vol. I, 647,648.
2. NG 2233 in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 348.
3. Text of both letters are in Jenő Levai, Eichmann in Hungary: Documents (NY: 1987), 93-97. Original German texts are in Randolph Braham, ed., The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry: A Documentary Account (NY: 1963), Vol. I, pp.383, 387. The May 26 letter states that the Jews are being sent to the General Government. However, Auschwitz was located in that part of Poland incorporated into the Reich, not the General Government. The May 25th letter identifies the Reich as being the destination of the Jews. Nevertheless, the May 26th letter clearly shows that the Jews were being sent to Poland.
4. NG 5615 in Randolph Braham, *ibid.*, Vol. 2 p. 443. All of Veessenmayer's correspondence is reproduced in Vols. 1 and 2. NG 5615 to NG 5624, May 31 to July 11, 1944. Photocopy of the July 11 letter also in Auschwitz State Museum, Death Books From Auschwitz (London: 1995), Vol. 1, Appendix, 194.

5. Veesenmayer telegram of November 13, 1944 in Braham, *ibid.* Vol. 2, p.527.
6. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1978), 144, 158. According to Butz, the number for the forced march deportations in November 1944 was between 35,000 and 45,000.
7. Randolph Braham, *The Politics of Genocide* (NY: 1994 2nd ed.), Vol. I, p.674. The total number of Hungarian Jews killed during the German occupation was 501,000. See the statistical breakdown in Braham, vol. 2, p. 1298.
8. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 1403-1405. The transport lists only show 137 of the 147 train transports. Also, the lists are not complete as to total deportees for the 137 transports listed.
9. *Annual Reports*, Vol. 3, p. 513, also cited in Butz, *Hoax*, 142.
10. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 144.
11. *Ibid.*, 149.
12. See Arieh Ben-Tov, *Facing the Holocaust in Budapest: The International Committee of the Red Cross and Jews in Hungary, 1943-1945* (Geneva: 1988), 125-202.
13. Text in Levai, *Eichmann in Hungary*, 126.
14. Braham, *The Politics of Genocide*, Vol. I, 679-680.
15. Text in Levai, *Eichmann in Hungary*, 141. See also David Irving, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich* (London: 1996), 462.
16. This information for the period May 15 to August 12, 1944 is drawn from Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle* (NY: 1990), 626-685. There appears to be some overlap in these figures.
17. *Ibid.*, 664.
18. NO 1990 in NMT, Vol. 5, pp.388-392. The document clearly states that the arrivals are to arrive at "the concentration camps." Some sources incorrectly identified this document as referring only to Auschwitz. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 687, made this error. Braham, *Politics of Genocide*, Vol. 2, p. 793 relied on Czech. The error, however, was not Czech's but the translator's. The tome was originally published in German where the document is correctly cited. Danuta Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau* (Reinbek: 1989), 850.
19. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 626-685, which lists about 26,000 Hungarian Jews registered and 20,000 in transit to other camps.
20. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 36, footnote 11 cite.
21. *Ibid.*, 173.
22. In fact Mattogno rarely, if ever, cites the works of other deniers in his own writings.

23. Document T/1163 from the The Trial of Adolf Eichmann (Jerusalem: 1992) on microfiche in Vol.9 reproduces the original Hungarian. Erroneously cited as T/1319 by Carlo Mattogno, The "Gassed" People of Auschwitz: Pressac 's New Revisions." Originally published by Granata Publishing in Palos Verdes in 1995. I have obtained this paper from CODOH's website. CODOH is a denier organization. <http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcnewrev.html>. Ferenczy memo cited on p. 5.

24. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 628-636. Mattogno was critical of Czech because her compilation of the Auschwitz records does not show the Hungarian trains arriving at Auschwitz. However, the camp records for 1944 do not always show the total arrivals at Auschwitz, only those registered from the arrivals. Nevertheless, the Ferenczy memo cited by Mattogno clearly shows that all of the deportees arrived at Auschwitz.

25. Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 182.

26. Ulrich Herbert, Hitler's Foreign Workers: Enforced Foreign Labor in Germany Under the Third Reich (Cambridge: 1997), 462. Germans would always specify Jewish as the nationality when dealing with Jews.

However, the records cited by Herbert only specify Hungarian. 27. Edward L. Homze, Foreign Labor in Nazi Germany (Princeton: 1967), 148.

28. From minutes of a meeting on November 22, 1944 in Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 162. In the opinion of the deputy police commissioner, the 10,000 had either escaped, died or were shot. Four thousand of those arriving for labor had not received any food or drink for three days. p. 162. This probably explains what happened to the 10,000 who had "disappeared".

29. Mattogno, The "Gassed" People of Auschwitz, 4.

30. Ibid. 4. Mattogno quotes what is purportedly a memo from von Thadden on May 26, 1944 as follows. "According to the verifications done up to now, approximately one-third of the deported Jews are able to work. After arriving at the gathering camp in Auschwitz, they are assigned to the services of Todt Organization, etc." - the organization in charge of construction projects. Mattogno also cited what purported to be the original German. A photocopy of the original German document NG 2190, of May 26, 1944, is reproduced in Braham, The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry, Vol. 1, pp. 387-390. An English translation of the document appears in Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 96-98. Nowhere does the language quoted by Mattogno appear, except that the total deportees up to May 24 of 116,000 at 12,000 to 14,000 daily is accurate.

Mattogno was attempting to show that these Jews had already been taken for labor. The only reference made by von Thadden to labor was his May 25, 1944 letter in which he mentions that ultimately it was envisaged that one million Jews would be seized, one-third of whom would be fit for work. Text in Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 93-96. However, he does not say that anybody had as yet been assigned for labor. Moreover, neither von Thadden's May 25 nor May 26 letter specifically mentions Auschwitz. German correspondence during this period, as can be seen by Veessenmayer's memos, never mentioned Auschwitz by name. The exception being Veessenmayer's letter of April 23, 1944 cited earlier.

31. Photocopies of these correspondences are in Braham, The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry, Vol. 2, 588, 590, 592, 600, 610, 611, 615, 617, 620.

32. Letter of May 8, 1944 in Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 89-90.
33. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (NY: 1985), Vol. 3, p. 935.
34. Meeting of May 26, 1944, NOKW 336 in NMT, Vol. 2, p. 557.
35. Statement by Kammler's representative at the meeting in *ibid.* 557.
36. Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews*, Vol. 3, p. 935.
37. NOKW 266 in NMT, Vol. 2, p. 580.
38. *Ibid.*, 582.
39. NOKW 359 in *ibid.*, 558.
40. NOKW 266 in *ibid.*, 579.
41. *Ibid.*, 594-595. See the interpreter's correction at the top of page 595.
42. Veessenmayer telegrams of June 15 and June 30, NG 5567 and NG 2263, in NMT, Vol. 3, pp. 358-9 and Levai, Eichmann in Hungary, 109-10.
43. PS 3803 in NCA, Vol. 6, p.738.
44. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 633, 636, 641, 642, 643, 647, 648, 650, 655, 661, 666, 671, 673 and 686.
45. NMT, Vol. 2, p.595.
46. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 671.
47. Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer* (NY: 1992), 166. Hoess does not specify when in 1944 these transfers took place. However, he was apparently referring to the Hungarian Jews.
48. Braham, *Politics of Genocide*, Vol. 1, p. 347. See pp. 343-362 generally on the labor transports. See also Randolph Braham, *The Hungarian Labor Service System 1938-1945* (NY: 1977), 59-73. Mattogno did not make any reference to Braham's works in *The "Gassed" People of Auschwitz*.
49. Braham, *Politics of Genocide*, Vol. 1, p. 358.
50. See note 32 herein.
51. NO 1990 in NMT, Vol. 5, pp. 388-9. Original German text is PS 1166 in IMT, Vol. 27, pp. 46-49. Complete translations in NCA, Vol. 3, pp. 824-7.
52. Carlo Mattogno, "The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews: Part I", 8 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1988), 159. Mattogno mistakenly wrote that only 50,000 Hungarian Jews were interned.

53. The photo appears in a number of publications. See Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, 339. For an analysis of the photos see Dino Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex* (Washington, D.C. 1979).
54. List in Braham, *Politics of Genocide*, (1994 edition), Vol. 2, pp. 1403-1405. Note that this list is incomplete as to the total number of transport and number of deportees.
55. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 781.
56. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 649-653.
57. NG 5619. Text in Levai, *Eichmann in Hungary*, 108-9.
58. Braham, *Politics of Genocide*, Vol. 2, p. 674.
59. Dino Brugioni, "Auschwitz-Birkenau," *Military Intelligence* (January-March, 1983), 53. This photo was not reproduced with the rest of 1979 photos in Brugioni's and Poirier's, *The Holocaust Revisited*.
60. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 36, 37, 45.
61. Michael Shermer, *Why People Believe Weird Things* (NY: 1997), 236

#### CHAPTER 4: AUSCHWITZ MEMOIRS

1. Kazimierz Smolen, "The Concentration Camp Auschwitz," in Kazimierz Smolen and Danuta Czech, eds. *From the History of KL-Auschwitz* (NY: 1982, first published in 1967), 12; Franciszek Piper, "Estimating the Number of Deportees to and Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp," *21 YVS* (1991), 63.
2. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, (Los Angeles: 1978) App. C, 260-263.
3. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (NY: 1953), 333-4. However, Reitlinger noticed that there were many deportees missing from the registration lists.
4. Helena Kubica, "Children" in Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Washington: 1994), 418.
5. Thomas Grotum and Jan Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries," in *Auschwitz State Museum, Death Books from Auschwitz* (London: 1995), Vol. 1, p. 222.
6. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 15.
7. De Telegraaf, June 15, 1942 cited in Jacob Presser, *Ashes in the Wind: The Destruction of Dutch Jewry* (Detroit: 1988), 151. First published in English in 1969.

8. Het Nederlandsche Roods Kruis, [Netherlands Red Cross] Auschwitz, Hoofdbestuur Van de Vereniging het Nederlandsche (The Hague: 1947-1953), Deel 1. p. 11.
9. Ibid. Deel 1, p. 11, Deel 3, pp. 12-15, 65.
10. Joods Historisch Museum Amsterdam, Documents of the Persecution of the Dutch Jewry 1940-1945 (Amsterdam: 1979), 115-120. The data for the total of 102 transports agrees with that of the Red Cross. Netherlands Red Cross, Auschwitz, Deel 1, p.7
11. Danuta Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-1945 (NY: 1990), 226-7. Some of Czech's data differs slightly from the Red Cross.
12. Ibid., 198-227.
13. Netherlands Red Cross, Auschwitz, Deel 3, pp. 12-15, 65. See also Louis De Jong, "The Netherlands and Auschwitz," 7 YVS (1968), 40.
14. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 270, believed that this transport came from Norway. However it was most probably the Dutch transport. The camp records do not disclose the identities or total arrivals on November 18. The Red Cross states that 100 men from this transport were seized for labor before arrival. Netherlands Red Cross, Auschwitz, Deel 3, p. 15.
15. Robert Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men Who Were at Auschwitz," 2 JHR No.2 {Summer 1981), 114. The same translation appears in Mark Weber, "Declaration of Mark Edward Weber", 3 JHR, No. 1 (1982), 38.
16. Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds. KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS (NY: 1984), 214-231, contain Kremer's entries for the period of the special actions.
17. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 232.
18. Bezwinska and Czech, KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS, 214 fn. 50.
19. The German entry is in Hefte von Auschwitz, 1971, Vol. 13, p. 41. Photocopy of the original handwritten entry in Death Books From Auschwitz Vol. 1, Appendix, p. 185. I wish to thank Judith Jenner, Karola Raab and Martina Badhaus, all of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for examining this entry.
20. Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men...", 115.
21. The transport lists 714, but 200 were taken for labor before arrival. Netherlands Red Cross, Auschwitz, Deel 3, p. 13.
22. Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men...", 120.
23. Bezwinska and Czech, KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS, 224 fn. 77.
24. Ibid., 226 fh. 82.

25. Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men," 120.
26. The original German and English translation are reproduced in Pierre Vidal Naquet, *Assassins of Memory* (NY: 1992), 113-114. See also the discussion at notes 13 to 16a in the text on pages 207 and 208 herein and in note 16a in the note section for further evidence that special actions had nothing to do with typhus or other sanitary measures.
27. Robert Faurisson, "Revisionism on Trial: Developments in France, 1979-1983," 6 JHR, No. 2 (Summer 1985), 147.
28. Robert Faurisson, "Response to a Paper Historian," 7 JHR, No. 2 (Spring 1986), 60.
29. Faurisson, "Revisionism on Trial," 148.
30. Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz* (NY: 1966), 160. Extracts reproduced in Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men...", 113. Kremer may have objected to the fact that his testimony at Warsaw in 1947, which was translated from German to Polish, was retranslated from Polish to German in Munster. It has been noted that the Polish version is "linguistically more precise" than the re translation. Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen and Volker Riess, *The Good Old Days* (NY: 1991), 287. This is confirmed by the source Faurisson relied on to contest Kremer's testimony. Jan Sehn, "The Case of the Auschwitz SS Physician J. P. Kremer," in *Auschwitz*, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 239-40. From *Przegląd Lekarski* No. 1a 1962.
31. Faurisson, *ibid.*, 127.
32. Naumann, *Auschwitz*, 160.
33. See the explanation in footnote 81 in Chapter 10 herein .
34. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 429
35. Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend* (Newport Beach: 1994), 25, 26, 44. Butz hints at typhus as a motive for the crematoria, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 58.
36. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 429.
37. Butz, *Hoax of the 20th Century*, 118; Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of A Legend*, 24-25.
38. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 664. As noted in footnote 18 in Chapter 3, Czech's numbers appearing on p. 687 are for all concentration camps, not merely Auschwitz. The translator had erroneously cited this document as referring only to Auschwitz.
39. *Ibid.*, 695. These figures included 20,000 unregistered Hungarian Jews in a transit camp. The July figures did not include Hungarian Jews kept in transit camps. The actual number of Hungarian Jews in transit camps, as noted in Chapter 3, appears to be 20,000 not 30,000. Camp authorities did not include transit camp prisoners in their numbers because they were supposed to be shipped out.
40. Lucie Adelsberger, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Story* (Boston: 1995), 52-53.

41. Ella Lingens-Reiner, *Prisoners of Fear* (NY: 1948), 64. She also notes the recovery of another prisoner from the disease p. 78. Lingens-Reiner describes typhus as a major problem at Auschwitz.
42. Olga Lengyel, *Five Chimneys* (NY: 1983), 146, First published in 1947.
43. Petro Mirchuk, *In the German Mills of Death* (NY: 1976), 56. First published in Russian in 1957.
44. Mark Weber, "Pages from the Auschwitz Death Registers", 12 JHR, No. 3 (Fall :1992), 266-298.
45. Kazimierz Smolen, "The Concentration Camp Auschwitz", in Smolen and Czech, *From the History of KL - Auschwitz*, 10.
46. Zdenek Lederer, *Ghetto Theresienstadt*, (NY: 1983, first published in 1953), 227, 228, 230-232, 251; Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 483, 548, 551, 627, 628.
47. Piper, "Estimating the Number of Victims...", 90-91.
48. Naumann, *Auschwitz*, 138.
49. Grotum and Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries", 220-221.
50. *Ibid.*, 222.
51. *Ibid.*, 219.
52. Wieslaw Kielar, *Anus Mundi: 1,500 Days in Auschwitz Birkenau* (NY: 1980, first published in 1972), 160-161.
53. Grotum and Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries," 219, 220; Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 171.
54. Lingens-Reiner, *Prisoners of Fear*, 63.
55. Grotum and Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries", 221.
56. Pery Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad," in Bezwinska and Czech, eds, *KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS*, 168.
- 56a. Naumann, *Auschwitz*, 129.
57. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 125. It also needs to be emphasized that Auschwitz had an extremely high death rate for registered prisoners even before the typhus epidemic of July 1942. This shows that the camp authorities were engaged in a massive killing campaign even before the typhus epidemic. See the discussion at notes 7 -11 on page 207 herein.
58. Grotum and Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries," 227. Faurisson argued that Kremer would have flatly stated that the "special actions" were gassings. However, Kremer's failure to mention in his diary signing any death certificates when he had signed over 10,000

shows that he was very careful about what he recorded.

59. Piper, "Estimating the Number of Deportees to and Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp," 97-99.
60. Raul Hilberg, "German Railroads/Jewish Souls," 14 *Society* (1976), 65.
61. Piper, "Estimating the Number of Deportees...", 78.
62. See the table in Abraham J. Edelheit and Herschel Edelheit, *History of the Holocaust: A Handbook and Dictionary* (Boulder: 1994), 226.
63. Serge Klarsfeld, *Memorial to the Jews Deported from France* (NY: 1983).

## CHAPTER 5: VICTIM TESTIMONY

1. Jacob Cohen, "Yes, Oswald Alone Killed Kennedy," 78 *Commentary* (June 1992), 34.
2. Lucy Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and the Historians* (NY: 1981), 176, 177 fn. 10.
3. Mark Weber, "My Role in the Zundel Trial," 9 *JHR* No. 4 (Winter 1989/1990), 405. The report actually quotes Krakowski as saying that many testimonies were unreliable, not more than half. *Jerusalem Post*, August 17, 1986, p. 1.
4. Letter in the *Jerusalem Post*, August 21, 1986, p. 10.
5. L. A. Rollins, "Book Reviews", 4 *JHR* No.1 ( Spring 1983), 103, 105. The first of the newly built crematoria in the Birkenau section of the camp was completed on March 22, 1943. The remaining crematoria were ready on March 31, 1943, April 4, 1943 and June 25 or 26, 1943. Franciszek Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," in Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Bloomington: 1994), 165.
6. Franciszek Piper, *ibid.*, 177, fn. 18.
7. Wieslaw Kielar, *Anus Mundi: 1500 Days in Auschwitz-Birkenau* (NY: 1980), 177.
8. Ella Lingens-Reiner, *Prisoners of Fear* (NY: 1948), 70. Wilhelm Staglich has attacked her statement. He quotes her as saying that she saw lorries pass by "again and again, in the direction of the crematoria. Scarcely 15 minutes later, she claims, she saw thick smoke ascending from the chimneys..." "What is particularly striking about her description of her nocturnal observations is that the crematoria went into operation just 15 minutes after trucks with women and children had driven past." *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, 121. What Lingens-Reiner actually wrote was that, "I walked through the hut to the other door, and saw lorries disappear in the direction of the crematoria... Scarcely fifteen minutes later the chimney began to belch thick clouds of black sweetish smelling smoke." (*italics added*). *Prisoners of Fear*, p. 70.

Thus Lingens-Reiner states that the smoke did not begin until after the lorries disappeared in the direction of the crematoria, not 15 minutes after driving in the direction of the crematoria.

Madame Vaillant-Couturier, discussed below, also witnessed the trains entering Auschwitz. She stated that the smoke began at about 45 to 60 minutes after the victims arrived. IMT, Vol. 6, p. 216.

9. Kielar, *Anus Mundi*, 160.
10. Lingens-Reiner, *Prisoners of Fear*, 64, 80.
11. Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz*, (NY: 1966), 91-95.
12. *Ibid.*, 114-115.
13. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1978), 110-112.
14. *Ibid.*, 110. Butz does not list Lingens-Reiner's book in his bibliography.
15. Lucie Adelsberger, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Story* (Boston: 1995), 62.
16. Louis Micheels, *Doctor #117641: A Holocaust Memoir* (Yale: 1989), 86-87.
17. Benjamin Jacobs, *The Dentist of Auschwitz* (Lexington: 1995), 146. Prisoner #141129.
18. Marco Nahon, *Birkenau, The Camp of Death* (Tuscaloosa: 1989), 95.
19. Gisella Perl, *I Was a Doctor at Auschwitz* (NY: 1948) 27, 33, 34, 129. Prisoner # 25404.
20. Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account* (NY: 1993), 47. Prisoner # A8450. Written in 1946.
21. Petro Mirchuk, *In the German Mills of Death* (NY: 1976), 61, 63, 100, 119, 126-7. Prisoner # 49734.
22. Sewereyna Szmaglewska, *Smoke over Birkenau* (NY: 1947), 90. Not to be confused with a book by Liana Millu with the same title.
23. Errikus Selvillias, *Athens-Auschwitz* (Athens: 1983), 46-47.
24. Pelagia Lewinska, *Twenty Months at Auschwitz* (NY: 1968), 96-97. Prisoner #32292
25. Isabella Leitner, *Fragments of Isabella* (NY: 1978), 35-36.
26. Carl Rosenberg, *As God is My Witness* (NY: 1990), 83-85.
27. Olga Lengyel, *Five Chimneys*, 61, 71. Prisoner # 25403.
28. Mira Rycke Kimmelman, *Echoes From the Holocaust* (Knoxville: 1997), 57. Prisoner #15744.

29. Magarita Glas-Larrson, *I Want to Speak* (Riverside: 1991), 75, 91, 95-97.
30. See his entries for September 6, September 23, October 11, 1942 in Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds. *KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS*, (NY: 1984), 216, 220, 223; see also Perl, / *Was A Doctor at Auschwitz*, 41, 116; Filip Friedman, *This Was Oswiecim* (London: 1946), 37-40.
31. IMT, Vol. 6, p. 217.
32. *Ibid.*, 215, 216.
33. Wilhelm Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986), 126.
34. *Ibid.*, 124-125.
35. Photos in Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle* (NY: 1990), 298, 318, 346, 358, 363, 368, 369, 426.
36. IMT, Vol. 6, p. 216.
37. Second Escapees Report From Auschwitz in David S. Wyman ed., *America and the Holocaust* (NY: 1990), Vol. 12, p. 40; Deposition of Alter Feinsilber (a Sonderkommando) in Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds. *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime* (NY: 1992), 56; Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer* (NY: 1992), 37; Pery Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad", in Bezwinska and Czech, eds., *KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS*, 181, 185; Dr. Paul Bendel cited in Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein and Adalbert Ruckerl, *Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas* (Yale: 1993), 171; Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account* (NY: 1993), 88, 113; Filip Muller, (a Sonderkommando) *Eyewitness Auschwitz* (NY: 1979), 130, 136-40. Testimony of Szlama Dragon (a Sonderkommando) and deposition of Henryk Tauber (a Sonderkommando) in Jean - Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (NY: 1989), 171, 496; Adolf Eichmann's memoirs written prior to his capture by the Israelis in David Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers," 13 JHR No.2 (March/April 1993).
38. Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks At the Evidence*, 125.
39. IMT, Vol. 6, p.216.
40. *Ibid.* , 216.
41. Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," 161, 164.
42. For an excellent analysis see *ibid.*, 157-182.
43. Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, 172-173.
44. See footnotes 36 and 37 herein.
45. Dr. Hugo Erichsen, *Cremation of the Dead* (Detroit: 1887), 138.
46. Cited in Eugen Kogon, et.al., *Nazi Mass Murder*, 163-4.

47. Staglich, Auschwitz, 148. Vaillant-Couturier gave a similar description. She stated that the block where she lived in 1944 "directly faced the stopping place of the trains". The stopping place of the trains was "about 100 meters from the gas chambers", IMT, Vol. 6, p. 215. Staglich avoided challenging Vaillant-Couturier on this description because it was accurate.
48. This is because some literature such as Czech's, Auschwitz Chronicle, p. 429, count the crematoria in Auschwitz I as Crematorium I and the four crematoria in Birkenau as II-V. However, when the crematorium in the main camp, Auschwitz I, is not counted, then the four crematoria in Birkenau become numbers I - IV.
49. Ibid., 429.
50. Ibid., 429, listing them as Crematoriums II-V. A photo of Crematorium V, before its destruction by the Germans, shows it was located in a forested area. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 368.
51. Kogon, et.al., Nazi Mass Murder, 164.
52. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 688.
53. Ibid., 699. Bendel refers to this as Crematorium IV. It is listed in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 429 as Crematorium V. See fn. 48 herein for an explanation.
54. Cited in Kogon et.al., Nazi Mass Murder, 150-151.
55. Ibid., 150. See also Mirchuk, In the German Mills of Death, p. 101 on gold teeth extraction from dead victims.
56. Kogon et.al., *ibid.*, 151-2.
57. Ibid., 167.
58. Ibid., 166.
59. Ibid., 166.
60. See footnote 100 herein.
61. Kogon, et al. Nazi Mass Murder, 166.
62. Nyzsli, Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account, 54, 55, 72, 88.
63. Ibid., 111.
64. Ibid., 90-91.
65. See footnote 46 in Chapter 4.
66. Staglich, Auschwitz, 156.

67. Ibid. , 155. Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (Torrance: 1978), 248 on the discrepancies.

68. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 117. Butz notes that Nyiszli's memoirs were published in *Les Temps Modernes* in 1951.

69. Neither Bendel nor Lettich are mentioned in *Debunking the Genocide Myth* nor Rassinier's, *The Real Eichmann Trial* (Silver Springs: 1979).

70. Butz, *Hoax*, 117 and the source cited for his footnote 64 on p.295 which states Rassinier (1962). Butz appears to have overlooked the significance of this even though he used the 1960 English language addition of Nyiszli's book.

Rassinier claims to have actually made contact with Nyiszli in 1951 through his interpreter, Tibere Kremer. Nyiszli supposedly told Rassinier, through Kremer, that 2.5 million people were murdered at Auschwitz. Rassinier then claims to have learned from New York where, according to Rassinier, Nyiszli's book was first published in 1951, that Nyiszli died before the book was published. Rassinier then goes on to say that Nyiszli died before he could have sent Rassinier the aforementioned letter. Rassinier, therefore, doubts that Nyiszli really wrote the memoirs. *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, 244-248.

Rassinier offers no proof in the way of any documentation (i.e., correspondences, date of death etc.) that any of this took place. Moreover, I have been unable to find any version of Nyiszli's book published in New York which predates 1960. I have checked the New York Public Library and World Cat computer search which includes more than 38 million entries. Rassinier probably made all of this up since he acknowledges that Nyiszli's book had already been published when he first made these claims in 1962. As noted earlier, when the book was published in 1960 Nyiszli was already known to be dead. Rassinier knew it also. A check of the World Cat shows that the book was first published in Hungarian in Budapest in 1947. A copy of the original, which I have personally examined, is available at UCLA. The next edition appeared in English in 1960. There were no other editions published between 1947 and 1960. The first French translation published in 1951 was in the journal *Les Temps Modernes*. Thus according to Rassinier, he had contacted a non-existent New York publisher in 1951, nine years before the book was published there!

71. Ibid. , 117. Butz has also misrepresented Nyiszli in regard to his assessment of cremation capacity. Nyiszli, as will be recalled, wrote that the four crematoria could burn several thousand bodies per day and the pits between five and six thousand. Butz notes this but then goes on to write that Nyiszli stated that two of the crematoria could dispose of 10,500. Nyiszli never wrote this. He did write that some 10,500 Czechs had gone off to two of the crematoria. The next day he saw a truck leave the crematoria with their ashes. Assuming Nyiszli's 10,500 is correct, many of the bodies could well have been burned in the pits. In this particular instance Nyiszli never claimed to have witnessed the gassings or the burnings. It is also probable that a gassing of this magnitude, which would have occurred sometime in 1944, would have utilized all operational crematoria and the cottage bunker which had been reactivated for this purpose. See Nyiszli's account in *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, 92. Nyiszli was probably incorrect as to the 10,500 number.

72. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 194.

73. Kazimierz Smolen, "The Concentration Camp Auschwitz" in Smolen and Czech, eds., From the History of KL Auschwitz, 10-23.

74. Carlo Mattogno, "The First Gassing at Auschwitz: Genesis of a Myth," 9 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1989), 212-213. Mattogno interpreted this testimony to mean that Smolen was in the dark about the first gassing, and that therefore such gassing did not take place. In fact, Smolen does not address the issue of the first gassing from the testimony reproduced by Mattogno. Nor does his testimony "demonstrate in contestably the historical groundlessness" of Czech's report in the Auschwitz Chronicle, pp. 85-86, which is based on the record of the Hoess trial.

Smolen stated that the first Russians appeared in the camp in October 1941 while Czech identifies the first gassing of Russians as occurring on September 3, 1941. Smolen gave his testimony in December 1947 and it is quite possible that he simply got the date wrong considering that he was describing events which occurred more than six years earlier. It is also possible that there was a gassing in October 1941 in addition to the one in September.

This is quite typical of the way deniers argue. That is: if there is a conflict as to a date or event, men it never took place. Moreover, Mattogno seems to have overlooked the fact that if Smolen is technically correct in his testimony, then the gassings took place but at a date later than September 3, 1941, or that the gassing he mentions is in addition to the one in September. As will be shown in the section on Rudolph Hoess in Chapter 6, there is now forensic evidence to establish that gassings took place in Block 11, regardless of the actual date in 1941.

In a recent analysis Smolen places the first Soviet POWs in Auschwitz in late June or July 1941, "They were not put through routine registration by the clerks..." "Soviet Prisoners of War in KL Auschwitz", in Auschwitz State Museum, Death Books From Auschwitz (London:1995) Vol. I, p. 116.

75. Jean - Claude Pressac, Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers (NY: 1989), 429.

76. NID -15534, November 24, 1944 in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 370.

77. R-135, May 31, 1943 in IMT, Vol. 38, p.373. English translation in NCA, Vol. 8, p. 208.

78. NID -15647, May 27, 1948 in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 376.

79. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 638. See also the affidavit by Emil Puhl, Vice President of the Reichsbank during the war, dated May 3, 1946 who states that "dental gold" was "taken from Jews, concentration camp victims and other persons by the SS". PS-3944 in NCA, Supp. A, 671.

80. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers, 231.

81. Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds., Amidst a Nightmare Crime (NY: 1992). For an overview of the Sonderkommando authors see also Nathan Cohen, "Diaries of the Sonderkommando," in Gutman and Berenbaum, eds. , Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, 522-534; Nathan Cohen, "Diaries of the Sonderkommandos in Auschwitz: Coping With Fate and Reality," 20 YVS (1990), 273-312.

82. Staglich, Auschwitz, 99.

83. Bezwinska and Czech, *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime*, 119.
84. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 98.
85. Bezwinska and Czech, *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime*, 115.
86. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 99.
87. Lucy Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and The Historians*, 100-101.
88. Editor's preface to *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime*, 7-8.
89. *Ibid.*, 182, 184.
90. Serge Klarsfeld, *Memorial to the Jews Deported from France* (NY: 1983), 388 (and pp. 384-5); Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 344.
91. Miroslaw Karny, "The Vrba and Wetzler Report," in Gutman and Berenbaum, eds. *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, 554.
92. An English language translation of the report appears in David S. Wyman ed., *America and the Holocaust* (NY: 1990), Vol. 12, pp. 5-37 (gassing description on p. 20); Text also in Michael Berenbaum, *Witness to the Holocaust* {NY: 1997}, 262-279; excerpts in Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* {West Orange: 1976}, 110-119.
93. Bute, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 94-98.
94. Text in Wyman, ed., *America and the Holocaust*, Vol. 12, p. 79.
95. Carlo Mattogno, "Jean - Claude Pressac and the War Refugee Board Report," 10 JHR No. 4 (Winter 1990/91), 461-485. Mattogno ignores the many accurate parts in the report. However, by using Pressac's, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* to refute the incorrect portions of the report, Mattogno actually provides a great deal of evidence that the report is correct in its overall assessment.
96. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 429.
97. Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," 166. However, the gas chambers for Crematoriums IV and V were located above ground. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 358. Crematorium III was identical to Crematorium II.
98. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, 211.
99. *Ibid.*, 373, 375 for the texts of six letters.
100. Photo with analysis in Dino Brugioni and Robert C. Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex* (CIA: 1979), 11. The photo identified Crematoriums II and III as I and II respectively in this study. See note 48 herein for an

explanation. See also Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," 167.

- 100a. The photo is reproduced in Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, 340.
101. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 352.
102. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 95.
103. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 356.
104. *Ibid.*, 483.
105. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 96-97.
106. Kogon et. al., *Nazi Mass Murder*, 174.
107. Jan Grotum and Thomas Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries", in *Death Books from Auschwitz*, Vol. I, p.223.
108. Lingens-Reiner, *Prisoners of Fear*, 86. See especially Tadeusz Paczula, "Office Procedure in KL Auschwitz" in *Death Books from Auschwitz*, Vol. I, p.55. Paczula was in charge of death registers.
109. See footnote 114 for Chapter 1.
110. Kogon et al, *Nazi Mass Murder*, 160. This report is in the possession of the Auschwitz State Museum.
111. Text of the memo in Jeremy Noakes and Geoffrey Pridham, *Nazism 1919-1945* (Exeter: 1988), Vol. 3, p. 1184. Registration data in Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 347.
112. Text in Wyman, ed., *America and the Holocaust*, Vol. 12, pp. 38-43; Berenbaum, *Witness to the Holocaust*, 281-283.
113. Randolph Braham, *The Politics of Genocide* (NY: 1994, 2nd ed.), Vol. 2, pp. 1403-1405.
114. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 627.
115. *Ibid.*, 628.
116. See the series of documents in Reimund Schnabel, *Macht Ohne Moral* (Frankfurt: 1957), 269-282. See also Robert Jay Lifton and Amy Hackett, "Nazi Doctors", in Gutman and Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, 304-7; Hermann Langbein, "SS Physicians in KL Auschwitz" in *Death Books from Auschwitz*, Vol. 1, p. 66; Wladyslaw Fejkiel, "Ethical and Legal Limits of Experimentation in Medicine - in Connection With Professor Clauberg's Affair," in Smolen and Czech, eds., *From the History of KL Auschwitz*, 97-117; Friedman, *This Was Oswiecim* , 47-49.
117. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 699.

118. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 36-37 and footnotes 36 and 37 herein on the open air burnings.
119. Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps* (Bloomington: 1987)
120. Zygmunt Klukowski, *Diary From the Years of Occupation, 1939-1944* (Illinois: 1993), 191. See also his 1942 entries for mass shootings of Jews. For similar observations by other diarists see Daniel Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (NY: 1996), 105.
121. *Polish Fortnightly Review*, December 1, 1942.
122. Carlo Mattogno, "The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews: Part II", 8 JHR No. 3 (Fall 1988), 273, attacks the gas chamber reports on the basis of this discrepancy. Mattogno is more successful in pointing out the discrepancies than showing what happened to the Jews. In Part I of this article published in the 8 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1988) he could offer no evidence as to what happened to the Jews, even though he appears to have searched through many primary documents including those in London's Foreign Office. It is understandable, therefore, why he prefers to focus on testimony as opposed to demographics. On Mattogno's gas chamber and body disposal arguments see pp. 198-201 and Chapter 10 herein.
123. *Ibid.*, Part II, 281-285. Mattogno summarizes the various discrepancies as to the crematoria and which ones broke down. Nevertheless, in attacking the witnesses he does not say that since there are so many discrepancies, then we may logically doubt the existence of the crematoria. See chapter 10 herein for a comprehensive analysis of body disposal at Auschwitz where it is shown that the eyewitness testimony concerning these matters is supported from the available documentation.
124. Samuel Willenberg, *Surviving Treblinka*, (NY: 1989).
125. Jankiel Wiernick, "One Year in Treblinka," in Alexander Donat, ed., *The Death Camp Treblinka* (NY: 1979), 147-188.
126. See the essays in Donat, *ibid.* The best analysis of survivor testimony from Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka may be found in Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor. Treblinka*
127. See Arad, *ibid.*, 66, 81, 138, 158, 352.
128. See the decision handed down by the court in Donat, ed., *Death Camp Treblinka*, 297 citing Zabecki's testimony who they refer to as Franciszek Z. His memoirs were published in Polish in 1977. They have not been translated.
129. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka*, 69.

## CHAPTER 6: PERPETRATOR TESTIMONY

1. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 189.

2. See generally Mark Weber, "The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust," 12 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1992), 167-213, who uses this method of argumentation.
3. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1979), 179.
4. PS 710 in NMT, Vol. 4, pp. 132, 133. After the anti-Jewish riots in Germany in 1938, which culminated in a great loss of property, Goring said, "I wish you had killed 200 Jews, and not destroyed such values". PS 1816 in NCA, Vol. 4, p. 439.
5. IMT, Vol. 9, p. 619.
6. David Irving, *Goring* (NY: 1989), 343.
7. IMT, Vol. 9, p. 611.
8. Butz, *Hoax*, 180.
9. IMT, Vol. 9, p. 611.
10. Butz, *Hoax*, 180.
11. IMT, Vol. 9, p. 276.
12. IMT, Vol.10, p. 409. The document is D-736. A partial translation in NMT, Vol. 7, pp. 190-1.
13. IMT, *Ibid.*, 411, 412.
14. *Ibid.*, 412.
15. Relevant excerpts in C. C. Aronsfeld, *Text of the Holocaust* (Marblehead: 1985) 34-37.
16. IMT, Vol. 11, pp. 254-260.
17. Wilhelm Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986), 127.
18. Mark Weber, "The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust," 197.
19. IMT, Vol. 11, pp. 275, 276.
20. *Ibid.*, 305.
21. David Irving, *Hitler's War*, 867.
22. Butz, *Hoax*, 181.
23. *Ibid.*, 112; Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 43. Testimony in IMT, Vol. 11, pp. 338-339.
24. IMT, Vol. 11, p. 337.

25. Ibid., 337.
26. Staglich, Auschwitz, 76-78.
27. IMT, Vol. 12, p. 13.
28. Staglich, Auschwitz, 80.
29. Cited on page 39 of the present work..
30. IMT, Vol. 12, pp. 18-19.
31. Many of these articles have been reproduced in English in NCA, Supp. A 951-962, 1204-1210. They cover the years 1939-1944.
32. IMT, Vol.12, p. 320.
33. Ibid., 348.
34. IMT, Vol. 20, p. 499.
35. IMT, Vol. 11, p. 502.
36. Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer* (NY: 1992), 179. For a comprehensive analysis on the reliability of the Hoess memoirs see John C. Zimmerman, *How Reliable Are the Hoess Memoirs* THHP website <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/hoess-memoirs/>.
37. Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death* (Feltham: 1983), 237, 238.
38. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 180-1.
39. Ibid., 142.
40. Ibid., 29, 30. On pp. 155 and 156 Hoess gives the impression that there were two gassings.
41. Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle* (NY: 1990), 121 for total interned and pp. 102, 112 and 120,131 for monthly deaths. The *Auschwitz Death Books* do not account for these Russians. The reason probably is that these POWs did not receive registration numbers in 1941.
42. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 36-37.
43. See the discussion on p. 74 of the present text.
44. See the discussion on pages 51 and 52 of the present text.
45. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 32.
46. NY Times, Nov. 25, 1942, p.10.

47. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 32.
48. *Ibid.*, 166 and footnote 44 in Chapter 3 documenting the transfers.
49. *Ibid.*, 39. At his pre trial interrogation of April 1 and 2, 1946 Hoess also gave the number of 2.5 million. He stated that this number was given to him by Adolf Eichmann, who was in charge of transporting Jews to death camps. However, earlier in this testimony he gave a breakdown of the number killed which agreed with his memoirs and totaled 1.1 million. Relevant portions in John Mendelsohn, *The Holocaust* (NY: 1982), vol. 12, pp. 71,72,110,111. When he appeared before the International Military Tribunal on April 15 he agreed to the number 2.5 million which was in his affidavit to the tribunal. IMT, vol.11, pp. 359.
50. *Ibid.*, 39.
51. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Historical Atlas of the Holocaust* (NY: 1996), 97. See also page 66 of the present work. Raul Hilberg and Gerald Reitlinger had always used figures closer to Hoess's.
52. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 39 criticizes the official number. The 4 million number was given by the Soviets in a report on May 6, 1945 in USSR-008. Text in IMT, Vol. 39, p. 260. The Poles accepted this figure. See Franciszek Piper, "Estimating the Number of Deportees to and the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp", 21 YVS {1991}, 53,54,58,59 for the various estimates.
53. Pery Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad" in Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds, *KL Auschwitz Seen By the SS* (NY: 1984), 143.
54. *Ibid.*, 181,185.
55. See footnotes 36 and 37 for Chapter 5 herein.
56. Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad," 184.
57. *Ibid.*, 184.
58. *Ibid.*, 184.
59. *Ibid.*, 187, 192.
60. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 39
61. Broad, "Reminiscences," 177-179.
62. *Ibid.*, 177, 181.
63. *Ibid.*, 182
64. *Ibid.*, 180. Kremer's testimony on this at the Auschwitz trials in the mid 1960s in Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz*, (NY:1966), 160.

65. Broad, *Ibid.*, 159.
66. Partial transcript of Broad's testimony in A. L. Silets, "Facts Written in Blood: The Zyklon B Trial of Bruno Tesch", in Shelly Shapiro, ed., *Truth Prevails: Demolishing Holocaust Denial, The End of "The Leuchter Report"* (NY: 1990), 100.
67. Naumann, *Auschwitz*, 37-40.
68. *Ibid.*, 162-182.
69. Silets, "Facts Written in Blood," 101.
70. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 164.
71. *Ibid.*, 165, 166.
72. Staglich writes that he is unaware whether Broad actually gave testimony in 1946. He is only aware of an affidavit submitted by Broad in the IG-Farben Trial. *Auschwitz*, 145.
73. Letter from his wife of March 22, 1965 reproduced in Saul Friedlander, *Kurt Gerstein: The Ambiguity of Good* (NY: 1969), 210-211.
74. Robert H. Hall's review of Carlo Mattogno, *Ill Rapporte Gerstein: Anatomia di Un Falso* (The Gerstein Report: Anatomy of a Fraud), 7 *JHR* No. 1 (Spring 1986).
75. *Ibid.*, 117; Henri Roques, *The "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein* (Costa Mesa: 1989), 123.
76. The text is reproduced in Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 251-258: Abridged text in Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* {West Orange: 1976}, 104-109. Partial text in Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps* (Bloomington: 1987), 100-102.
77. In Hall's review, note 74 above, he mistakenly quotes Gerstein as having stated 25 million Jews were killed.
78. NI-9908, May 24, 1944 reproduced in Friedlander, *Kurt Gerstein*, 185-6.
79. See Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka*, 100.
80. Text of the letter in Serge Klarsfeld, ed., *The Holocaust and the Neo Nazi Mythomania* (NY: 1978), 127-128.
81. Roques, "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein, 309-313.
82. Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret* (Boston: 1980), 48-49.
83. Abridged text of his statements in Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka*, 103-4.
84. Text in Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen and Volker Riess, *The Good Old Days* (NY: 1991), 238-244.

85. Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness* (NY: 1983), 101.
86. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (10th ed., 1997), Supplement B, 337.
87. Klee, et. al., *The Good Old Days*, 247.
88. See page 19 of the present work.
89. Klee, et al., *The Good Old Days*, 247.
90. Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 121.
91. Transcript is in <http://www.nizkor.Org/hweb/people/h/horn-otto/horn-001.htm>
92. Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 123.
93. Klee, et. al., *The Good Old Days*, 231.
94. *Ibid.*, 232.
95. Oberhauser testimony in *Ibid.* , 228. Sculch testimony in Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 70-71.
96. For a comprehensive discussion of the Operation Reinhard trials see Dick de Mildt, *In the Name of the People: Perpetrators of Genocide in the Reflection of Their Post - War Prosecution in West Germany* (Hague: 1996), 227-301. The West German courts were very lenient in many of the sentences handed down for those convicted of mass murder. Many of those convicted did not even receive life sentences. De Mildt, pp. 18-226 also gives a thorough account of the euthanasia trials. The best account to date of the Nazi euthanasia program, which lasted from 1939 to 1941, is Henry Friedlander's, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (Chapel Hill: 1995).
97. Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution*, (London: 1984), 150.
98. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, 176.
99. David Maxwell Fyfe, ed., *Trial of Joseph Kramer* (London: 1949), 157. This constitutes Volume 2 of the War Crimes Trials series. It contains the text of the testimonies and depositions given at the trial.
100. *Ibid.*, 184.
101. *Ibid.*, 196-7.
102. Staglich, *Auschwitz*, 263.
103. *Ibid.*, 277-278.
104. *Ibid.*, 277.

105. Naumann, Auschwitz, 76-77.
106. Staglich, Auschwitz, 255.
107. Naumann, Auschwitz, 46.
108. Klee, et. al., The Good Old Days, 253-255.
109. Staglich, Auschwitz, 238.
110. Bute, Hoax of the Twentieth Century, 186.
111. Paul Rassinier, The Real Eichmann Trial Or the Incurable Victims (Silver Springs: 1979, first published in French in 1962), 155.
112. Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein and Adalbert Ruckerl, Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History on the Use of Poison Gas (Yale: 1993), 142.
113. The trial testimony has been thoroughly covered in Bernd Naumann's, Auschwitz. Naumann was a journalist who covered the trial.
114. Staglich, Auschwitz, 253.
115. Naumann, Auschwitz, 412-414.
116. Thies Christophersen, Auschwitz: Truth or Lie (Toronto: 1973), 5, 24.
117. Ibid., 19.
118. Robert Lenski, The Holocaust on Trial (Costa Mesa: 1989), 147. This is a denier account of the trial of Canadian denier Ernst Zundel.
119. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 725-6. This revolt is discussed in much of the literature on Auschwitz.
120. Lenski, The Holocaust on Trial, 152.
121. Ibid., 155.
122. Christophersen, Auschwitz: Truth or Lie, 19.
123. Thies Christophersen, "Reflections on Auschwitz and West German Justice", 6 JHR No. 1 (Spring, 1985), 118.
124. Staglich, Auschwitz, 117.
125. Text in ibid., 303-4.

126. Christophersen, *Auschwitz: Truth or Lie*, 11.
127. NG-4096 in NMT, Vol. 13, p. 363. See also NO 2003, a report dated May 13, 1943 on the distribution of loot from death camps. NMT, Vol. 5, 709-712.
128. See fn. 77 in Chapter 1.
129. Christophersen, "Reflections on Auschwitz and West German Justice," 118. He also increased the number of Auschwitz inmates to 200,000 on p. 119 of the article from 20,000 on p. 19 of his pamphlet
130. *Ibid.*, 119.

## CHAPTER 7: IDEOLOGIES AND REPRESENTATIONS

1. Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (NY: 1993), 137-156.
2. Paul Rassinier, *The Real Eichmann Trial* (Silver Springs: 1979), 115. The recent biography of Rassinier by Nadine Fresco (see note 4 in the Introduction to the present work) shows that he attributed his failed postwar political ambitions to Jews.
3. Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (Torrance: 1978), 224.
4. Walter Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* (Torrance: 1983), 53-58.
5. Arthur Bute, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1978), 130.
6. Wilhelm Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986), 59.
7. *Ibid.*, 119, 120.
8. *Ibid.*, 112.
9. See Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, 85-102 for a comprehensive overview of App's activities.
10. Austin J. App, *The Six Million Swindle* {Tacoma Park: 1973}, 1, 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 14. The Mein Kampf excerpt is in Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (West Orange: 1976), 31.
11. See Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World-Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (NY: 1967).
12. The following discussion is based on publications advertised in the 1997 catalog of the Noontide Press. See also Werner Cohn, *Partners in Hate: Noam Chomsky and the Holocaust Deniers* (Cambridge: 1985), 77.

13. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library is the only library to have all issues going back to 1980. Very few libraries carry the JHR. Princeton University has all volumes from 1983 onwards.
14. Austin App, "The "Holocaust" Put in Perspective," 1 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1980), 50.
15. Lewis Brandon, "A Note From the Editor," 1 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1980), 101.
16. 5 JHR (1984) 446-450.
17. Austin J. App, *The Curse of Anti-Anti Semitism* (West Virginia: 1976), 23, 63.
18. Leon Degrelle, "How Hitler Consolidated Power," 12 JHR No. 3 (Fall 1992), 307, 313, 364, 368.
19. Leon Degrelle, "The Enigma of Hitler," 14 JHR No. 3 (May/June 1994), 25.
20. Leon Degrelle, "Epic: The Story of the Waffen SS," 3 JHR No. 3 (Winter 1982), 441, 446, 452.
21. Robert J. Chapman, "A Challenge to Thought Control: The Historiography of Leon Degrelle", 6 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1985), 223, 225-227.
22. Florence S. Rost von Tonningen, "For Holland and for Europe," 9 JHR No. 4 (Winter 1989/1990), 430, 433.
23. Karl Otto Braun, "Reflections on German and American Foreign Policy, 1933-1945," 6 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1985), 47, 56.
24. Anthony Read and David Fisher, *Kristallnacht* (NY: 1989), 68-69.
25. David Irving, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich* (London: 1996), 275-276.
26. Ingrid Weckert, "Crystal Night" 1938: The Great Anti-German Spectacle," 6 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1985), 186, 188, 189, 190, 198, 199, 202.
27. Mark Weber, "Goebbels' Place in History," 15 JHR No. 1 (January/February 1995), 21. The source which Weber cited for this statement, Helmut Heiber's *Goebbels* (Berlin: 1962), 254, did not make it for the overall proposition of Goebbels' fidelity to truth. Rather, he was talking about Germany's early military victories, a time when Goebbels could afford to be truthful as to this subject only. But Heiber is only talking about these early military victories. See also the discussion on page 168 of the present work about a Goebbels' fabrication.
28. Robert Faurisson, "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie", 2 JHR No.4 (Winter 1981), 337, 338.
29. Brian Chalmers, "The Jewish Question in 15th and 16th Century Spain," 16 JHR No. 1 (January/February 1996), 3.
30. Robert Williams, "The End of the Romanoffs: Nicholas, Alexandra and Their Children", 10 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1990), 151. On the Soviet Union's anti-Zionism see William Korey, *Russians, Anti-*

Semitism, Pamyat, and the Demonology of Zionism (Jerusalem: 1995), 1-59.

31. Williams, *ibid.*, 116.

32. Charles E. Weber, "Cui Bono? An American Veteran's Views on Non-Jewish Toleration and Propagation of the Extermination Thesis", 3 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1982), 112. Weber's source for this conclusion is the virulently anti-Semitic, *The World Conquerors* by Louis Marschalko.

33. Mark Weber, "The Jewish Role in the Bolshevik Revolution and Russia's Early Regime," 14 JHR No. 1 (Jan/Feb. 1994), 4-14.

34. Richard Pipes, *Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime* (NY: 1993), 102-104, 112-114.

35. See the documents in Richard Pipes, ed., *The Unknown Lenin* (Yale: 1996), 116-117, 128-129; see also Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: A History of the Russian Revolution* (NY: 1997), 749-750 on the Bolshevik suppression of Jews.

36. Hugo Valentin, *Anti-Semitism* (NY: 1936), 257, 260.

37. Text of declaration in 1932 by the Germany's Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Religion in Raul Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction* (NY: 1971), 9.

38. Salo Baron, *The Russian Jews Under Tsars and Soviets* (NY: 1976), 169, 170.

39. Oliver Radkey, *Russia Goes to the Polls: The Election to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, 1917* (Cornell: 1990), 18, 19 for the Russian vote in general and 152-153 for the Jewish vote. See also Baron, *ibid.*, 178; Pipes, *Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime*, 113; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 82 n.

40. Text of the letters in Anthony Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (NY: 1974), 194-6.

41. Dmitri Volkogonov, *Lenin* (NY: 1994), 8.

42. They are published in English translation in Z. A. B. Zeman, *Germany and the Revolution in Russia* (NY: 1958).

43. Volkogonov, *Lenin*, 111.

44. Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction*, 9.

45. Michael Pearson, *The Sealed Train* (NY: 1975), 60.

46. Ivor Benson, "Russia 1917-1918: A Key to the Riddle of an Age of Conflict," 10 JHR No. 3 (Fall 1990), 327.

47. Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (NY: 1990), 382; see also Pearson, *The Sealed Train*, 114.

48. Volkogonov, *Lenin*, 110.

49. Ibid., 122-123.
50. Pipes, Russian Revolution, 411.
51. Volkogonov, Lenin, 110-111.
52. Zeman, Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 94.
53. See Stephen Koch, Double Lives: Spies and Writers in the Secret Soviet War of Ideas Against the West (NY: 1994), 53-74, 109-125.
54. See Mikhail Heller and Alexandr M. Nekrich, Utopia in Power (NY: 1986), 353-355.
55. Butz, Hoax of the Twentieth Century, 112.
56. Walter Sanning, Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry (Torrance: 1983), 11.
57. Wilhelm Staglich, "Historians Wrangle Over the Destruction of European Jewry," 7 JHR No. 2 (Summer 1986), 240.
58. Mark Weber, "My Role in the Zundel Trial," 9 JHR No. 4 (Winter 1989/1990), 398-403.
59. Yitzhak Arad, Shmuel Krakowski and Shmuel Spector, eds. The Einsatzgruppen Reports (NY: 1989), 46. Weber was no doubt aware that at the time of the Zundel trial in 1988 most of these reports had not been published in English and were not easily available.
60. Ibid., 131-2.
61. Mark Weber, "An Open Letter to the Rev. Mark Hebener," 8 JHR No.2 (Summer 1987), 176.
62. E. Thomas Wood and Stanislaw M. Jankowski, Karski: How One Man Tried to Stop the Holocaust (NY: 1994), 135-180.
63. Ibid., 128-9. See also David Silberklang, "The Allies and the Holocaust: A Reappraisal," 24 YVS (1994), 148 fn. 2.
64. Jan Karski, The Story of a Secret State (Boston: 1944), 339, 349, 350.
65. Text in Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen and Volker Riess, The Good Old Days (NY: 1991), 232-235.
66. Mark Weber and Andrew Allen, "Treblinka" 12 JHR No.2 (Summer, 1992), 156, fn. 47. The key source is Yisrael Gutman's, The Jews of Warsaw, 1939-1943 (Bloomington: 1982), 219-221.
67. Weber and Allen, *ibid.*, 134.
68. Raul Hilberg, Destruction of the European Jews (NY: 1983), Vol.3, p. 979; Yitzhak Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps (Bloomington: 1987), 373; Gitta Sereny, Into That Darkness (NY: 1983), 249; Junusz Gumkowski, Poland Under Nazi Occupation

(Warsaw: 1961), 75; German Crimes in Poland (NY:1982) Vol. 1, pp. 103-4; Alexander Donat, ed., The Death Camp Treblinka (NY:1979), 265.

69. NO-057 in NMT, Vol. 5, p. 717.

70. Weber and Allen in "Treblinka", p. 143. They claimed that hundreds, or maybe even thousands, were killed. However, they claim that there were not enough ashes found from cremated bodies to support the fact that more than 750,000 people were killed in Treblinka. But in fact the Germans had more than sufficient time to scatter the ashes from the cremated bodies. Treblinka operated for 13 months. Moreover, Globocnik's memo, cited in fh. 69 above, shows that the Germans were clearly attempting to destroy the evidence months after the camp had been disbanded. The key fact, acknowledged by Weber and Allen, is that ashes from cremated bodies were found.

71. Robert Faurisson, "The Warsaw Ghetto 'Uprising': Jewish Insurrection or German Police Operation," 14 JHR No. 2 (March/April 1994), 2-5.

71a. Text of NO-2494 in Michael Berenbaum, Witness to the Holocaust (NY: 1997), 236.

72. Text in Yitzhak Arad, Yisrael Gutman and Abraham Margalioth eds. Documents on the Holocaust (Jerusalem: 1981), 275-6.

73. Friedrich Berg, "Typhus and the Jews," 8 JHR No. 4 (Winter 1988/1989), 476.

74. German directive on food supplies in PS 1189 in NCA, Vol. 3, p.833. For the link between the famine and typhus see Christopher Browning, The Path to Genocide (Cambridge: 1992), 156. On p. 146 Browning cites a 1939 German public health directive which states: "We are indifferent to the hygienic fate of the Jews. Also for the Jews the basic principle is valid, that their propagation must be curtailed in every possible way."

75. Hilberg, Documents of Destruction, 41.

76. Enrique Aynat, "Auschwitz and the Exile Government of Poland," 11 JHR No. 3 (Fall 1991), 281 -319. Arthur Butz made a similar argument at a denier conference in 1982. This is probably where Aynat got the idea from. Hoax of the Twentieth Century, (10th ed., 1997), 349-50.

77. A number of significant articles are cited in Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 349-359. See also David Engel, In the Shadow of Auschwitz (Chapel Hill: 1987), 199-200. On the efforts of the Polish resistance to expose the extermination of the Jews see also Richard Lukas, The Forgotten Holocaust {NY: 1996}, 152-181; Jan Blonski, Polish Catholics and Catholic Poles: The Gospel, National Interest, Civic Solidarity, and the Destruction of the Warsaw Ghetto," 25 YVS {1996}, esp. 182; Dariusz Stola, "Early News of the Holocaust From Poland", 11 Holocaust and Genocide Studies No. 1 {Spring 1997}, 1-27.

78. Aynat, "Auschwitz and the Exile Government of Poland" 292.

79. Information Bulletin, September 8, 1942 cited in Walter Laqueur, The Terrible Secret, (Boston: 1980), 111. Aynat cited Laqueur's book several times but never mentioned this article.

80. Ibid., 111.

81. Cited in Engel, *In the Shadow of Auschwitz*, 201.
82. Richard Breitman, "Allied Knowledge of Auschwitz - Birkenau in 1943-1944", in Verne W. Newton, ed., *FDR and the Holocaust* (NY: 1996), 177; David Engel, *Facing a Holocaust: The Polish Government in Exile and the Jews. 1943-1945* (Chapel Hill: 1990), 231 fn. 122
83. Richard Breitman, "Auschwitz and the Archives," in Michael Marrus, ed., *The Nazi Holocaust* (Westport: 1989), Part 8, Vol. 1, p. 85. This statistic is badly mangled in the article cited in footnote 82.
84. *Ibid.*, 86.
85. *Ibid.*, 85. Breitman has now presented all of this information in his *Official Secrets* {NY: 1998}, 110-121; See also Henryk Swiebocki, "Disclosure and Denunciations of SS Crimes", in Franciszek Piper and Teresa Swiebocka, eds., *Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp* (Oswiecim:1996), 249-266
86. Jeremy D. Harris, "Broadcasting the Massacres: An Analysis of the BBC's Contemporary Coverage of the Holocaust," 25 *YVS* (1996), 75.
87. Report from London on April 18, 1943 cited in Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies* (London: 1981), 130.
88. *Washington Post and New York Herald Tribune*, March 22, 1944 cited in Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust* (NY: 1986), 233.
89. Report of March 15, 1944 cited in Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies*, 179-180.
90. Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (10th ed), 386.
91. *Poland Fights, Oswiecim, Camp of Death* {NY: 1944}, 9, 33. See pp.45 and 46 where Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka are identified as extermination camps. The reference to underground cells appears to be to the gassing which took place in Block 11 in 1941 as discussed in Chapter 6 under the Hoess discussion. It also may have been a reference to the underground gas chambers which went into operation in 1943 and are discussed in chapter 9 herein.

## CHAPTER 8: DAVID IRVING AND THEODORE KAUFMAN

1. Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment* (NY: 1990), 463-476; Walter Laqueur, *Stalin: The Glasnost Revelations* (NY: 1990), 189-201; Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims* {New Brunswick: 1998}, 102-176.
2. See my letter in 97 *Commentary* (February 1994), 9-10.
3. Lewis Brandon, "A Note From the Editor", 1 *JHR* No. 3 (Fall 1980), 198. The letters from the historians appear on pp. 199-202.

4. See Lucy Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and the Historians* (NY: 1981) 48-55; Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors* (NY: 1946).
5. Mark Weber, "A Prominent German Historian Tackles Taboos of Third Reich History," 14 *JHR* No. 1 (January/February 1994), 38.
6. Ernst Nolte, "Between Historical Legend and Revisionism? The Third Reich in the Perspective of 1980" in John Knowlton and Truett Gates, eds. *Forever in the Shadow of Hitler* (NJ: 1993), 2.
7. *National Review*, August 19, 1977, p. 946.
8. *New York Times Book Review*, April 3, 1977, p. 13.
9. Review by Dennis E. Showalter in 82 *American Historical Review* (December 1977), 1281.
10. Bradley F. Smith, "Two Alibis for the Inhumanities," 1 *German Studies Review* No. 3 (October 1978), 332.
11. Martin Broszat, "Hitler and the Genesis of the Final Solution," 13 *YVS* (1979), 73-125 reprinted in Michael R. Marrus ed., *The Nazi Holocaust* (Westport: 1989) Part 3, Vol. 1, 115-167.
12. Charles Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler: David living's Hitler's War," 12 *Central European History* No. 2 (June 1979), 169-199 reprinted in Marrus, *ibid.* , Part 3, Vol. 1, 21-52. See also Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* (Berkeley: 1984).
13. David Irving, *Hitler's War* (NY: 1977) 332, 504, 505.
14. Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and the Historians*, 38.
15. *Ibid.*, 38; Broszat, "Hitler and the Genesis of the Final Solution," 106.
16. Ernst Nolte, "Between Historical Legend and Revisionism?," 8.
17. *National Review*, August 19, 1977, p. 946.
18. See Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler," 182.
19. D-728 in *NCA*, Vol. 7, p. 175. Fn. 88 in Chapter 1 herein.
20. Paul Addison, "The Burden of Proof," 94 *New Statesman* (July 1, 1977), 18.
21. Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler", 182. English translation of NO 1128 in *NMT*, Vol. 13, pp. 269-270. A photocopy of the original German is in Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* (Berkeley: 1982) plate 6 and the German language edition of this work *Hitler und Die Endlosung* (Germany: 1982), plate between pp.128 and 129.
22. Irving, *Hitler's War*, 436. Irving only addressed the issue of the Himmler memo when he was specifically asked about it at the trial of Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel in Canada in 1988. He stated

"that this was such an extraordinary document, that the figure was so unusual, that it is the kind of thing that makes one raise one's eyebrows and question further..." Thus, Irving reverted to the common denier tactic of suggesting that it was a forgery. Robert Lenski, *The Holocaust on Trial: The Case of Ernst Zundel* {Decatur: 1989}, 427.

Irving's "explanation" of the Einsatzgruppen reports of mass killing of Jews {examined in chapter 2 herein} shows that he will employ any absurd logic. When asked about these reports at the Zundel trial, he stated these statistics were "meaningless" because the SS men submitting the reports wanted to show that they were really doing good job. *The Holocaust on Trial*, 406. He did not explain why the SS would think it necessary to inflate statistics on mass murder so their superiors would think that they were doing a good job.

23. Czeslaw Madajczyk, "Hitler's Direct Influence on Decisions Affecting Jews During World War II," 20 YVS (1990), 57.

24. NY Times, January 21, 1998, p. A4; Richard Breitman, *Official Secrets* {NY: 1998}, 86.

25. All of the below citations appear in C. C. Aronsfeld, *The Text of the Holocaust* (Marblehead: 1985), 35-36. See also Andreas Hillgruber, "War in the East and the Extermination of the Jews," in Marrus, ed., *The Nazi Holocaust, Part 3, Vol. I*, 105-107. Hitler's speeches have been reproduced in the original German in Max Domarus, ed., *Hitler Reden und Proklamationen, 1932-1945*.

26. Hillgruber, *ibid.*, 114, citing the political testament recorded by Hitler's secretary, Martin Bormann. Original German is in Hugh Trevor Roper, ed., *Hitler's Politisches Testament: Die Bormann Diktats vom Februar und April 1945* (Hamburg: 1981), 122. The verb *ausgerottet* is from *ausrotten*. It literally means to extirpate or exterminate. The word was used by Himmler in his Posen speech of October 4, 1943 when he said: "Das Jüdische Volk wird ausgerottet" [t]he Jewish people are being exterminated]. *IMT*, Vol. 29, p.145.

27. David Irving, "On Contemporary History," 5 JHR (1984), 282.

28. *Ibid.*, 275-6.

29. David Irving, "Hitler's War: An Introduction to the New Edition," 10 JHR No. 4 (1990/1991), 401.

30. David Irving, *Goring* (NY: 1989), 343.

31. Irving, *Hitler's War*, 575. Speeches cited on p. 576 fn.

32. *Ibid.*, 575.

33. Speech in Yitzhak Arad, Yisrael Gutman and Abraham Margoliot eds. *Documents on the Holocaust* (Jerusalem: 1981), 344-5.

34. David Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers", 13 JHR No. 2 (March/April 1993), 20.

35. Jochen von Lang, ed, *Eichmann Interrogated* (NY: 1983), 81; Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in*

Jerusalem (NY: 1963), 78.

36. Von Lang, *ibid.*, 84.

37. *Ibid.*, 85.

38. *Ibid.*, 84.

39. Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer* (NY: 1992), 28, 29, 38, 39.

40. David Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers," 23.

41. Von Lang, ed., *Eichmann Interrogated*, 86.

41a. Adolf Eichmann, *Ich, Adolf Eichmann, Ein historischer Zeugenbericht*, 179-180 cited in Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps* (Bloomington: 1987), 26. The place to where Eichmann traveled was the Belzec extermination camp.

42. Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers," 23. 42a Irving, *Hitler's War*, 330.

42b. NO 365 in Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* {Berkeley: 1984}, 70-71. Original German in Fleming, *Hitler und Die Endlosung* {Germany: 1984}, 81. Photocopy of the original German and an English translation at THHP. See also the commentary by Jamie McCarthy. There is an issue as to whether the gassings actually occurred in Latvia. Andrew Ezergailis writes in his standard *History of the Holocaust in Latvia: 1941-1944* (Washington D.C: 1996), 149 that "[t]he gas - vans in Latvia only arrived in December 1941, after most of the killing was finished, and it is not known that they were ever used".

43. Irving, *Hitler's War*, 632.

44. Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers," 20.

45. Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler," 187-188; Irving, *Hitler's War*, 575-576, fn. Irving appears to have accepted Rosenberg's explanation of the word's usage. Rosenberg argued that there was a difference between extermination of Jewry and extermination of the Jews, but never explained the difference. The Collins German Dictionary (Munich: 1997), 379 defines Judentum as having the meanings of Judaism, Jews or Jewry. Rosenberg became defensive when the prosecution offered to read him the dictionary definition of *ausrottung*. Rosenberg's testimony in IMT, Vol. 8, pp. 553-555. His memo to Hitler of December 14, 1941 was classified as a "Reich Secret". It is in PS 1517. German text in IMT, Vol. 27, pp. 270-273 (esp. p. 270). English translation in NCA, Vol. 3, pp. 55-58.

46. Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler," 188; Irving, *Hitler's War*, 867.

47. Irving, *Hitler's War*, 632.

48. Sydnor, "The Selling of Adolf Hitler," 188.

49. Hillgruber, "War in the East and the Extermination of the Jews", 92.

50. Irving, "On Contemporary History", 276.
51. New Muret Sanders Encyclopedia Dictionary (Zurich: 1974), 182; The New Enlarged Schoffler-Weis German and English Dictionary (Lincolnwood: 1981), 33 German to English portion; Harrap's Standard German and English Dictionary (Oxford: 1977), 173.
52. Wahrig, Deutsches-Worterbuch (1994), 255, 1674.
53. Irving, "On Contemporary History", 276.
54. IMT, Vol. 12, p. 357.
55. See footnote 27 in Chapter 7 herein.
56. Interviews with Ron Casey in July 1995 and November 1996. Texts in <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/DeoDle/i/irving-david/australia/2gb transcript-1196.html> and <http://www.nizkor.Org/hweb/people/i/irving-david/australia/2gb transcript-0795.html>.
57. Doug Collins, "Goebbels, Frank Speech and War Memories," 17 JHR No.3 (May/June 1998), 22.
58. David Irving, Churchill's War (Australia: 1987), 35.
59. Letter of September 16, 1919 cited in Eberhard Jackel, Hitler's Weltanschauung: A Blueprint for Power (Middletown: 1972), 48.
60. Howard J. Langer, The History of the Holocaust (NJ: 1997), 29.
61. The program appears in Barbara Miller Lane and Leila Rupp, Nazi Ideology Before 1933: A Documentation (Austin: 1988), 41-43.
62. Excerpts in *ibid.*, 46-59.
63. Text in *ibid.*, 95-97.
64. Thesis XII in *ibid.*, 109.
65. These are reproduced in English in Simon Taylor, Prelude to Genocide (NY: 1985), 26-84.
66. Irving, Goebbels, 106,128.
67. *Ibid.*, 570, fn. 17.
68. Avraham Barkai, From Boycott to Annihilation (Hanover: 1989), 72.
69. See Taylor, Prelude to Genocide, 52, 57, 63, 81-82. See particularly photo no. 5 between pp. 116

and 117 from 1931 showing how Jewish department stores strangled small traders.

70. Bruce Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution: A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism* (Chapel Hill: 1992), 201.
71. NY Times, Feb. 10, 1932, p. 8.
72. Ibid., July 1, 1932, p. 4.
73. Voelkischer Beobachter in NY Times, May 17, 1932, p. 4.
74. Leni Yahil, *The Holocaust* (NY: 1990), 27.
75. NY Times, March 3, 1933, p. 5, March 6, 1933, p. 7.
76. Ibid., March 7, 1933, p. 16, citing *Der Angriff*, a paper published by Goebbels.
77. Ibid., March 9, 1933, pp. 1, 10.
78. Daily Express (London), March 9, 1933, p. 11.
79. NY Times, March 10, 1933, p. 1.
80. Taylor, *Prelude to Genocide*, 162.
81. Langer, *The History of the Holocaust*, 40.
82. Richard Bessel, *Political Violence and the Rise of Nazism* (Yale: 1984), 105.
83. Helmut Krausnick, et al., *Anatomy of the SS State* (NY: 1965), 23, 24.
84. Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation*, 15; for text of laws against Jews enacted in April 1933 see Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (West Orange: 1976), 40-42.
85. Krausnick, *Anatomy of the SS State*, 24.
86. L-188 in NCA, Vol. 7, pp. 1026-1030. See also PS 1759 deposition by Raymond H. Geist on August 26, 1945, the American Consul in Berlin on anti-Jewish activities during March 6-13, 1933 in IMT, Vol. 28, pp. 242-246. Geist states on p. 246 that "I personally can verify that the police had been instructed not to interfere; that is that there was official sanction for these activities."
87. John Dippel, *Bound Upon A Wheel of Fire* (NY: 1996), 81.
88. De Telegraaf (Amsterdam) cited in American Jewish Committee, *Jews in Nazi Germany* (NY: 1935), 39.
89. NY Times, March 23, 1933, p. 10.
90. The Times (London), March 27, 1933, p. 14.

91. NY Times, March 23, 1933, p. 10.
92. The Times (London), March 29, 1933, p. 14.
93. Edward Alexander, *The Holocaust and The War of Ideas* (New Brunswick: 1994), 190.
94. I wish to thank the New York Public Library for going to great lengths to obtain a microfilm copy of the Daily Express for March 24, 1933 for me.
95. David Bankier, "On Modernization and the Rationality of Extermination," 24 YVS (1994), 113-114.
96. Irving, Goebbels, 207-8. He stated that the laws were enacted in September 1936. Texts of all these laws are in Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, 38-49.
97. Irving, Goebbels, 275-6.
98. See Gerald Schwab, *The Day the Holocaust Began: The Odyssey of Herschel Grynszpan* (NY: 1990); Anthony Read and David Fisher, *Kristallnacht: The Nazi Night of Terror* (London: 1989).

In order to show that Kristallnacht was not part of official Nazi policy, Irving distorted an order to the authorities from Reinhard Heydrich, Himmler's national chief of police. Irving quotes the memo as "instructions to all police authorities to restore law and order, protect Jews and Jewish property, and halt any ongoing incidents." Goebbels, 276. In fact the order says the exact opposite. It states:

"a. Only such measures may be taken which do not jeopardize German life or property (for instance, burning of synagogues only if there is no danger of fires in the neighborhood". (italics added)

"b. Business establishments and homes of Jews may be destroyed but not looted.

"c. In business streets special [care] is to be taken that non Jewish establishments will be safeguarded at all cost against damage." (italics added)

The memo goes on to state that "as many Jews, particularly wealthy ones, as the local jails will hold, are to be arrested in all districts." PS 765, memo of November 10, 1938 in NCA, vol. 3, pp 545-547. This memo strongly suggests that these riots were encouraged as a part of official German policy. Moreover, Irving cited the wrong document for this memo. He cited PS 3052, which had nothing to do with Kristallnacht, as opposed to PS 765. The way Irving cited this document shows that he cannot be trusted to present any accurate information that involves German policy towards Jews.

99. Saul Friedlander, *Nazi Germany and the Jews* (NY: 1997), Vol. I, p. 177. Friedlander's book is one of the better accounts of the period from 1933 to 1939.
100. Irving, Goebbels, 321.
101. Text of the letter in *The Times* (London), September 6, 1939, p. 8.
102. Irving, *Hitler's War*, 12; John Lukacs, *The Hitler of History* (NY:1997), 180

103. Ernst Nolte, "Between Historical Legend and Revisionism", 8.
104. Irving, Goebbels, 288, 372, 387.
105. Ibid., 388.
106. Louis P. Lochner, *The Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943* (NY: 1948), 148.
107. Irving, Goebbels, 648 fn. 41. Memo of June 23, 1942.
108. Arthur Butz, *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: 1978), 195, 197. Irving specifically affirms the authenticity of the March 27, 1942 entry. He has checked the original entry on microfiche. Goebbels, 648 fn.42.
109. Lochner, *Goebbels Diaries*, 241. The German verb *aufräumen* has more than one meaning. It can mean to tidy up or to do away with. Another meaning is to decimate a population or slaughter a population wholesale. *Collins German Dictionary* (Munich: 1997), 63. Lochner's translation of the word as exterminating is correct within the context of referring to a population, which Goebbels was doing. The original German entry is in Lochner, ed., *Goebbels Tagebucher* (1948), 222. Lochner had once interviewed Goebbels.
110. Hugh Trevor Roper, ed., *Final Entries 1945: The Diaries of Joseph Goebbels* (NY: 1978), 121.
111. *Das Reich*, June 14, 1942 cited in Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret* (Boston: 1980) 32.
112. Speech of February 18, 1943 cited in Willie A. Boelcke ed., *The Secret Conferences of Dr. Goebbels* (NY: 1970), 309.
- 112a. Martin Broszat, "Hitler and the Genesis of the Final Solution: An Assessment of David Irving's Thesis" in Michael Marrus, ed. *The Nazi Holocaust* (Westport: 1989), Part 3, Vol.1,p.130
- 112b. Original German and English translation in Gordon McFee, *When Did Hitler Decide on the Final Solution THHP* citing *Die Zeit*, January 9, 1998. The original German also appeared on denier David Irving's website at [www.fpp.co.uk/Himmler301141 .html](http://www.fpp.co.uk/Himmler301141.html). Irving did not challenge the authenticity of the entry. It should be emphasized that this is the only entry from Goebbels' diary cited in this chapter to which Irving did not have access for his Goebbels' biography. In other words, all of the other incriminating entries cited were known to Irving.
113. Irving, Goebbels, 387.
114. Ibid. , 388, 647-8, m. 40. The entry is from March 20, 1942. It also appears in Lochner, *The Goebbels Diaries*, 188. Irving mistakenly writes that the entry has not been published.

Irving makes a similar claim in regard to Eichmann. He writes that Hitler was less militant than Himmler, Heydrich, Goebbels and Speer on the Jewish question. He cites Eichmann's unpublished memoirs that Hitler wanted to settle the Jews in Madagascar. I have not had access to these memoirs but can state with some degree of certainty that Eichmann was not writing this about Hitler's attitude in 1942.

Eichmann discussed the Madagascar plan in his interrogation with the Israelis. It was a plan being floated in the 1930s to resettle Germany's Jews in Madagascar. However, Eichmann told them that the plan "never went beyond the theoretical stage..." The Israeli interrogator then asked Eichmann if he was aware of the fact that a Polish commission of inquiry had also looked into Madagascar and found that only 15,000 families could be settled there. Eichmann said that he was not familiar with this commission. Von Lang, *Eichmann Interrogated*, 68-69.

115. Irving, *Goebbels*, 387.

116. Lochner, *Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943*, 86. Original German is in Lochner ed. *Goebbels Tagebucher*, 88. The entry is from February 14, 1942.

117. Lochner, *Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943*, 377.

118. Irving, *Goebbels*, 455-6. See especially p. 670 m. 17.

119. *Ibid.*, 672 fn. 70.

120. Theodore N. Kaufman, *Germany Must Perish* (Reedy: 1980), 51.

121. Paul Rassinier, *The Real Eichmann Trial* (Silver Springs: 1979), 116.

122. Wilhelm Staglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (Torrance: 1986), 55-56.

123. Irving, *Goebbels*, between pp. 332 and 333.

124. *Ibid.*, 369.

125. *Ibid.*, 369, 372-374, 404.

126. *Ibid.*, 640 fn. 38.

127. *Time*, March 24, 1941, pp.95-96.

128. *NY Times*, July 24, 1941, p. 8; September 9, 1941, p. 4.

129. Irving, *Goebbels*, 369.

130. *Ibid.*, 369. So much for the claim made by Mark Weber, cited in Chapter 7, that Goebbels' success was due to his "fidelity to facts and truth." See the discussion on page 126 of the present work.

131. *NY Times*, July 24, 1941, p. 8.

132. *Ibid.*, September 9, 1941, p. 4.

133. These and many other examples are reproduced in English in *NCA, Supp. A*, 950, 956-963, 1209-1216, for years 1939-1944. For the impact of Streicher's *Der Sturmer* in Germany and abroad see Randall L. Bytwerk, *Julius Streicher* (NY: 1983), 171-172.

134. Hugh Trevor Roper, ed. *Hitler's Table Talk* (NY: 1953), 154-5 for December 28 and 29, 1941.
  135. Rassinier, *The Real Eichmann Trial*, 116.
  136. *Ibid.*, 116. It is worth noting that during World War I the Reverend Newell Dwight Hillis of the Plymouth Congregational Church wrote a book in which he spoke approvingly of surgeons who were "preparing to advocate the calling of a world conference to consider the sterilization of ten million German soldiers, and the segregation of their women, that when this generation of German goes, civilized cities may be rid of this awful cancer that must be cut clean out of the body of society." *The Blot on the Kaiser's Scutcheon* (NY: 1918), 59.
- The importance of this statement from the perspective of evaluating the motivations of deniers is that they never call attention to it because Germany never rounded up all of its Congregationalists and threw them into concentration camps. Deniers who claim that Kaufman was somehow related to Germany's anti Jewish policies would then have to explain why the Congregationalists were not persecuted in Germany but Jews were. My thanks to John Drobnicki of CUNY for calling this to my attention and providing me with the citation.
137. Jacob Heilbrunn, "Meet the Real David Irving: Out to Lunch", 215 *New Republic* (October 21, 1996), 14, 15.
  138. Irving, *Goebbels*, 228, 598 m. 61.
  139. *Ibid.*, 205.
  140. Julian Petley, *Capital and Culture: German Cinema, 1933-1945* (London: 1979), 60. Petley also notes on p. 59 that rising fees paid by the Nazi government to actors were driving up production costs. The reason for these increased costs was due to "the steady emigration of important actors, directors etc. Those that were left could demand and expect even higher fees".
  141. Victoria de Grazia, "Mass Culture and Sovereignty: The American Challenge to European Cinemas, 1920-1960," 61 *Journal of Modern History* No. 1 (March 1989), 77-78. De Grazia cites the Petley source in fn. 140 herein.
  142. Irving, *Goebbels*, 46.
  143. Irving, "Revelations from the Goebbels Diary", 6.
  144. David S. Landes, "The Jewish Merchant: Topology and Stereotypology in Germany," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* (1974) Vol. 19, p. 20.
  145. *Ibid.*, 20.
  146. Richard Tilly, "An Overview on the Role of the Large German Banks up to 1914," in Youssef Cassis, ed., *Finance and Financiers in European History, 1880-1960* (Cambridge: 1992), 96.
  147. Statistical breakdown in Kurt Grunwald, *Studies in the History of the German Jew in Global Banking* (Jerusalem: ND ), 61.

148. See Fritz K. Ringer, *The German Inflation of 1923* (London: 1969), 70-76; Eric E Rowley, *Hyperinflation in Germany* (Cambridge: 1994), 2-9. My thanks to Colin Loader of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for calling these sources to my attention.

## CHAPTER 9: GAS CHAMBERS: THE "SCIENCE" OF HOLOCAUST DENIAL

1. Tom W. Smith, "The Holocaust Denial Controversy", 59 *Public Opinion Quarterly* No.2 (Summer 1995), 269. The Roper Organization changed the wording to ask: "Does it seem possible to you that the Holocaust never occurred"?
2. *Ibid.*, 281
3. German text with English translation of the 1960 letter in 13 *JHR* No. 3(May/June 1993), 12. It is important to emphasize that Broszat never claimed that no gas chambers existed on German soil, only that there were no operational gas chambers in these three camps. Robert Faurisson falsely claimed that Broszat stated that there were no gas chambers in the frontiers of the Old Reich. "The Muller Document," 8 *JHR* No. 1 (Spring 1988), 121. Earlier, Faurisson falsely claimed that Broszat "had to tell his amazed countrymen that there had never been a 'gas chamber' in the entire Old Reich..." "The Problem of the "Gas Chambers" 1 *JHR* No.2 {Summer 1980), 108. Broszat only stated that more Jews died of diseases in the Old Reich, not that no Jews were killed in gas chambers.
4. David Fyfe, *The Trial of Joseph Kramer and Forty Four Others* (London: 1949),17
5. This study has not addressed the often repeated and false denier claim that the Anne Frank diaries are forgeries. For a comprehensive analysis see Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (NY: 1993), 229-235; Paul Kuttner, *The Holocaust: Hoax or History* (NY: 1996), 2-8. See especially David Barnow and Gerald Van Der Stroom, *The Diary of Anne Frank: The Critical Edition* (NY: 1989) prepared by the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation, especially pp. 102-172 for an examination of the handwriting. See also the *N Y Times* September 10, 1998 pp.A1 and A6 for important background information about the diaries and the recent publication of new diary pages.
6. See David Hackett, *The Buchenwald Report* (Boulder: 1995)
7. L-159 in *IMT* Vol. 37, p.621. For an excellent overview of Dachau see Harry W. Mazal, *The Dachau Gas Chambers THHP* (1997). Mazal reproduces a photo of the entrance to the gas chamber.
8. *IMT*. Vol. 37, 612-617
9. Letter of August 9, 1942 in Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein and Adalbert Ruckerl, *Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas* (Yale: 1993), 202.

10. See *ibid.*, 177-202. See also Konnilyn Feig, *Hitler's Death Camps: The Sanity of Madness* (NY: 1981) This study will not address the issue of the concentration camps on the soil of Germany proper. Many of the photos that were taken of these camps after liberation by the Allies show starving prisoners living in horrible conditions. Deniers claim that the Germans were not responsible for these conditions. Rather, deniers claim that the conditions were the result of a breakdown in the concentration camp system because Germany was losing the war and could not feed its prisoners. One of the worst of the camps was Bergen Belsen. Major A.L. Berney testified about Bergen Belsen at the war crimes trials for guards at that camp. He investigated the food situation at the camp after the liberation to ascertain why prisoners were not being fed. He stated: "I obtained a list of food in the store from [the person in charge of the food], and remember there were 600 tons of potatoes, 120 tons of tinned meat, 30 tons of sugar, upwards of 20 tons of powdered milk; cocoa, grain, wheat and other foodstuffs." He went on to state that he found "a very large bakery there with a capacity, I was told, of 60,000 loaves a day, which was completely staffed. It appeared to me that there was a very vast quantity of all the necessary materials for making bread. The bakery is still working now and most of the staff are the same." Berney was then asked : "From your investigation of the stocks available, was there any reason why Camp No.1 should not have been supplied with food". He replied: "I cannot see any conceivable reason". Fyfe, *The Trial of Joseph Kramer and Forty Four Others*, 53-54.

11. Text with denier commentary in Robert Faurisson, "The Muller Document", 8 JHR No.1 (Spring 1988), 117-121.

12. The texts of the reports from the Austrian Resistance Archives are at <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/orgs/austrian/austrian-resistance-archives/lachout-document.html>. See also, Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, *The Lachout "Dokument": Anatomy of a Forgery* (Austrian Resistance Archives: 1990)

12a. a copy of the bill appears in *Obozy hitlerowski na ziemiach polskich 1939-1945: Informator encyklopedyczny* (Warsaw: 1979), Illustration # 142. My thanks to Stephane Bruchfeld of the Holocaust and Genocide Studies Program at Uppsala University in Sweden for providing this information.

Holocaust denier Friedrich Berg has claimed that using diesel engines for homicidal gassing is not efficient. Therefore, he doubts that diesel engines were used and believes the supporting documentation is a forgery. Berg's claim is based on the notion that diesel engines are not really that deadly and would have been an inefficient killing method. Diesel engines were identified in some eyewitness testimony as the mechanism for pumping in carbon monoxide to the stationary gas chambers in Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka and Chelmno and mobile gas vans which patrolled the Soviet occupied territories. (See the discussion in the text for footnote 15 at pages 177-178 herein and the discussion in the below footnotes 13 and 15). See Berg's, "The Diesel Gas Chambers: A Myth Within a Myth," 5 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1984), 15-46. Also appears on <http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcdiesel.html>.

It should, however, be noted that there may also have been engines which were gasoline models which emit greater amounts of carbon monoxide and are more efficient for lethal gassing. It was difficult for witnesses to identify the precise type of engine being used.

Nevertheless, Berg ignored one of the original studies on diesel fumes which shows that the emissions can reach very lethal concentrations under the right conditions. John Holtz and M.A. Elliot, "The Significance of Diesel Exhaust Gas Analysis," 63 *Transactions of the ASME* (1943), 97 -105. The authors were able to run two large diesels under various loads and fuel ratios. They didn't have any problem making the exhaust highly lethal. - with up to 6% carbon monoxide. The adjustment of the

engine to increase the fuel air ratio was a trivial process in order to attain this level of toxicity. However, the authors also demonstrated that exhaust is lethal even at normal operating mode - 2.5% oxygen and 12% carbon dioxide - without having to adjust the engine. Also, they did not report any damage to the engines as Berg claimed would happen when a diesel engine ran under these conditions.

One of the conditions that contributes to lethal gassings using engines is when the chamber is compact. The displaced air makes the process more deadly. A German memo dated June 5, 1942, and cited and discussed in note 15 herein, which describes the gassing process in vans, states:

"The normal capacity of the vans is nine to ten per square meter [one square meter equals 10.763 square feet] . . . The problem [of space] cannot be solved by merely reducing the number of subjects treated, as has been done so far. For in this case a longer running time is required, as the empty space also needs to be filled with CO [carbon monoxide]. On the contrary, were the cargo area smaller, but fully occupied, the operation would take considerably less time, because there would be no empty space"

My thanks for the technical assistance of Dr. Dan Keren in the preparation of this note.

13. PS 501 in NCA, Vol. 3, pp. 418-422. See the discussion at pages 22 and : 23 of the present work. For a comprehensive analysis see Mathias Beer, "Die Entwicklung der Gaswagen beim Mord an den Juden," 37 Vierteljahreshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte No.3 (1987), 403-417. An English translation of this study by Dr. Ulrich Roessler appears at <http://www.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/camps/chelmno/gas-wagons/sonderdruck.0387>.

Holocaust denier Ingrid Weckert has claimed that this document is a forgery. The Gas Vans: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence ([codoh.com/found/mdwagon.html](http://codoh.com/found/mdwagon.html)), 14-19. She states that the origins of the document are "unknown and dubious" because of two letters which she claims attest to two different origins of the document. I have obtained the full set of PS 501 from the United States National Archives. Her claim of a contradiction in the origins of the document is without foundation. It is based on two memos. The first one is dated April 26, 1945 from the 12th Army Group. It states that the documents which comprise PS 501 were found in a Reich Main Security Reserve depot in Bad Sulza, Germany and were being forwarded to Paris. The second document, dated September 7, 1945, is from the United States Office of the Chief Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality. It states that the source of the original was unknown and that the copy it had was obtained from the OCC in London, the British prosecution for war crimes.

The most probable explanation for the September 7, 1945 memo is that the documents were passed along from Paris to the British, who then passed them along to the U.S. Chief Counsel to be used at the International Military Tribunal which prosecuted the war crimes. The U.S. Chief Counsel was probably not aware of who had discovered the documents and where they had been discovered. What is probable is that the Chief Counsel was not aware of the April 26 memo from the 12th Army which identified the source of the documents. Weckert tried to imply that the documents may have originated in Moscow, thus repeating a familiar denier claim that the Soviets forged evidence to incriminate innocent Germans. However, the April 26 document clearly shows that the Soviets had nothing to do with PS 501. The real issue raised by the April 26 and September 7 memos is that there was a communication problem between the various branches of the Allied powers, not that any forgery was involved.

Weckert also claimed that there were three different copies of PS 501. She does not, however, reveal from where she obtained these copies. One set of the copies she apparently received was from the

National Archives. I received photocopies of PS 501 from the National Archives and could not find some of the physical characteristics on the documents Weckert claims she found (i.e. archival numbering). Therefore, she appears to have obtained two other sets of these documents from a source other than the National Archives. However, she did not claim that any of the three copies differed in contents from one another. One of her complaints is that what she calls Specimen B, a carbon copy of the original, has certain notations on the exact same places as Specimen A, also a carbon copy of the original. She states that this should not be the case because the notations would have been written after the receipt of the memos which comprise PS 501. Therefore, she claims there should only be writing on Specimen A. The idea is apparently that the notations were not written on the original copy. The obvious answer is that either (1) the notations were written on the original copy or (2) Specimen B is a copy of Specimen A. In fact, we can be absolutely certain that if the notations did not appear on the exact same places on both sets of documents, Weckert would claim PS 501 to be a forgery on that basis.

August Becker, the author of the principal memo of May 16, 1942 which comprises the series of documents known as PS 501, gave a deposition in 1960 on the nature of the gas vans. He was recruited because people "like me, were specialists in extermination by gassing..." Becker had a Ph.D. in chemistry. Text in Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen and Volker Reiss, *The Good Old Days* (NY: 1988), 68-71.

14. PS 501 in NCA, Vol. 3, pp. 420 - 422. My thanks to the National Archives for providing me with photocopies of PS 501.

14a. Photocopy of the original with an English translation at

<http://www.holocaust-history.org/19420326-rauff-sonderwagen>.

The document is from the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz, Germany, reference R 58/871. It is also cited in Kogon et. al, *Nazi Mass Murder*, 182.

15. Original German and English translation in Kogon et. al, *Nazi Mass Murder*, 228-235 and THHP.

Holocaust denier Ingrid Weckert, has claimed that this document is a forgery. *The Gas Vans: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence* pp. 24-29 discussed in note 13 herein. She offers three "proofs." The document contains the word "einzigste". Weckert notes that this form of the word "einzig" does not exist in German, thereby suggesting the forger did not really know German. Mr. Juergen Landowski, a native German speaker who lives in Germany, has had his name in 100 books because he is professional translator. He informed me that the word is a common oral and written mistake made by many Germans. He writes in a communication to me dated April 1, 1999: "...Weckert assumes that German officials always and under all circumstances produced absolutely flawless documents. This is ludicrous. Ingrid Weckert has published a few books and articles, and since there is no book without mistakes, I'm prepared to prove that Ingrid Weckert herself is a forgery and doesn't exist."

Weckert also claimed that there are three versions of this document "which differ from each other in text underlining and in handwritten additions..." In fact, this only means that the authors of the two books which reproduced the original from the Koblenz archives made comments and underlinings on the document. Interestingly, Weckert did not claim that any of these three 'versions' differed as to text or content, which should have alerted her to the fact that she was looking at one and the same document in all three instances.

Her most important claim about this document, dated June 5, 1942, being a forgery is that it was written after a letter dated June 23, 1942. She claimed that the June 23 letter mentions a conversation that took place on June 16 and this same conversation is mentioned in the June 5 letter, eleven days before it took place. The context in which both of these letters place the subject matter does not preclude the fact that the June 5 letter was merely mentioning something that was spoken of again eleven days later. I have not had access to the June 23 letter. However, Stephane Bruchfeld of the Holocaust and Genocide Studies program at Uppsala University in Sweden has examined both letters. In a communication to me dated February 14, 1999, he writes:

"...it is quite obvious that there is no necessary connection between the two events referred to in the letters, i.e. there is no reason that the two events would be identical."

"The June 5 letter is a letter from Just to Rauff. Under item of that letter Just refers to a discussion with the manufacturer about the unwanted effects of shortening the van. There is no indication of who spoke to whom. The June 23 document is, as far as I understand, a memo to the RSHA [Reich Main Security Agency] and the SD chief about the construction of vans which speaks about letting the company Gaubschat continue building them despite the difficulties of the company... There is no specific information about precisely what [the participants at the June 16 meeting ] spoke about... but the impression I get is that it concerned several of the problems connected to the new construction of the vans. Why the 16 June talk would preclude another one prior to 5 June is beyond me."

In fact, a memo by Just on June 16, 1942 gives no information about the nature of the discussions. It only states : "For further action and immediate start of repairs. I request to be informed about arrival of vans." PS 501. See the discussion in note 13 herein.

16. Cole, however, admitted to denier critic Michael Shermer that the Institute for Historical Review must, of financial necessity, appeal to far right anti-Semites. Michael Shermer, *Why People Believe Weird Things* (NY: 1997), 193.

17. Text of the letter in the Daily Texan in

<http://www.nizkor.Org/ftp.cgi/people/p/piper.franciszek/press/daily.texan>. 1093. Some of Piper's letter is stilted because he normally writes in Polish, not English.

18. Arno Mayer, *Why the Heavens Did Not Darken* (NY: 1990), 365. For a scathing criticism of Mayer's methodology and lack of scholarship in this area see Christopher Browning, *The Path to Genocide* (NY: 1992), 82-83.

19. Mayer *ibid.*, 362

20. *Ibid.*, 362

21. Robert F aurisson, "The Mechanics of Gassing," 1 JHR No.1 (Spring 1980), 23-30; "The Problem of the Gas Chambers", 1 JHR No.2 (Summer 1980), 103-114; "The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to be Physically Inconceivable", 2 JHR No.4 (Winter 1981), 311-317; "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?" 2 JHR No.4 (Winter 1981), 322-327. For an analysis see Nadine Fresco, "Denial of the Dead", 28 *Dissent* (Fall 1981), 467-483.

22. Sources cited in *ibid.*

23. Fred Leuchter, "The Leuchter Report: The How and Why", 9 JHR No.2 (Summer 1989), 134-135.
24. Text of the telegram in Shelly Shapiro, Truth Prevails: Demolishing Holocaust Denial: the End of the Leuchter Report (NY: 1990), 56.
25. Fred Leuchter, The Leuchter Report: The End of a Myth (Toronto: 1988), 3. The report was also published by David Irving in London. Irving credits the report with his conversion to denial. Leuchter does not appear to have purchased the brochures which are available to tourists at Auschwitz.
26. Ibid., 15
27. Arthur Goodman, "Leuchter: Exposed and Discredited by the Court," in Shapiro, ed., Truth Prevails, 78-79.
28. Ibid., 80 - 81
29. Shapiro, ed., Truth Prevails, 10, reproduces Leuchter's testimony and Vasquez's letter.
30. Text of Leuchter's testimony and warden's letter in *ibid.*, 18-19
31. Ibid., 28.
32. Washington Post, June 18, 1991. Text in <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/people/l/leuchter-fred/press/washington-post-0691.html>.
33. Jean - Claude Pressac, Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers (NY: 1989), 231, 429, 436, 442, 448, 458.
34. Leuchter Report, 8.
35. Shapiro, ed., Truth Prevails, 82.
36. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz, 211. Leuchter claim in The Leuchter Report, 11.
37. Leuchter Report, 4.
38. German text with English translation in John Mendelsohn, The Holocaust (NY: 1982), Vol.12, pp. 132-142. English translation in Leuchter Report, 18-20.
39. Pressac, Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers, 221, 230, 231, 274, 275, 289, 355, 357-360.
40. See the discussion on page 247 of the present work for an analysis of how many were killed and the method of body disposal during the Hungarian operation. During the operation it would have been possible to use the chambers and ovens of Crematoria II and III once and the pits of the White Bunker and Crematorium V twice to dispose of the bodies of gassed victims. Thus about 1000 to 1500 could be

killed in Crematoria II and III, for a total of 2000 - 3000 in one operation. Another 6000 could be killed in two operations in the White Bunker and Crematorium V and their bodies disposed of on pyres and in pits.

41. Leuchter Report, 12.

42. Jean - Claude Pressac, "The Deficiencies and Inconsistencies in the Leuchter Report", in Shapiro, Truth Prevails, 45.

43. Arthur Goodman, "Leuchter: Exposed and Discredited by the Court", in Shapiro, ed., Truth Prevails, 82.

44. Carlo Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend (Newport Beach: 1994), 54; see also Friedrich Paul Berg, "The German Delousing Chambers", 7 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1986), 76, who - while denying any homicidal gassings - writes that several dozen people could be gassed in an area of about 65 square feet.

45. Pressac, "Deficiencies and Inconsistencies", 37-38.

46. Note 38 herein.

47. Deborah Lipstadt, Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory (NY: 1993), 168. See the transcript of Leuchter's testimony on these issues in <http://www.nizkor.Org/hweb/people/l/leuchter-fred/leuchter-04.html>.

48. Leuchter Report, 1; Robert Faurisson, "The End of a Myth", 8 JHR No.3 (Fall 1988), 378.

49. Robert Faurisson, "Response to a Paper Historian," 7 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1986), 37.

50. See the discussion at pages 189-190 of the present work.

51. The Leuchter Report, 8

52. Denier Paul Grubach argued that morgues would have to be deloused because typhus ridden bodies were stored in them and lice "evacuate the corpses of those who have died from the disease". "The Leuchter Report Vindicated", 12 JHR No. 4 (Winter 1992/1993), 463. As was noted in Chapter 4 herein the Auschwitz Death Books show far fewer deaths from typhus than previously thought.

Moreover, Grubach has failed to address two important points. First, if the lice evacuated the bodies, then the prisoners would have died in the morgue if this is where the lice were found. This would be consistent with prisoners being gassed in the morgues. If the prisoners died outside of the morgue, (i.e. the living barracks) then the lice would not be found in the morgue because they would have evacuated the dead bodies in these structures. As will be shown later, a study of the living barracks failed to turn up any cyanide.

Second, and more importantly, is that deniers have always claimed that the crematoria were built to cremate prisoners who died of typhus. Why then would the camp authorities store these bodies in areas where the lice would spread? It would make more sense to immediately cremate such bodies rather than allow the disease to spread. Additionally, the worst of the typhus epidemic occurred in 1942. The

first of the four Birkenau crematoria did not become operational until March 1943.

53. Paul Grubach, *ibid.*, 448.

54. "An Official Polish Report on the Auschwitz Gas Chambers," 11 JHR No.2 (Summer 1991), 207. Text of the report on pp. 209-214.

55. Pressac, "Deficiencies and Inconsistencies in the Leuchter Report," and "Additional Notes: Leuchter's Videotape", in Shapiro, ed., *Truth Prevails*, 40, 46, 63-68.

56. Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account* (NY: 1993), 52 and Rebecca Camhi Fromer, *The Holocaust Odyssey of Daniel Bennis, Sonderkommando* (Tuscaloosa: 1993), 46

57. Rudolph Hoess, *Death Dealer* (NY: 1992), 156.

58. See Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 30, 156. On pages 155 and 156 Hoess suggests that only two gassings occurred at Block 11. The first occurred while he was away. However, he was present for the second gassing. This causes many problems for deniers because unlike the crematoria, which deniers claim had to be deloused for lice infested bodies (see the discussion in note 52 above), Block 11 was never used as a morgue.

59. These are reproduced in Friedrich Berg, "Typhus and the Jews", 8 JHR No.4 (Winter 1989), 464, 468, 469, 471, 474; and "The German Delousing Chambers", 7 JHR No. 1 (Spring 1986), 88. Berg, who is at least familiar with the lethal properties of Zyklon B, has taken issue with Robert Faurisson's claim that massive amounts of Zyklon B would be needed for mass murder. Berg describes Faurisson's claim as "pure fantasy! He [Faurisson] is apparently unaware of the meaning of the word 'saturate' and the fact that the amount of HCN needed to kill someone is less than one gram whereas the amount needed to 'saturate' a corpse is at least a thousand times greater." *Gas Chambers for Robert Faurisson: Answers to a Challenge* (<http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gaschamb.html>). CODOH is an internet site for deniers.

60. Emil Wustinger, "Increased Use of Hydrocyanic Acid Delousing Chambers," *Gesundheits-Ingenieur* (1944), 179-180 reproduced in Berg, "The German Delousing Chambers", 89. For an excellent overview of Zyklon B see Richard Green, *The Chemistry of Auschwitz*, and Leuchter, Rudolf and the Iron Blues. Both of these studies appear at THHP. See also Brian Harmon, *Technical Aspects of the Holocaust* in <http://www.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/camps/auschwitz/cyanide/cyanide.001> Green is a chemist and Harmon a biologist.

61. Denier Paul Grubach, "The Leuchter Report Vindicated", 463 cited a German wartime document { NI-9098 } which stated that Zyklon B should be used for large scale fumigation of storerooms. Grubach was arguing that "storerooms" should be equated to morgues which store bodies. In fact, the context of "storerooms" in the report refers to places which store food, furniture, and clothing, not dead bodies.

62. Studies cited are: G. Peters and W. Rasch, "Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausaure-Durchgasung bei tiefen Temperaturen", *Zeitschrift fuer Zoologie und Schaedlingsbekaempfung*, Heft 8/9, 1941. Original German and English translation at THHP. R. Irmscher, "Nochmals: Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausaure bei tiefen Temperature", *Zeitschrift fur Hygiensche Zoologie Und Schadlingsbekampfung*, Heft 2/3, 1942. Original German with English translation at THHP; Emil Wustinger, note 60 herein, p. 90.

63. A review of the secondary literature also tends to confirm the absence of using Zyklon B in the living barracks. Among the earliest memoirs were those of Polish prisoner Seweryna Szmaglewska who was in Auschwitz from 1942-1945. She devotes two chapters to the delousing process which took place in special barracks constructed for this purpose. However, nowhere does she mention the delousing of the living quarters. *Smoke Over Birkenau* (NY: 1947), 64-111. (Not to be confused with a book by Liana Millu with the same title.)

Ukrainian prisoner Petro Mirchuk, who was in Auschwitz from 1941-1945, worked in the special delousing barracks. However, he says nothing about delousing the living barracks. In *the German Mills of Death* (NY: 1976), 99.

Prisoner Macha Ravine testified about taking furniture and clothing to the delousing barracks. However, she says nothing about delousing the living barracks. Testimony in *Pressac, Auschwitz*, 54.

Mira Rycke Kimmelman was a prisoner first in Majdanek and then in Auschwitz. In her memoirs, she specifically recalls the delousing of her living barracks in Majdanek. However, no such recollection appears about Auschwitz. *Echoes From the Holocaust* (Knoxville: 1997), 44.

63a A partial attempt to answer the Institute has been made by denier Germar Rudolf, formerly of Germany's Max Planck Institute. Rudolf's writings have been thoroughly analyzed by Richard Green, who has a Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Stanford University. Green has examined the scientific basis of Rudolf's assertions. Not surprisingly, Dr. Green has found Rudolf's scientific assertions wanting in a number of respects. The technical nature of these writings is beyond the scope of the present study. The reader is referred to the following scientific studies by Dr. Green which appear on THHP. *Chemistry is Not the Science: Rudolf, Rhetoric and Reduction with Jamie McCarthy*; and *Leuchter, Rudolf and the Iron Blues and The Chemistry of Auschwitz*.

One of Rudolf's arguments is that if the homicidal gas chambers had really functioned as such there would have been the formation of Prussian Blue on the walls of the chambers. A blue coloration appears on the walls of some of the delousing chambers. However, the Cracow Institute noted that Prussian Blue did not form in all of the rooms used as delousing chambers. This signifies that Prussian blue was not necessarily formed no matter what the concentrations or exposure times to HCN were. Moreover, the Institute noted that the average delousing lasted 72 times longer than a homicidal gassing (24 hours vs. 20 minutes. This time differential has implications for the formation of Prussian Blue. The issue arises as to whether 72 homicidal gassings of 20 minutes each occurring over a long period of time would be more likely to effect the ability of Prussian Blue to form as opposed to one intense 24 hour delousing. The answer is most certainly no. Neither Rudolf nor any other denier has addressed this specific issue. The point, however, is academic from the denier perspective. This is because if Prussian Blue had turned up in the homicidal gas chamber morgues of the crematoria, deniers would then argue that its formation is evidence that the morgues were deloused. They would argue that a homicidal gassing would not have produced Prussian Blue because the cumulative effect of many short gassings over a long period of time (72 gassings at 20 minutes each over a period of weeks or months) is less likely to produce the same effect that one intense delousing produces over a continuous 24 hour period. In other words, it made no difference what turned up in the morgues. Either way deniers would offer the same argument but in a different context.

In this respect it is important to note that Rudolf is directly contradicting Leuchter because the latter claimed that the presence of hydrocyanic acid in the morgues was evidence of delousing. However, the

logical conclusion of Rudolfs argument is that such a delousing would have to produce Prussian Blue. The question therefore becomes: how did the hydrocyanic acid get into the morgue if not from delousing?

It should also be pointed in this regard that there were in all likelihood many more delousings than homicidal gassings. Delousings had to take place all year round. Homicidal gassings did not always occur on a regular basis. In addition, many of the homicidal gassings occurred in the two bunkers outside of the camp, not in the crematoria.

We can do a rough calculation of the total time spent in homicidal gassing as opposed to a delousing. There were approximately 1.1 million killed in the camp. Probably about 1 million of these were gassed. Of these, about 250,000 to 300,000 were probably killed in the two bunkers, of which there is not sufficient remainder to conduct any tests. This leaves about 750,000 to be killed in the five crematoria. Probably no more than 25,000 were killed in Krema I. This means that there were 700,000 to 750,000 killed in the four Birkenau crematoria. Assuming that there were 1500 people killed per gassing - a conservative number - there would have been a total of 500 gassings at no more than 20 minutes each. This means a total of 167 hours of gassing in the four crematoria. It would have only taken 8 or 9 delousings in all 10 of the delousing installations to equal this total, and the delousing chambers operated far more frequently than the homicidal gas chambers. In other words, 700,000 people could have gassed in the time it took for 8 or 9 delousings. Seen in this light, it is easy to understand the discrepancy between the amounts of cyanide found in the crematoria homicidal chambers versus the delousing chambers.

64. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz, 211 and THHP. In the original German text the word "Vergasungskeller" is underlined. Deniers have argued that this memo should not be given sinister interpretations because it is not marked secret. The claim being that if it did refer to murder it would have been marked secret. However, as shown on pages 210-211 and the discussion in note 29 for chapter 10, there was a blanket order of secrecy on all of these projects which had been issued in June 1942. Therefore, it was not necessary to label each document that dealt with these matters as "secret."

65. Arthur Bute, Hoax of the Twentieth Century (Los Angeles: 1978), 121

66. Harper Collins, German-English, English-German Dictionary (Stuttgart: 1991), 708; Cassell's German- English, English-German Dictionary (London: 1968), 515.

67. The New Wildhagen German Dictionary (Chicago: 1969), 1119.

68. Butz, Hoax (10th ed., 1997), Supp. C., 380. This was a paper delivered at the 1992 conference of the Institute For Historical Review.

69. Ibid., 381-2.

70. Ibid., 382.

71. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz, 212.

72. Text in ibid. 231.

73. Arthur Butz, "The Nagging Gassing Cellar Problem," 16 JHR No. 4 {July/August 1997}, 21.

The idea had first been expanded upon from an earlier remark in 1991 by Faurisson, in an article by denier Samuel Crowell, a pseudonym. Technique and Operation of the German Anti-Gas Shelters in World War II: A Refutation of J.C. Pressac's Criminal Traces (<http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconpressac.html>), 16. Bute did not acknowledge Crowell. It should be noted that in their attempts to distance the word vergasung from Zyklon B, Bute and Crowell ignored the research of fellow denier Carlo Mattogno who found the term in a 1941 Auschwitz camp document which referred to one of the camp's delousing barracks where the gas was used to delouse clothing. Thus, Mattogno clearly linked the term to Zyklon B. Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 64. Mattogno's explanation of the word "vergasungskeller" as housing a delousing chamber in relation to Crematorium II will be examined in the next part of this chapter.

Interestingly, it is Mattogno who finally debunked the idea that the crematoria could have been built with the idea that they would be used as air raid shelters. He examined all 88,200 pages in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow which deal with the building of these structures. Mattogno states that there is no evidence in any of these documents that the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency ever considered the possibility of using the crematoria for such a purpose when building them. Reply to Samuel Crowell's "Comments" About "My Critique of the Bomb Shelter Thesis " (<http://www.codoh.com/granata/reply.html>), 8.

74. Bute, *ibid.*, 21 writes that he found two Russian-German dictionaries which refer to gaskeller as meaning gas shelter. Predictably, Bute ignored all of the standard German dictionaries which use the word schutz to denote protection. The Oxford-Duden German Dictionary {Oxford: 1997}, 1462; The Collins German Dictionary (NY:1991), 622. The German word keller is used to denote a cellar, not a shelter. Butz's interpretation would only work if the word gasschutzkeller, gas protection cellar, was used.

75. Robert Faurisson, "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers: Part 1", 11 JHR No.1 (Spring 1991), 56-57. Faurisson also argued that this "gassing cellar" could have been Corpse Cellar III in Crematorium I, where the gas was stored. The problem is that the final completion document on Crematorium II reveals that there was no Corpse Cellar III. Text in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 231. Faurisson's problem is that his whole thesis rests on the "gassing cellar" being a gas storage room.

76. Butz, *Hoax*, 121.

77. Text of letter dated March 6, 1943 in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 221, 375.

78. Berg, "German Delousing Chambers," 78.

79. Faurisson, "Auschwitz..." Part 1, p.59. Letter of March 25, 1943 in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 230. Denier Carlo Mattogno writes that preheating would not be needed for a homicidal gassing because the victims' bodies would be sufficient to heat up the area. *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 64.

80. Bill from Topf and Sons dated August 20, 1943 in AA File 502-1-327, Reel 42, p. 2 of the memo.

81. Texts in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 373.

82. Letter of March 14, 1943 in *ibid.*, 373.

83. Text of completion document on Crematorium II in *ibid.*, 231. The completion document gives the dimensions of the two corpse cellars, but does not specifically state which is the larger structure. However, we know that Corpse Cellar n was the larger structure because of a floor plan of the two Corpse Cellars in documents from the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency from October 1942 which were discovered in Prague. These plans give the dimensions of the two corpse cellars and specify which is CC I and which is CC II. They are reproduced in Florian Freund, Bertrand Perz and Karl Stuhlpfarrer, "Der Bau des Vernichtungslagers Auschwitz - Birkenau," 20 *Zeitgeschichte* (May/June 1993) Heft 5/6, p.206. My thanks to Ulrich Roessler of THHP and Ms. Claudia Rapp of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte at the University of Wien for providing me with copies of this article.

84. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 65

85. Faurisson, "Auschwitz... Part I", 49, 50.

86. Arthur Butz, "The Nagging Gassing Cellar Problem", 22.

87. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: the End of a Legend*, 61, 62.

88. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 359-361. See also pp. 230, 231.

89. *Ibid.*, 231.

90. *Ibid.*, 436.

91. The August 25, 1944 photo showing the openings was first reproduced in Dino Brugioni and Robert Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex* (Washington, D.C.: 1979), 11. See also page 84 of the present work.

92. Faurisson, "Auschwitz... Part 1", 54. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: the End of a Legend*, 69; Enrique Aynat, "Neither Trace nor Proof of the Seven Auschwitz "Gassing" Sites, 11 *JHR* No.2 (Summer 1991), 202. All of these authors ignored the reason, discussed in footnote 93, for Pressac's conclusion.

93. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 429,430. Pressac found the error by comparing this document with an earlier drawing. The document which places the devices in Corpse Cellar II also states that in Corpse Cellar n there are ten lamps and three taps while in Corpse Cellar I there are 16 lamps and 5 taps. However, an earlier drawing states that there are ten lamps and five taps in cellar II and 16 lamps and three taps in cellar I. Thus, Pressac concluded that there was an invoice error in the document. Considering that the photo shows the devices over Corpse Cellar I, his conclusion was quite reasonable. For more on this document see the commentary by Jamie McCarthy and Mark Van Alstine which precedes the document's publication on THHP.

The above inversion error is the type one would expect to find in a camp document. For example, a document by the Auschwitz Crematorium Administration from June 1, 1944 mentions the repair of doors on the 30 ovens in Crematoria IV and V. However, these two crematoria only had a total of 16 ovens, or eight in each. The 30 ovens were in Crematoria II and III., where the repairs were most likely taking place. The author of the document simply made a mistake. See APMO, Dpr.-Hd/11a, Nr. 1600 and Nr. 1617, p. 96

94. Jean - Claude Pressac with Robert - Jan Van Pelt, "The Machinery Of Mass Murder at Auschwitz", in Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, (Bloomington: 1994), 230. Photocopy of the original document on p. 231.

95. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 66. In fact, Pressac himself noted that these devices could not be used to detect prussic acid. Rather, he understood the significance of the document as connecting Zyklon B to Crematorium II. *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz: Le Machinerie du Meurtre de Masse* (Paris: 1993), 73 and "The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz", 230 where he notes that this letter "amounts to another leak of the existence of a lethal gas chamber in Crematorium II..."

Mattogno's thesis that this document is a forgery was not very well thought out. The forgers could have certainly fabricated more incriminating documents. For example, it would make far more sense to forge a document stating how many people could be killed in a gas chamber and have it signed by camp authorities. Or, better yet, forge a document stating how many people have been gassed to date. Mattogno appears to have realized the problem with his thesis because several years later he claimed that this document was an original which was not forged but probably altered by the KGB to say something other than what it initially said. As usual, he presented no evidence. The Gasprufer of Auschwitz (<http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcgvpruf.html>), 23.

Mattogno's thesis is that the camp authorities would have ordered gas detectors from the firm which manufactured Zyklon B, Tesch and Stenbow, not the oven builders. In fact, it is probable that Tesch and Stenbow were simply out of gas detectors and that the Auschwitz authorities were seeking someone to help them. This was 1943 and Germany was losing the war. Many items were in short supply. He presents no evidence that these devices were readily available on demand to the camp authorities. In fact, the letter itself supports the view that these devices were in short supply when it states that "we can tell you that for two weeks now we have been making inquiries of five different firms about the apparatus you want indicating the traces of Prussic acid." Why would Topf spend two weeks searching for these items if they were readily available?

Moreover, in a recent article Mattogno unknowingly presents evidence that these items were not readily available. He found an order for Crematorium II dated April 13, 1943 for two disinfestation heaters and a warm air induction device. These devices could be used to heat an area so that the Zyklon B would vaporize more efficiently. However, an inventory of materials delivered to Crematorium II shows that the warm air induction device [warmluftzufuhrung] only arrived on June 11, 1943. The April 13 order is reproduced by Mattogno in *Morgue Cellars of Birkenau: Gas Chambers or Disinfesting Chambers* ([codoh.com/granata/liechen.htm](http://codoh.com/granata/liechen.htm) footnote 21 attachment. See the discussion in note 116 herein. The June 11 delivery is in AA File 502-1-327, reel 42, bill from Topf and Sons dated August 20, 1943, p. 2. See the discussion at note 80 on page 193 of the present work. The disinfestation heaters appearing in the April 13 memo were eventually delivered to the Central Sauna to be used for legitimate purposes.

96. Arthur Butz, "Gas Detectors in Auschwitz Crematory II", 16 JHR No.3 (September/October 1997), 27. Butz's theory on these gas detectors appears to have been far fetched even for other deniers. He drew fire from fellow denier Carlo Mattogno, who noted that there was no support for this theory in any of the literature dealing with the subject. Mattogno notes that the problem Butz mentions was unknown until the 1970s, meaning that the Germans could not have thought this to be a consideration in the 1940s. Carlo Mattogno, *A Critique of Arthur Butz's "Gas Detectors in Auschwitz Crematory II"* (<http://www.codoh.com/viewpoints/vpmatbutz.html>).

97. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 429. Photocopy of the list on p.430 and THHP.

98. Faurisson, "Auschwitz... Part 1", 53.
99. Pressac, Auschwitz, 429. Denier Enrique Aynat erroneously stated that Pressac did not prove that the showers were a sham. Aynat, however, could not explain why 14 showers would be in a morgue." Neither Trace Nor Proof: The Seven Auschwitz "Gassing" Sites",203.
100. Pressac, Auschwitz, 231. Faurisson, "Auschwitz... Part 1," 54 also acknowledged that there was a shower on the ground floor.
101. Pressac, Auschwitz, 429.
102. Ibid. ,429.
103. Faurisson, "Auschwitz.. Part I", p.53. Faurisson also claimed that such doors were common in air raid shelters and debusing chambers. He was indirectly hinting that the crematoria could have been used for these purposes. The first claim was examined earlier; the second will examined in the next part of this chapter. "Auschwitz.. .Part 1" , 52, 56.
104. Pressac, Auschwitz, 231, 436.
105. Completion document for Crematorium II in Ibid., 231.
106. Aynat, "Neither Trace...", 202.
107. Faurisson argued that there could not have been gas chambers in Crematoria IV and V because there were no undressing rooms in these structures. "Auschwitz...Part 1," 44. He presented no information as to how he could have possibly known this. In fact, both Crematoria were large enough to have places where people could undress.
- 108 Pressac, Auschwitz, 442, 443, 445, 448, 452, 454 for Crematorium IV and p. 454 for Crematorium V.
109. Ibid., 446. Photocopy of reports on p.450.
110. Ibid. ,456.
111. Faurisson, "Auschwitz.. Part 1", 49.
112. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 63-64.
113. . Text of completion document in Pressac, Auschwitz, 231.
114. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend,, 64.
115. See page 153 of the present work..
116. The drawings and correspondence are in AA file, 502-1-331, reel 42. Mattogno's alleged findings cited in Mark Weber, "Important New Documents Found in Moscow Archives," 15 JHR No. 6

(Nov./Dec. 1995), 36.

In 1999 Mattogno reproduced two documents which he claimed were related to each other. He essentially argued that when both documents are read together, they show a delousing installation was in Crematorium II - though he later changed his mind. He was trying to explain the meaning of the term "gassing cellar." The first document was from Topf and dated April 13, 1943. It mentions requests by the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency for two disinfestation heaters for Crematorium n. It also requested a warm air induction device [warmluftzufuhrung]. Disinfestation heaters were used to warm an area before a delousing. As was shown earlier in this chapter, warm air helped Zyklon B gas to take effect more quickly. What Mattogno had actually done was to show that the authorities were attempting to warm the morgue. As noted earlier, (see the discussion at note 80 on page 193 of the present work) the warm air induction device was delivered in June 1943. However, the document which lists this delivery says nothing about the heaters, so that the authorities may have believed that the warmluftzufuhrung was sufficient for these purposes. The two disinfestation heaters were eventually delivered to the Central Sauna.

Mattogno was on dangerous ground for a denier because he was repudiating testimony given at a Swiss trial by another denier who was identified as an "engineer" and a "gas applications expert" that gassings were not possible in the cellars of Crematoriums II and III because they were too cold. Testimony of Wolfgang Frohlich reproduced in 17 JHR No.4 {July/August 1998}, 2-4.

Mattogno then reproduced a document he found in the Auschwitz Archives which gives details on a building project being performed by a roofing company for a disinfestation installation. On the top of the document it states: "Crematorium-Auschwitz." Mattogno initially believed that the document referred to Crematorium II. Thus, when this report was added to the one about the Topf disinfestation heaters, Mattogno argued that a delousing facility was in Crematorium n. The problem with Mattogno's rationale is that the building he thought was a crematorium because it was listed as such on the worker's report could not have been a crematorium. The report does not specify the exact nature of the work being done. However, it states that there are being placed on a building 2460 square meters of bituman cardboard and 4620 kilos of bituman. Harry Mazal of The Holocaust History Project has done this type of work and informed me that the bituman cardboard is probably tar paper being placed on the concrete roof. The size of the material being used supports this view: 2460 sq meters equals about 25,000 square feet. The bill is from the United Roofing - Felt Factories, Incorporated [Vereingte Dachpappen - Fabriken Aktiengesellschaft]

The report states that the work was being performed from May 16 to July 21, 1943. However, all of the crematoria had already been built by July. In fact, there is a photo of Crematorium II's roof being built in October 1942, seven months before the work on the roof of the building listed in the report. The photo shows bitumin being placed on the roof of Crematorium II. Photo in Pressac, Auschwitz, 332 (My thanks to Harry Mazal of THHP for calling the photo to my attention). Bitumin is listed in the July 1943 report as among the materials being used. Therefore, it could not have been any of the crematoria. Crematorium II was completed in March 1943.

What then was the building listed in the report? The building could only have been the Central Sauna which was completed in December 1943. There is a photo of the uncompleted roof on the Central Sauna taken in the summer of 1943, the time of the report . Photo in Pressac, Auschwitz, 77. The report reproduced by Mattogno states that the work is being done on a disinfestation facility [Entwesunsanlage], which was the purpose of the Central Sauna.

I called the above to Mattogno's attention in an e mail to an associate of his in early March 1999. His associate informed me in an e mail dated March 5, 1999 that he had passed my observations along to Mattogno. In June 1999, Mattogno issued a new version of the article where he admitted that the bill for the roof work was for the Central Sauna. However, he now argued that the documents for the disinfestation heaters and the bill for the roof work together "portray the expression of a plan or at least of the Zentralbauleitung's intention to combine cremation and disinfestation in the same edifice." In fact, these documents show no such thing. The bill for the roof work was issued by a private company, not the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency. The Agency's request for the heaters only shows that they wanted to heat the homicidal gas chamber so that the gas would spread more effectively. Since Crematorium II received the warmluftzufuhrung [warm air induction device], the authorities may have believed that the heaters were not necessary.

The question arises as to why the report mentions a Crematorium when the building could have only been the Central Sauna. The Central Sauna was located between Crematoriums III and IV. Crematorium III was next to n and Crematorium IV was next to V. The worker who wrote the report probably thought that he was working on a building that was a crematorium as well as a disinfestation facility. Given the Central Sauna's location in the area of four crematoria, such an error would have been understandable. The two documents on the disinfestation heaters and the roof on the building are reproduced by Carlo Mattogno, *Morgue Cellars of Birkenau: Gas Shelters or Disinfesting Chambers?* (<http://www.codoh.com/granata.leichen.html>) attached to footnotes 21 and 25 of the article.

Thus, the principal problem with Mattogno's delousing chamber thesis is that of all the thousands of documents he has examined- 88,200 pages in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow in addition to documents in the Auschwitz State Museum- he has failed to identify even one which places a delousing installation in any crematoria. Nor has he provided any evidence that the Auschwitz authorities even considered this possibility. It might be instructive to recall in this respect that Mattogno criticized Samuel Crowell's thesis that the crematoria were built to house air raid shelters on the grounds that there were no documents in the Auschwitz Archives supporting this idea. See the discussion in note 74 herein.

117. Photocopy of this document in Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton, eds. *Archives of the Holocaust* (NY: 1989), Vol. 11, Part 2, p. 285. German text with English translation also at THHP. The so called "delousing van" used carbon monoxide poison, not prussic acid.

118. IMT, Vol.4, p.322. Text of Ohlendorfs testimony also in Michael Berenbaum, ed., *Witness to the Holocaust* (NY: 1997), 121-135. Cite on p. 128. Ohlendorf stated that the reason for this order was because Himmler did not want married men to have to aim at women and children because of the psychological strain. Berenbaum, 132.

119. See the discussion at notes 69-76, pages 192 and 193, and notes 110-111, page 198, of the present work.

120. In *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 64, Mattogno argued that it was not unusual for a crematorium to have a delousing facility. However, he has never presented any evidence that the Germans used a morgue as a delousing facility at any time during the war. Nor did he explain why the Germans would use a morgue to serve such a function when there were nine other installations in Auschwitz for delousing at the time the "gassing cellar" document was issued.

Mattogno cited a document from another camp reproduced by Pressac (*Auschwitz*, 561) which showed

plans dated May 29, 1945 - after Germany had surrendered- for a crematorium which housed a delousing chamber. But these plans say nothing about a morgue being used for delousing. There are original drawings by the Auschwitz authorities which clearly show the delousing facilities in a building separate from the crematorium. Pressac, Auschwitz, 76.

121. These structures are thoroughly discussed in Pressac, Auschwitz, 23-52 on Auschwitz I and 53-63 on Birkenau. Photos of the two delousing buildings in Birkenau are on pp. 59, 60.

Immediately before arguing that the Auschwitz authorities planned to install disinfestation chambers in Crematoria II and IV, Mattogno claimed, on the basis of a German study, that the air extraction device in Crematorium II was not strong enough to extract the gas needed for a delousing installation. He did not attempt to reconcile this argument with the one he was making about installing a delousing installation there. At the time he made this argument about there being insufficient gas extractive capabilities, the Cracow Institute does not appear to have released its report. Mattogno's monograph and the report came out in the same year. Therefore, when he made this argument, he did not have to explain the actual presence of hydrocyanic acid in Crematorium n.

In 1996 Mattogno stated: "There is nothing, for example, to prevent the morgues of the crematorium from being fumigated with Zyklon B for disinfection purposes..." My Banned Holocaust Interview (Palos Verdes: 1996), 15. He did not attempt to reconcile this statement with his claim that there was not sufficient air extractive capability for Zyklon B for the morgues, which he once again argued in this interview. Thus, he simultaneously argued that "nothing" would prevent such a fumigation while at the same time arguing that the lack of extractive capacity would indeed prevent it!

In 1945 the Cracow Institute of Judiciary Expertise did a toxicological study of the six grills which had been a part of the ventilation system of Corpse Cellar I of Crematorium II. The tests indicated the presence of hydrocyanic compounds. Three of these grills are kept in the Auschwitz Museum reserve. Pressac, "The Deficiencies and Inconsistencies of The Leuchter Report", 41-42.

122. Leuchter Report, 8. See footnote 51 herein.

123. Jean - Claude Pressac with Robert - Jan Van Pelt, "The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz", 223.

124. "Bauvorhaben: der Zentralbauleitung der Waffen SS und Polizei Auschwitz, die im Jahre 1943 gebaut werden sollen." March 5, 1943 in AA File 502-1-79, p. 2, Reel 23; "Geschäftsverteilungsplan der Zentralbauleitung der Waffen SS und Polizei Auschwitz und der unterstellten Bauleitungen", (1944) AA file 502-1-50, p. 6, reel 21.

125. "Aktenvermerk Betr: Stromversorgung und Installation des KL und KGL," in AA File 502-1-26, Reel 20. Text also at THHP.

126. Memo of November 27, 1942 in the Auschwitz State Museum cited in Pressac, "Machinery of Mass Murder," 223.

127. NO 4634 in NMT, Vol. 4, p. 1166.

128. See the discussion at pages 21-23 of the present work

129. See the discussion at pages 85-86 of the present work.
130. All three documents are in Raul Hilberg, *Documents of Destruction* (NY: 1971), 220-221.
131. Mark Weber, "Damning Documentary Evidence ?," 11 JHR No.3 (Fall 1991)
132. Pressac, *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz*, 107, fn. 256. Mattogno argument in *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 45.
133. Pressac, *ibid.*, 46. Mattogno's arguments in *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*. 46, 76. Mattogno craftily misrepresented Pressac's views of these documents. Pressac was showing that the "special treatment" memo was about gassing prisoners while the "special measures" memo was about the Central Sauna, where there were no homicidal gas chambers. However, when Mattogno first referred to the "special treatment" memo he cited Pressac's views on special measures and tried to make it look as if Pressac was referring to sanitation in connection with special treatment. Mattogno wrote that it was clear that "special treatment reserved for the registered prisoners of the camp referred simply to the 'sanitary measures put into practice for the prisoners' to use the words of Jean-Claude Pressac." *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 46. In fact, Pressac had never used such language in connection with "special treatment."

Mattogno has claimed that an Auschwitz construction plan for October 1942 supports the notion that a "disinfestation facility... fur sonderbehandlung [for special treatment] was foreseen and planned specifically for the hygienic - sanitary treatment of the prisoners." *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 46. The problem is that the document he cites does not provide support for this proposition. The source he cites is from a plan by the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency found in Prague. The reference is under that part of the plan dealing with a disinfestation facility where the word sonderbehandlung is mentioned. Mattogno concluded from this that the word deals with sanitation issues. However, when the whole document is read in its full context a different picture emerges.

The document deals with many different construction projects planned for the Birkenau area of Auschwitz. The heading on the first page of the document states: "Building Projects for Prisoner of War Camp Auschwitz: Implementation of Special Treatment." An overview of the costs for all of these projects is given. On the second page the same heading appears with the words special treatment where details for the costs are given for the various projects. One of the projects under this heading is the planned crematoria. Therefore, all of the building projects were concerned with the special treatment. Read in its proper context the document is saying that Birkenau is to be a place where special treatment will be carried out. This interpretation is consistent with other documents from the Auschwitz Central Construction Agency located in the Auschwitz Archives from 1943 and 1944 and cited in note 124 herein. In both of those documents the same terminology is used: "Implementation of Special Treatment" [Durchführung der Sonderbehandlung]. In the one from March 1943 directly under these words are listed Crematoria n through V. Neither of these documents makes any specific reference to the disinfestation facilities as being used for special treatment. Both are referring to the overall camp's function as a place where special treatment is being carried out. The October 1942 plan appears in the source cited in note 83 herein pp. 202, 203, 207.

The role of delousing in special treatment dealt with fumigating the clothing of prisoners who were killed in the gas chambers. Prisoners had to undress prior to entering the chambers. This is the context of how "special treatment" should be viewed in that part of the October 1942 plan that deals with the disinfestation installation.

134. Hoess, Death Dealer, 32. Testimonies of Auschwitz SS guard Richard Bock, Sonderkommandos Szlama Dragon, Moshe Gabarz and Filip Muller in Pressac, Auschwitz, 161, 164, 171, 181.

135. Predictably, Carlo Mattogno has started to argue in this direction. He was critical of Deborah Lipstadt because in her Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory (NY: 1993) she argued that gas tight doors were incompatible with a shower facility. This was discussed on pages 196 and 197 of the present study.

Mattogno's criticism was based on a document he found in the Auschwitz Archives in Moscow. He asked: "If a gas tight door and a shower facility are "absolutely incompatible" then why did the Auschwitz Zentralbauleitung [Central Construction Agency] on 13 November 1942 order "2 100/200 gas-tight doors for the sauna" of the disinfestation installation BW 5a." Deborah Lipstadt: A Review of Denying the Holocaust (<http://www.codoh.com/review/revdeblp/htm>), 10. BW 5a was a disinfestation facility in the Birkenau area of Auschwitz.

The document he cited is a work order in AA File 502-1 -328. It states: "For: Delousing Barrack. The following work is to be done: The creation of two steel gas proof doors for the sauna." In other words, if we are to believe Mattogno's explanation of this document, gas tight doors were being used in the shower facilities of the sauna. Why would gas tight doors be needed in a shower facility unless prisoners were being gassed?

The sauna is a reference to delousing barracks BW 5a which contained legitimate prisoner shower facilities and rooms where clothing was deloused with Zyklon B. Any logical person reading this document would realize that the gas tight doors were for that portion of the sauna used to disinfect clothing, not for the shower facilities. If Mattogno's explanation of this document is to be believed, then he has demonstrated that prisoners were gassed in the shower facilities of the sauna because the work order specifically refers to the type of gas tight doors which were used in the clothing disinfestation facility!

Mattogno may have believed that because the word sauna was used the argument could be made that it referred to the shower portion. But in fact the building known as the Central Sauna - which began operation in December 1943 - had legitimate shower facilities and places where clothing was disinfested. Not even Mattogno has claimed that the prisoner shower facilities of the Central Sauna had gas tight doors.

## CHAPTER 10: CREMATORIA AND BURNING PITS

1. For a comprehensive analysis of the demographics of the Auschwitz deportations see Franciszek Piper, "Estimating the Number of Deportees to Auschwitz-Birkenau" 21 YVS (1991).
2. See Franciszek Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria", in Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds., Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp (Bloomington: 1994), 157-182 for an overview.

3. Christian Gerlach, "Failure of Plans for an SS Extermination Camp In Mogilev, Belorussia", 11 Holocaust and Genocide Studies No. 1 (Spring 1997), 61-62; Gotz Aly, Final Solution: Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews (NY: 1999), 224
4. Jean - Claude Pressac, Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers (NY: 1989), 187, 191, 193
5. Danuta Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle (NY: 1990), 102, 112, 120, 131. The morgue registries cover the period from October 7, 1941 to August 31, 1943. The entries were made by individual body bearers. Auschwitz Chronicle, 94, fn.
6. Robert - Jan Van Pelt, "A Site in Search of a Mission", in Gutman and Berenbaum, Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, 119.
7. Jan Grotum and Thomas Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries" in Auschwitz State Museum, Death Books From Auschwitz (London: 1995), Vol. 1, p. 212.
8. See the table in Jean - Claude Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz: La Machinerie Du Meurtre De Masse (Paris: 1993), 144.
9. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 127.
10. Danuta Czech, "Origins of the Camp, Its Construction and Expansion," in Franciszek Piper and Teresa Swiebocka, eds., Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp (Oswiecim: 1996), 31-32 for information up to January 31, 1942.  
Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 144-145 for deaths of registered prisoners from February to June 30, 1942. I have pro rated these numbers since the death books go from January 3 to July 7, 1942. The 12,500 number I used includes 455 Soviet prisoners not in the death books. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 139.
11. Henryk Swiebocki, "Disclosure and Denunciation of SS Crimes," in Piper and Swiebocka, *ibid.*, 251.
12. See Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 146 where the date given is March 20, 1942.
13. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz, 198.
14. Text in *ibid.*, 204.
15. Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, and Adalbert Ruckerl, Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas (New Haven: 1993), 150, 152, 161, 163, 165-167.
16. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz. 429-430.
- 16a. Text of the July 23, 1942 in APMO, D-Aul, Garrison Order 19/42.

It has been argued that "special actions" did not necessarily have to mean gassing because of a memo referred to by denier critic Jean -Claude Pressac that referred to a "special action" among all the civilian

workers from December 1942. The Bauleitung memo from December 1942 states that "for security reasons there was special action among all the civilian workers." Text in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 210 and discussion in *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz*, 63.

Pressac believed that this "special action" did not mean killing. Rather, he interpreted it to mean a security check among civilian workers because of a quarantine order issued as a result of typhus. While Pressac's interpretation is possible in this instance, it is not certain because he mentions this "special action" within the context of a strike among all the civilian workers. It is quite possible that the camp administration sought to make an example of some of the civilian workers by executing them. This could explain why the memo is marked "secret."

The quarantine memo of July 23, 1942 dealing the typhus epidemic was not marked secret and was intended to be distributed throughout the camp. However, there are far fewer people listed on the December "special action" memo to receive it than on the quarantine order from July 1942. The "special action" memo only lists two individuals and one department to receive the memo. By contrast, the July memo was routed to 22 departments throughout the whole camp, meaning that its contents were intended to be known by everyone. Clearly, the authorities were attempting to conceal the "special action" memo that was issued within the context of a quarantine. If the "special action" memo only dealt with a security check resulting from a typhus quarantine, then the camp authorities should have been anxious to have it distributed to all departments, not have it marked secret for a limited distribution.

The special action memo of December 1942 does, however, discredit Faurisson's argument, discussed at pages 56-60 of the present work, that "special action" had to do with delousing clothes and trains because of the typhus epidemic. The memo specifically separates the delousing from the special action. It states: "During the month of December, work had to be interrupted several times for delousing and disinfestation. Also, starting on 16th December, for security reasons, there was a special action among all the civilian workers". Thus, the delousing is clearly separate from the "special action."

17. Recall, however, from the prior discussion that Auschwitz had a very high death rate for registered prisoners before the typhus epidemic of July 1942.

18. See the discussion at pages 60-65 of the present work.

19. See Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 95, 108. See also the chart of the crematoria in the various concentration camps in Pressac, *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz*, 97.

20. A breakdown of the monthly figures for 1941 to 1944 are in Hans Marsalek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen: Dokumentation* (Wien: 1974), 128, 129 under column III.

21. Table in Pressac, *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz*, 144. Pressac interpolates 1500 into each missing death book. Information on Soviet POWs in Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 131.

22. AM, File B/12/31 for the period from September 26 to November 12, 1941.

23. Marsalek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, 129.

24. See the table in Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, 24. In fact, Mattogno doubted that even this level could be achieved. With specific reference to the six Krema I ovens he wrote: "This is

the maximum theoretical capacity. The existing documents show that the effective capacity was much less." He did not mention what these "existing documents" are.

25. Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," 175

26. Pressac, *Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz*, 145.

27. Text in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 211.

28. "Aktenvermerk Betr: Stromversorgung und Installaton des KL und KGL" in AA file 502-1-26 reel 20.

29. Hausverfugung Nr. 108, May 5, 1943, AA, File 502-1-17, reel 19. The relevant part of the decree reads as follows:

"Internal Decree [Hausverfugung] No. 108"

"This is a reminder of decree Number 35 of June 19, 1942."

"As is stated in this decree SS-Lieutenant Colonel Dejaco is personally responsible that all in and outgoing plans are registered in an orderly fashion in a specific book. All outgoing plans have to be signed by the person receiving them".

"Furthermore, all this work is related to econo-military tasks that must be kept secret. Specifically, the plans for the crematoria must be strictly controlled [strengstens zu beaufsichtigen]. No plans are to be passed to the work brigade or others. During the construction work they are to be kept under lock and key... In particular attention should be paid to the regulations of D.V. 91 (secret matters/documents)." [Verschluss-Sachen]

This memo shows that the authorities were particularly concerned about the crematoria when compared to all of the construction projects. Also, it shows that there was a blanket order of secrecy on building projects dating from at least June 1942. This answers denier claims about why documents such as the "gassing cellar" memo (see page 191 herein) were not specifically labeled secret. It should be noted that the reference in this document to secret matters required by regulations is very similar to those issued to the participants in Operation Reinhard on July 18, 1942 which stated "that the process of the evacuation of Jews is a subject which comes under "Secret Reich Document," in accordance with censorship regulation *Verschl, V*". Yitzhak Arad, Yisrael Gutman, and Abraham Margliot, *Documents on the Holocaust* (Jerusalem: 1981), 274. Also significant in this memo is the mention of Walter Dejaco, an architect with the Bauleitung. He worked on modifications of a crematorium in January 1942 when it was still in the proposal stage, designed an entrance to the basement of *Krema II* in December 1942, and drafted a final design for *Krema IV* in January 1943. Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan Van Pelt, *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present* (NY: 1996), Plates 16, 17 and 18.

Dejaco designed the doors for the entrance to *Corpse Cellars I* in *Kremas II* and *III*. Recall from Chapter 9 that *Corpse Cellar I* was where the gas chamber was located. (See the discussion on page 192 of the present work.) The design for the entrance doors to *Corpse Cellars I* show that the doors swing outward. Normally, entrance doors swing inward. It would have been necessary for the doors to the gas chambers to swing outward because there would have been too many bodies crammed together for the doors to swing inward. The design for these doors was examined by Professor Robert Jan Van Pelt, a

historian of architecture, from the files of the Auschwitz State Museum, APMO BW (B) 30/12 and cited in the report he filed for the defense in the civil lawsuit by David Irving against Professor Deborah Lipstadt in England. The Pelt Report, 297. At the time of this writing the report has not been published. It may be posted in the future on the website of THHP.

30. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 216. Mattogno, The "Gasprufer" of Auschwitz (<http://www.codoh.com/gcgvpruf.html>X 8, places the outbreak in early July. Prisoners contracted typhus both before and after the typhus epidemic.

31. Mattogno's argument in Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 25. Expansion information in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 218.

31 a. Information for July 1 as the date for the bids for the crematoria in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 190 and Czech, "Origins of the Camp, Its Construction and Expansion", 34 where she specifically notes that the negotiations began for all four crematoria in July 1942. On the planned expansion to only 30,000 in mid July see "Erlauterungsbericht Zum Bauvorhaben Auschwitz O/S", July 15, 1942, AA, File 502-1- 222, p.2 reel 34. The population of the camp on July 1, 1942 was 15,925. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 190.

31b. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 196. The contract was signed on July 29. Photocopy of the contract and a discussion in Pressac, Auschwitz, 200.

32. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 50 for the expansion proposal. See Robert -Jan Van Pelt "A Site in Search of a Mission", 109 on the architect's plans. For background information on the ovens see Jean - Claude Pressac with Robert - Jan Van Pelt, "Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz," in Gutman and Berenbaum, Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, 189-197.

32a. See the discussion at notes 13 - 16a pages 207-208 of the present work.

33. Prisoner figures in Marsalek, Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslager Mauthausen, 106-107. Higher figures for Mauthausen in 1944 are in Evelyn Le Chene, Mauthausen: History of a Concentration Camp (London: 1971), 184-189 who lists more than 70,000 entering the camp in 1944 and a total population of 90,000. Le Chene's figures can be calculated to show a 15% death rate. I have subtracted prisoners transferred out of the camp to reach this figure. Marsalek's lower figure of 7300 deaths on a lower population comes to about 15%. Marsalek's deaths for Mauthausen on p. 129 of Die Geschichte.

34. Figures in Hans Marsalek, Konzentrationslager Gusen: Ein Nebenlager des KZ Mauthausen (Wien: 1987), 37, 42. In 1945 slightly less than 9000 prisoners died in Gusen. p. 39

35. On the Buchenwald population expansion see David A. Hackett, The Buchenwald Report (Boulder: 1995), 66, 114-115. On a total of eight ovens in the camp see Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 97 and Pressac, Auschwitz, 95.

35a. Paul Berben, Dachau, 1933-1945 (London: 1975), 107, 110 on typhus, 228-229 on prisoner figures. On the number of ovens in Dachau see Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 97.

35b. Erlauterungsbericht Zum Bauvorhaben Auschwitz O/S, July 15, 1942 AA, File 502-1-222, p.2 reel 34. The registered male population of the camp was 21,421 on August 1, 1942 and 22,391 on

December 1. The female population is not known on August 1. It was 8232 on December 1. The total camp population was 11,703 on January 19, 1942. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 127, 208, 275, 276. Thus, the camp population had essentially remained static during the typhus epidemic. Camp population for August 1943 in a report by the head of the German concentration camp system in PS 1169, NMT, vol. 5, p. 382. Deaths of registered prisoners in Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 145.

36. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 30; Rudolph Jakobskotter, "Die Entwicklung der Einäscherung bis zu dem neuen elektrisch beheizten Heisslufteinäscherungs-ofen in Erfurt", 64 Gesundheits-Ingenieur, Hefte 43 (October 25, 1941), 582-583, 587. On the type of ovens used in the concentration camps see Pressac, "The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz", 190-191.

The basis of Jakobskotter's numbers appear to be the traditional method of burning a body completely in a coffin before a new body is introduced, a process which appears to have taken from 50 to 60 minutes. As will be shown in this chapter, there is good reason to believe that in instances involving single body burning, a new body was introduced to the oven before the old one was completely consumed, resulting in an average body burning time of 25 minutes. Essentially, this could have had the effect of doubling the normal life span of an oven. Moreover, concentration camp burnings did not utilize coffins. See the discussion on pages 218 and 223 of the present work.

37. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 30.

38. BA doc. 94, February 14, 1941.

39. BA docs. 106 and 148, March 13 and June 25, 1941. The repair material was monolithe.

40. Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 79-80.

41. Topf letter of April 4, 1943 to the Bauleitung in APMO, BW 30/34 p.43. Topf agreed to fix the ovens without charge providing the problem did have to do with oven misuse by the camp authorities. Photocopy of the letter also in Reinhard Kuehnl, Der deutsche Faschismus in Quellen und Dokumenten (Verlag: 1975), 395.

42. It is worth noting in this respect that it is possible that the reason for the breakdown of the ovens in Krema IV in 1943 and Gusen in 1941 had to do with misuse by the camp authorities in both instances. However, such misuse does not support the limited life that Mattogno was attributing to these ovens.

42. See the discussion at note 67 on page 220 of the present work.

43. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 30.

44. Marsalek, Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen, 128-129, 160.

45. On the delivery of the materials see BA docs. 260, 261, 262, 266-268 and BA doc. 271 on the cancellation of the building projects. The cancellation of the Topf ovens for Mauthausen also provides information as to the life of the single oven in that camp. The Mauthausen oven was built by Kori, Topf's chief competitor. In 1943 and 1944 there were 8439 cremations in Mauthausen. Marsalek, Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslager Mauthausen, 160. Although there is no information as to whether

this oven was ever overhauled, we can be fairly certain that it was not overhauled in 1943 or 1944. This is because the Mauthausen authorities would hardly have incurred the expense of overhauling that oven when it had already received materials for the Topf double muffle oven.

46. BA docs. 278-280.

47. Monthly figures up until the end of 1944 in Marsalek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, 128-129. Figures for 1945 in Marsalek, *Konzentrationslager Gusen: Ein Nebenlager des KZ Mauthausen*, 39. It might be worth noting that the paper trail on the Gusen ovens shows that they functioned for a minimum period of 22 months - November 1941 to August 1943 - without being overhauled. The first of the 46 Birkenau ovens became operational in March 1943. Auschwitz was evacuated in January 1945 - 22 months after the first of these ovens became operational.

48. Marsalek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, 128-129.

49. My thanks to the efforts of Ulrich Roessler of THHP for obtaining this file for me.

50. Topf letter of August 20, 1943 in AA File 502-1-313 reel 41; letter of June 13, 1944 and bill from December 23, 1943 in AA File 502-1-327, reel 42; billing information from 1943 in AA File 502-1-79, reel 23; various billing documents for 1942 in AA File 502-1-222, reel 34.

51. Carlo Mattogno and Franco Deana, *The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau*, (<http://www.codoh.com/found/fndcrema.html>), 26 Hereafter cited as Mattogno and Deana.

52. Augustus Cobb, *Earth Burial and Cremation* (NY: 1892), 133

53. *Ibid.*, 109-110.

54. A yearly breakdown appears in *The Urn*, Vol.11, No.5, June 1893, pp.3 and 4. The stillborn children are referred to as embryos. About 7000 are included in a category which states "paupers and dissecting tables." No breakdown is given. However, it is unlikely that the cost of many dissecting tables would have been incurred by the crematoria to cremate paupers.

The *Urn* was published by the New York Cremation Society. The figures were taken from a speech by Georges Salomon, Secretary General of The Cremation Society of France at its twelfth annual meeting in Paris on March 8, 1893.

55. William Eassie, *Cremation of the Dead* (London: 1875), 106-108; See also *Scientific American*, vol.30, May 9, 1874, p. 295 and vol. 117, 1917, p. 22.

56. H.R. Haweis, *Ashes to Ashes* (London: 1875), 101

57. Mattogno and Deana, 7, 8

58. Statement by Mr. L.G.A. Leonard of TABO Cremators at Verbatim Conference of the 1975 Annual Conference organized by The Cremation Society of Great Britain (Eastbourne: 1975), 83. My thanks to Dr. Dan Keren for providing me with the transcript of these proceedings, which is not available in the United States.

59. Text in Pressac, Auschwitz, 136
60. Transactions of the Cremation Society of England (London: 1885), 60.
61. Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, In 1926: Standing on the Edge of Time (Cambridge: 1997), 62.
62. Oscar Overton, "The International Development of Cremation," First Joint Conference of Cemetery and Crematoria Authorities (Brighton:1932), 50-51.
63. Los Angeles Times, April 13, 1983, pp. 1, 24, 25.
64. From the ten hour PBS series Blood on the Snow aired in the summer of 1998.
65. Mattogno and Deana, 25. On the dates that each of the crematoria came into service see Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 352 and 364-365 for K II, 357 for K IV, 368 for K V and 426 for K III. While K II did not officially come into service until March 31, there was a test gassing there on March 13.
66. APMO, BW 30/34, p. 17
67. Deborah Dwork and Robert - Jan Van Pelt, Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present (NY: 1996), 331-332.
68. APMO, Dpr.-Hd/11a, Nr.1600 and Nr. 1617, p.96 of the Hoess trial. The firehook reference in the document refers to the 30 ovens of Kremas IV and V. In fact this was an error in the document because Kremas II and m had a total of 30 ovens while IV and V had a total of 16. So the reference had to be to Kremas II and III, not IV and V.
69. The engineer's report in BA doc. 188 for October 9 to 15, 1941 shows repairs on the Gusen double muffle oven for a total of 30 hours, 10 hours per day, from October 13 to 15. For the same three day period there were 75 cremations (23, 19 and 33), AM, File B/12/31. BA doc. 188 states that there are repairs taking place on one of the ovens. This means that, assuming only one of the ovens was operational, it could still function while the other was undergoing repairs. Alternatively, it is possible that the oven being repaired was also incinerating corpses when work was not being done on it.  
  
The report for the period from November 6 to 9, 1941, BA doc.213, shows oven work for November 6 (4 hours), 7 (4 hours) 8 (4 hours) and 9 (8 hours). On those days there were 57, 94, 72 and 34 cremations respectively. AM, File B/12/31.
70. Mattogno and Deana, 25.
71. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 442.
72. Transcript in Gerald Fleming, Hitler and the Final Solution (Berkeley: 1994, 2nd ed.), 202, 206, 207. Note that the earlier edition of this work does not contain these transcripts. Predictably, deniers have attempted to discredit these transcripts on the basis that the Soviets forced the Topf engineers to say what they did. But in fact, a close reading of these transcripts suggests that the opposite is true. See the commentary in note 133b below.
73. Ibid., 205. Pruffer said that two bodies were simultaneously incinerated in his presence, p.207.

74. Filip Muller, *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers* (NY: 1979), 124
75. Zundel was tried under a Canadian statute which prohibited the spreading of false news. The statute was eventually struck down by the Canadian Supreme Court. The testimony is only being quoted to establish its factual accuracy in connection with Holocaust denial. I do not approve of laws which prohibit any form of speech.
76. Robert Lenski, *The Holocaust on Trial* (Deacatur: 1989), 251. However, he went on say that the 46 ovens could handle a total of 184 bodies per day or four per oven, p.252. This book is a denier account of the trial.
77. Fred Leuchter, *The Leuchter Report: The End of a Legend* (Toronto: 1988), 10 for information for Kremas II through V. Leuchter placed the capacity of Krema I at 18 per day, bringing the total to 156.
78. Mattogno and Deana, 2.
79. AM, File B/12/31.
80. Ibid.
81. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 71-72. Text of the original German in Reimund Schnabel, *Macht Ohne Moral* (Frankfurt: 1957), 346. Schnabel's reproduction of this document lists 10 to 35 cremations instead of 30 to 36. Czech relied on Schnabel. It has been pointed out that Schnabel made an error in reproducing the document. The actual number is 30 to 36. See the sources cited in note 84 below.
82. Text in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 136.
83. Lenski, *The Holocaust on Trial*, 251, 254.
84. Pressac, "Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz", 189-190. The date was July 14, 1941. The letter is also cited in Mattogno and Deana, 16. The actual number - which is correctly cited by Pressac and Mattogno -is 30 to 36, not 10 to 35. See the discussion in note 81 herein.
85. Text of a letter he wrote on November 15, 1942 in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 99.
86. Pressac, "Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz," 212.
87. AM, File B/12/31 contains the cremation information. Mattogno claim in Mattogno and Deana, 19.

The information for November 7 shows that operations began at 11:15 A.M. The last cremations occurred at 5 A.M. on November 8. There is no time specified for how long these 5 A.M. cremations lasted. However, the November 8 cremations began at 7 A.M. This means that the November 7 cremations lasted from 11:15 A.M. on November 7 to 7 A.M. on November 8, or 19 hours and 45 minutes.

Mattogno's claim that the November 8 cremations took 24-1/2 hours is based on his placing these

cremations as ending at 7:30 A.M. on November 9. In fact they ended at about 3:30 A.M. He misread the 1:30 on the timesheet as a 7:30 and assumed that the operation ended when the last load of coke was added when in fact it had not.. The November 8 time sheets show operations beginning at 7 A.M. The last operation began at 1:30 A.M. on November 9. It is not known how long this 1:30 operation lasted. But it is not likely that it lasted longer than two or three hours since six loads of coke were used. Topf repair sheets from this date show that 4 hours of work were done on the ovens on November 8. BA doc. 213. This means that the ovens were down for four hours on November 8. This must have occurred between 7 A.M. and 4 P.M. on November 8 because the time sheets show that only 8 loads of coke were used during these 9 hours. However, a total of 35 loads of coke were used for the November 8 operation, 21 of which were used for the 9-1/2 hours from 4 P.M. on November 8 to 1:30 A.M. on November 9. We can thus calculate the total time usage on November 8 as between 16 and 17 hours. 7 A.M. to 1:30 A.M.= 18-1/2 hours. Add two or three hours for the 1:30 operation and subtract four hours for the repairs. This time usage would be consistent with the information for the time usage on the rest of the dates, especially the November 7 information. My thanks to Dan Keren for calling Mattogno's error to my attention

It is also instructive to note that Mattogno was aware of the four hours of work done on the Gusen ovens on November 8 because he had examined the repair sheet. Therefore, he must have known that the ovens had to have been shut down for at least four hours, meaning that they could not have functioned for the time period he was alleging.

88. Marsalek, Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen, 105 for 1941 Gusen data. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 429 for June 1943 Bauleitung cremation estimates.

89. Nico Rost, Concentration Camp Dachau (Brussels: nd, but appears to be late 1940s or early 1950s), 28.

90. Berben, Dachau, 1933-1945,7.

91. Pressac, Auschwitz, 224 gives a monthly breakdown of the figures.

92. Coke figures in Pressac, Auschwitz, 224. Prisoner deaths in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 151, 208. The March prisoner death figures include 580 Soviets.

93. Death book totals in Grotum and Parcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries", 213. For slightly different numbers see Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 145.

94. Action Report, December 1993, 3. My thanks to David Irving for sending me a copy of this newsletter.

95. Mattogno and Deana, 1.

96. AM, File B/12/31.

97. Mattogno and Deana, 29.

98. Ibid., 29.

99. AM, File B/12/31.

100. Ibid.
101. Mattogno and Deana, 14-15.
102. Photocopy of the memo in Pressac, Auschwitz, 224.
103. Mattogno and Deana, 27.
104. Ibid., 21. In a recent article Mattogno argued that the report could have been an alteration of an existing document. However, he opted for the view that the letter was an error which was corrected by a subsequent version. Since he could not find the "correct" version of the letter or had any evidence that there ever was a different version, he suggested that the "correct" copy was suppressed by the Soviets who captured these documents. He writes: "The fact that the copy of the correct version of the 28 June 1943 does not exist in the Zentralbauleitung archives could obviously depend upon the selection of the documents made by the Soviets." Carlo Mattogno, "The Auschwitz Central Construction Headquarters Letter Dated 28 June 1943: An Alternative Interpretation," (<http://www.codoh.com/granata/lalett.html>), 8

One of the reasons he needed to make this argument is that he had already acknowledged that it was common practice for the Bauleitung to issue corrections to mistakes made in prior correspondences, but he could find no correction for the June 28 document. Indeed, this "correct" version of the letter seems to exist in his mind only.

105. Gordon J. Horowitz, *In the Shadow of Death: Living Outside the Gates of Mauthausen* (NY: 1990), 67.
106. Hugo Erichsen, *Cremation of the Dead* (Detroit: 1887), 32
107. *Transactions of the Cremation Society of England* (London: 1915), 15.
108. *Los Angeles Times*, April 13, 1983, pp. 1, 24, 25.
109. Deposition in Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, eds., *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime* (NY: 1992), 41.
110. Pery Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad," in Jadwiga Bezwinska and Danuta Czech, *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS* (NY: 1984), 184
111. Filip Muller, *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers* (NY: 1979), 98-99.
112. Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein and Adalbert Ruckerl, *Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas* (New Haven: 1993), 167.
113. David Wyman, ed. *America and the Holocaust* (NY: 1990), Vol.12, p. 18 who reproduces the full text of the report. Text is also reproduced in Michael Berenbaum, ed., *Witness to the Holocaust* (NY: 1997), 262-283.
114. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 345. My thanks to Mark Van Alstine for calling this to my

attention.

115. Mattogno and Deana, 19-20.

116. BA doc. 213 for work done from November 6 to 9, 1941. The claim made by Mattogno that the engineer stayed there during this period "to tune the oven and supervise its operation" is without foundation. Mattogno and Deana, 26. The report states "oven work in progress." There is no other documentation dealing with the nature of the work. In fact the testing work that Mattogno referred to took place from October 23 to 29, immediately after the ovens were overhauled. The report states: "Mauthausen Furnace finished, test instituted. Control and firing work." BA doc. 196. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that Topf would have returned one week later to do more tests. Mattogno did want to admit that the ovens were burning so many bodies while still undergoing repairs. The fact that repairs were continuing while such high outputs were being achieved suggests that perhaps the ovens had not reached their full potential. During the testing period for the ovens from October 23 to 29, 103 bodies were burned. AM B/12/31.

117. Pressac, Auschwitz, 483, 484, 489.

118. Ibid., 489, 495.

119. Ibid., 495.

120. Ibid., 489. In the translation reproduced by Pressac the word "round" appears where I have placed "through" in brackets. Tauber's testimony was given in Polish. The Polish words in the original text are "przez obie boczne retorty" - through the two lateral chambers. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 92.

121. Pressac, Ibid., 483, 495.

122. Jakobskotter source cited in footnote 36 herein, p. 587.

123. Mattogno and Deana, p.l. Mattogno went on to claim that the necessary procedure to accomplish this is not the one identified by eyewitnesses. However, he did not explain what the "correct" procedure is and how it differed from the eyewitness accounts.

124. Pressac, Auschwitz, 494.

125. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 99.

126. John Mendelsohn, The Holocaust (NY: 1982), Vol.12, p.114. The full text of Hoess's "pre trial" testimony is reproduced in this volume.

127. Rudolph Hoess, Death Dealer: The Memoirs of the SS Kommandant at Auschwitz {NY: 1992}, 45.

128. Pressac, "Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz," 208.

129. Pressac, Auschwitz, 489.

130. Mattogno and Deana, 29.

131. Photos in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 358, 363, 368, 426, 601, 619, 639, 802; Pressac, Auschwitz, 340, 342, 343, 347, 366, 369, 416, 418, 425, 501.

132. Photo in Pressac, Auschwitz, p. 251. My thanks to Dan Keren for calling this photo to my attention.

133. Photocopy with an English translation at <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/labor-force/19440728>.

133a. The cremation is listed AA, File 502-1-327. It states: "The local building authority reports that the erection work on the cremation oven was completed on August 15, 1940. The test cremation of the first body took place the same day." For Mattogno's writing that he examined all 88,200 pages in the Auschwitz Archives - which I personally believe based on his writings - see his Reply to Samuel Crowell 's "Comments "About "My Critique of the Bomb Shelter Thesis." (<http://www.codoh.com/granata/reply.html>) , 8.

133b. Tadeusz Paczula, "Office Procedures in K L Auschwitz", in Death Books From Auschwitz, Vol. 1, p.33. See also Aleksander Lasik, "Structure and Character of the Camp SS Administration," in Piper and Swiebocka, Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp, 47. The Crematoria Administration [Krematorium Verwaltung] is also referred to in a series of camp documents. See APMO, Dpr.-Hd/11a, Nr.1600 and Nr.1617, pp. 93-96 of the Hoess trial.

Mattogno has begun to hint that the Soviets have suppressed the records. This is the only denier argument which can be offered to "explain" why there are no records. The only other explanation is that the records were destroyed by the Germans. The claim is made as part of Mattogno's "40 points" delivered by his associate Russ Granata to the convention on "Real History", sponsored by David Irving, in Cincinnati on September 26,1999. The tape is entitled Russ Granata Reports on Carlo Mattogno and is sold commercially by Russ Granata.

Mattogno blames Soviet "culling" for the lack of information on oven testing, suggesting that the Soviets weeded out documents they didn't like. This is not surprising. Recall from the discussion in note 95 in Chapter 9 that he argued that the Soviets had altered a document from the captured Bauleitung archives to attempt to link Zyklon B to Krema II. In note 104 of the current chapter it was shown that he argued that the Soviets suppressed the "correct" version of the Bauleitung report of June 28, 1943 which stated that 4756 bodies could be incinerated in a 24 hour period.

Mattogno knows that the advantage of making absurd arguments like these is that it is impossible to prove a negative. That is, to prove that the Soviets did not tamper with these documents. However, there is very strong evidence that the Soviets never touched these documents. This comes from the interrogations the Soviets made of the Topf engineers they captured.

The interrogations occurred in March 1946. Engineer Kurt Prufer, who built the Auschwitz ovens, stated that the Birkenau ovens could incinerate one corpse per hour and that brick lining on the ovens was damaged after six months because of the enormous strain being placed on the ovens. Transcripts in Gerald Fleming, Hitler and the Final Solution (2nd edition, 1994), 200, 202. Prufer's statements in this regard directly contradicted a Soviet report on this issue. In May 1945 the Soviets had submitted a report to the International Military Tribunal hearing war crimes trials. The report claimed that the ovens

could incinerate 279,000 per month or 9,000 per day. This comes out to about 7-1/2 minutes per corpse working non-stop for a period of 24 hours each day without any rest. The report claims that the ovens had the capacity to cremate over 5 million corpses during the time they functioned in Auschwitz. In other words, the Soviets claimed that the ovens had an unlimited burning capacity. These claims were being directly contradicted by Prufert's statements to the interrogator. The contents of these interrogations would have been the obvious choice of suppression or alteration since they were directly contradicting the official Soviet view of these ovens. Text of USSR 008, Report to the International Military Tribunal in IMT, Vol. 39, p. 261 on the Soviet view of the alleged burning capacity of the ovens.

134. Hoess, Death Dealer, pp. 38-39.

135. Broad, "The Reminiscences of Pery Broad", 182.

136. Pressac, Auschwitz, 488.

137. Ibid., 495.

138. Tadeusz Paczula, "Office Procedures in KL Auschwitz," in Death Books From Auschwitz, vol. 1, 33.

139. Ibid., 29, 30, 38.

140. D-728, in NCA, Vol.7, p. 175.

141. Joanne Reilly, Belsen: The Liberation of a Concentration Camp (NY: 1998), 25.

142. Jozef Marszalek, Majdanek: The Concentration Camp of Lublin (Warsaw: 1986), 142-143

143. Photos are reproduced in Eric Markousen and David Kopf, The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing (Boulder: 1995), 163-164. My thanks to Dan Keren for calling these photos to my attention. They may be accessed at <http://www.nizkor.org/ftD.cgi/places/gennanv/dresden/images/dresden-pyre-01.jpg> and [02.jpg](http://www.nizkor.org/ftD.cgi/places/gennanv/dresden/images/dresden-pyre-02.jpg).

144. Kogon et al. Nazi Mass Murder, 133-136; Yitzhak Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps (Bloomington: 1987), 170-178.

145. NO 064 in NMT, Vol. 5, p.715.

146. Robin O'Neill, "Belzec: The Forgotten Death Camp," 28 East European Jewish Affairs No. 2 (Winter 1998-9), 52.

147. Photocopy of the report dated October 24, 1942 at <http://www.nizkor.org/ftP.cgi/camps/aktion.reinhard/treblinka/images/ostrow2>. I am grateful to Dan Keren for calling this document to my attention. Dr. Keren thanks the Militararchiv in Freiburg for providing him with a copy, Dr. Ulrich Roessler for calling this document to his attention and Gord McFee for translating the document.

148. Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 174.

149. Coke figures in Pressac, Auschwitz, 224; Deaths of registered prisoners in Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 145 where numbers for six missing death books are interpolated. Non - interpolated numbers in Grotum and Farcer, "Computer Aided Analysis of the Death Book Entries," 212-213. The death books for the period February 24 to March 22, show 1492 deaths. I have only allocated 1000 to the March figures.
150. Figure comprises 2397 prisoners in the death books for March 1942 and 580 Russian POWs not in the death books. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 151. Czech was able to isolate the March totals. Russian POWs were not listed in the death books.
151. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 208.
152. Mattogno and Deana, 32.
153. Soviet POW deaths in Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 112, 120, 131. Deaths of other prisoners extrapolated from death book information in Pressac, Les Crematoires d'Auschwitz, 144-145.
154. Mattogno and Deana, 33.
155. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 242.
156. See John C. Zimmerman, How Reliable Are the Hoess Memoirs? THHP
157. Hoess, Death Dealer, 32.
158. Erlauterungsbericht zum Bauvorhaben Auschwitz O/S, AA file 502-1-222, p. 38, reel 34.
159. Mattogno and Deana, 32.
160. Bezwinska and Czech, Amidst a Nightmare of Crime, 43.
161. Broad, "The Reminiscences of Pery Broad," 182-184
162. Bezwinska and Czech, Amidst a Nightmare of Crime, 46-47.
163. Pressac, Auschwitz, 171-172.
164. Ibid., 489.
165. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 49-50.
166. David Wyman, ed. America and the Holocaust (NY: 1991), Vol. 12, p. 18.
167. Kogon et. al., Nazi Mass Murder, 150-151.
168. Pressac, Auschwitz, 174,181.
169. Mattogno and Deana, 29.

170. Pressac, Auschwitz, 172.
171. Hoess, Death Dealer, 37.
172. Mendelsohn, The Holocaust, Vol. 12, p. 114
173. Mattogno and Deana, 33
174. Bernd Naumann, Auschwitz (NY: 1966), 279-280. He did not identify the method of extermination.
175. See the discussion at notes 197-200, pages 242 and 243 of the present work.
176. See the discussion at notes 65 to 69, page 220 of the present work.
177. See the discussion at note 67 page 220 of the present work.
178. Wyman, ed., America and the Holocaust, Vol. 12, p.18
179. Hoess, Death Dealer, 45.
180. Pressac, Auschwitz, 496.
181. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 133.
182. Bezwinska and Czech, Amidst a Nightmare of Crime, 46, 50, 62. The reference on p. 50 is to the location in the the area of the White Bunker because he mentions that these pits existed before the arrival of the Hungarian Jews. The pits at Krema V, mentioned by Feinsilber on p.62, were dug expressly for the Hungarian operation. Those at the White Bunker, as discussed earlier, had been dug in 1942.
183. Wyman, ed. America and The Holocaust, Vol. 12, p. 36
184. Miklos Nyiszli, Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account (NY: 1993), 84-87. On p. 88 he mentions that there were two such pyres burning bodies.
185. Eugen Kogon et al. Nazi Mass Murder, 170-171.
186. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 132.
187. Bezwinska and Czech, Amidst a Nightmare of Crime, 58.
188. Tauber testimony in Pressac, Auschwitz, 496. Nyiszli, Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account, 41.
189. Photocopy of the report dated July 28, 1944 with an English translation is at <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/labor-force/19440728/>. Document provided by Dan Keren via the Auschwitz State Museum.

190. Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 699.
191. Mattogno, Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 32.
192. Gutman and Berenbaum, Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, 341.
193. Carlo Mattogno, The "Gassed People" of Auschwitz: Pressac's New Revisions (Palos Verdas: 1995). Also at <http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcnewrev.html>. 11.
194. Bauleitung completion document for Krema II in Pressac, Auschwitz, 231.
195. Bill from Topf dated August 20, 1943 in AA file 502-1-313, p. 2, reel 41. The item is a Mull-Verbrennungs-Ofen.
196. Mattogno, My Banned Holocaust Interview, 43. The source Mattogno cited in support for the possibility of the crematoria not functioning was Danuta Czech's, Auschwitz Chronicle, p. 677 entry for August 2, 1944, three weeks after the Hungarian operation had been concluded. He describes the entry as "cadavers of Gypsies alleged to have been homicidally gassed on 2 August, 1944, were cremated out in the open because the crematory ovens at that time were not working." However, he could cite no sources which mention any oven failures during the Hungarian operation. Moreover, he used a technique that, as noted elsewhere in this chapter, he had utilized when trying to justify positions he was advocating for which he could not cite the original source. One of the principal sources Czech used for the crematoria not operating on August 2, 1944 - not mentioned by Mattogno - and therefore necessitating outdoor burnings was eyewitness testimony. I obtained this testimony from the Auschwitz State Museum. It was given in Polish by native Poles. My thanks to Dr. William Samelson of THHP for translating this testimony for me.

This testimony cited by Czech, when read in its entirety, discussed the gassing of prisoners. Czech describes the testimony as follows: "Trucks drive into the camp and 2,897 defenseless women, men and children are driven to the gas chambers. After the gassing the corpses of the murdered are incinerated in the pit next to the crematorium, since the crematorium ovens are not operating at the time."

Mattogno had to argue that the crematoria were not functioning otherwise he would be unable to offer any justification for outdoor burnings. Why? Assuming that Kremas II and III were operating and further assuming that each of them could only burn one body per hour in a 20 hour period, it would mean that they had the combined capacity to burn 600 bodies, a number which has been advanced by Mattogno on the capacity of the 30 ovens of Kremas II and III. See Mattogno's table in Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, 24. Why would it be necessary to utilize open air burnings if there was a capacity to burn 600 bodies? Such open air burning would be consistent with mass murder. Even if only one of the Kremas was operating there would not be a need for open air burnings absent mass murder.

Mattogno also has another problem which he avoided in My Banned Holocaust Interview. In the earlier article he wrote with Franco Deana and cited throughout this chapter, he had admitted to outdoor burnings in the area of the White Bunker for the period prior to the opening of the Birkenau crematoria in March 1943. This area, as noted by Mattogno, is visible on the May 31, 1944 photo. The problem is as follows: since there already was an area available for these burnings, why was it necessary to create a second area near Krema V? Why not simply use the site that was available and used previously? The fact that there are two such areas visible on the May 31 photo is consistent with mass murder. In none

of Mattogno's writings that I have read has he ever admitted to the existence of both these areas. In the article with Deana he only mentioned the gravesite areas used for outdoor burnings in the area of the White Bunker while in his 1996 interview he only mentions the area of Krema V as a possible burning site.

197. A key piece of evidence that the ovens were functioning during the Hungarian operation is a memo from the Bauleitung discussing June 16, 1944 while the Hungarian operation was taking place. It states: "The concealment [tarnung] of the crematory and security measures through the construction of a second fence (the camouflaging [tarnung] through pipes) which are to be erected by the SS personnel administration are to follow." If the ovens were not functioning there would be no need to camouflage the crematoria. Source cited in note 228 below.

The Lucas Report, reproduced in Appendix IV, identifies construction work going on at Krema V on the May 31 photo. This suggests that Krema V was indeed functioning, otherwise there would be no need to work on it. The construction work indicates that the authorities wanted to expand Krema V's functions during the Hungarian operation. See pages 291,299 and 300 herein.

See also the discussion at note 68 page 220 of the present work which presents evidence that the ovens were working because of the production of firehooks in June 1944, which would not be necessary if the ovens were not functioning.

198. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend.*, 72. Mattogno has been very crafty in the way he has presented the evidence on the White Bunker. In his monograph, he states that the "designation" of terms like "red house" and "white house", references to the Red and White Bunkers, are not to be found in any documents. He also writes that "[t]here exists no document on the existence of Bunker 1 [the Red Bunker] and 2 [the White Bunker] as homicidal installations" (*italics added*) p. 72. The reader of these words would probably get the impression that he is denying the existence of these installations. However, a close reading of the language he uses shows that he is not actually denying the existence of these structures, even though he is trying to give his readers such an impression.

In Mattogno's 40 points, which were read by his associate to a gathering organized by David Irving in September 1999 (cited and discussed in note 133b above), he was even more deceptive. In Point 21 Mattogno states that every building from March 31, 1942 onwards had to have a building number but that there is "no trace of the so called bunkers of Birkenau." He also states that "the so called bunkers of Birkenau never existed." Note that he has not stated that there were no bunkers, only that these buildings did not have a number and the "so called" bunkers of Birkenau did not exist - that is in the sense that they would be designated as such in camp documents, but are not. Once again, anyone listening to these points would reach the conclusion that these bunkers never existed. But Mattogno has never stated this outright. In fact, since he has examined the photos and identified the "four huge parallel pits" in the area of the White Bunker, he has no doubt seen the White Bunker and the three undressing huts next to it on the May 31 photo.

When he is finally forced to confront the issue of the White Bunker and the undressing huts on the May 31 photo he will no doubt claim that he did not say that these structures never existed, only that they are not listed in camp documents. He used a similar technique in discussing the pits near Krema V when in 1996 he did not deny their existence - as he had in 1994 - but only that there were no "huge pits," thus once again attempting to give the reader the impression that there were no pits. See the discussion in note 201 below.

If Mattogno's theory is that these structures should have turned up in camp documents is correct, then he has proven that they had a secret purpose that camp authorities wanted to conceal. The evidence for this comes from the May 31 photo which clearly shows the White Bunker. According to the eyewitness testimony, the Red Bunker was destroyed before the Hungarian operation. The challenge for deniers will be to explain why the White Bunker and three huts are there in the first place.

With the publication of this book and the Lucas Report in Appendix IV, which identifies the White Bunker and adjacent huts, deniers will no longer be able to avoid the issue. Therefore, I predict that they will claim that the White Bunker was a delousing installation while the huts next to it were shower facilities for prisoners. This explanation will cause some problems. First, why place these installations in the area of mass grave sites? Second, there were already a number of delousing and shower facilities in the camp. In December 1943 the Central Sauna became operative in Birkenau which had new and improved delousing and shower facilities. Why then use primitive facilities? Also, if they are delousing facilities, why aren't they listed in camp documents as Mattogno claims they should be? Finally, why did the Germans destroy the White Bunker and huts if they had a benign purpose? None of the delousing facilities in the camp were destroyed. The Central Sauna and two other buildings used for delousing in the Birkenau area of the camp are still standing. The Germans also dynamited the four crematoria which were used for homicidal purposes. This shows the true nature of the White Bunker, which would have been spared if it did not have a homicidal purpose.

199. Van Alstine informed me that he was able to identify the White Bunker and huts from the photos in John Ball's book. See p. 250 herein.

200. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 32.

201. Mark Van Alstine to the author in a communication dated April 13, 1999. In order to avoid discussing what is actually on the May 31 photo in the area of Krema V, Mattogno attempted to discredit the idea that cremation pits were present by arguing what is not there. In order to do this he misquoted Sonderkommando Filip Muller as writing that "5 (five) 'cremation pits' measuring 45x8 [meters], therefore 360 m<sup>2</sup> each or 1800m<sup>2</sup> for all five..." 1800 square meters equals about 19,000 square feet. *My Banned Holocaust Interview*, 41.

What Muller actually wrote is that under orders his work detail dug "two pits [that] were 40 to 50 meters long, about 8 meters wide and two meters deep." However, it is not clear whether he means that each pit measured this amount or both pits together. He then writes that "[t]hree more cremation pits were dug in the back yard of crematorium 5, making up the five [camp guard] Moll had ordered." *Eyewitness Auschwitz*, 130, 133. However, no size is specified for these three pits and for all Mattogno or anyone else knows Muller could have meant them to be one tenth the size of the other two pits.

However, Mattogno's attributing 19,000 square feet to Muller was actually an improvement over what he had written a year earlier. In 1995 Mattogno wrote: "So in the aerial photographs of 31 May, the alleged 'cremation pits' ought to be visible, with an area of approximately 2800 square meters [about 30,000 square feet] (calculated according to the declaration of Filip Muller). But there is no trace of them at all!" *The Gassed People of Auschwitz*, 11. Indeed, Mattogno is correct. There is no evidence for 30,000 square feet of cremation pits. Of course, he avoided mentioning how much square footage of pits is on the photo.

In *My Banned Holocaust Interview*, 18, he states that eyewitness testimony attributes a total of 2400 square meters to the May 31 photos consisting of the 1800 allegedly identified by Muller in the area of

Krema V and 600 identified by Miklos Nyiszli, a Jewish doctor who worked in the crematoria. Nyiszli did identify two pits in the area of the White Bunker, but only gave the dimensions of one of the pits as being about 3300 square feet while no area was specified for the second pit. Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account, 87-88. At any rate, the Lucas Report in Appendix IV would not rule out an area of about six thousand square feet of pits in the area of the White Bunker.

Mattogno then writes that the photos "do not reveal the slightest trace of such an appalling extermination: there is no trace of huge 'cremation pits' " Once again, by inflating the real area of the pits in the area of Krema V he was able to avoid explaining the pits that are actually on the photo which are identified in Carroll Lucas's report. (Appendix IV). Thus, Mattogno can argue that he never denied that there are pits, he only denied that there were "huge cremation pits." Of course, Mattogno himself has defined what is "huge." No doubt that if the photos showed 2400 square meters of cremation space Mattogno would then argue that this is not really "huge" and concentrate on some higher number. Mattogno did not address the writings of Sonderkommando Paul Bendel on the pit question. He identified three pits in the area of Krema V as being about 800 square feet each. Kogon et.al. Nazi Mass Murder, 170. In fact Bendel's estimate is conservative considering the actual photo shows more space than this.

202. See the discussion on page 52 of the present work.

203 The photo is labeled as National Archives # RG 373- GX/DT/TM. It will be the subject of a future analysis on THHP. My thanks to the late Mark Van Alstine for analyzing it for me. This photo was not analyzed by Carroll Lucas because it was unknown when he carried out his research. Lucas notes in his report that there are signs of vegetation on the gravesites in the June 26 photo. (Page 292 herein) However, this is not surprising. Recall that June 26 was during a one week period when deportees from Hungary were not arriving in the camp. Deportations had been suspended from June 17 to June 24, 1944 and it took 3 or 4 days to reach Auschwitz from Hungary. (See the discussion at notes 54-58 on page 51 of the present work.) Therefore, there was no activity during this period of time that would have necessitated open air burnings. The July 8 photo clearly shows that the burning pits were still in use when the deportations resumed.

204. Hugo Erichsen, Cremation of the Dead (Detroit: 1887), 138. An eyewitness testified before the International Military Tribunal that during the Hungarian operation "many bodies were thrown into large pits and covered with quicklime." IMT, Vol. 37, p.627

205. Hoess, Death Dealer, 32; Pery Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad," 182; Testimony of Szlama Dragon, in Kogon et.al, Nazi Mass Murder, 151; Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 49; Testimony of Madame Vaillant-Couturier, a prisoner at Auschwitz and a member of France's Constituent Assembly when she testified at the war crimes trials in 1946. IMT, Vol.6, p. 216.

206. Reilly, Belsen: The Liberation of a Concentration Camp, 25.

207. Marszalek, Majdanek. The Concentration Camp of Lublin, 142-143.

208. Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, 172-174.

209. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 136, 137.

210. Kogon et al, Nazi Mass Murder, 171.

211. Mattogno and Deana, 32,33

212. Nyiszli, Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account, 84-89; Dragon testimony in Kogon et al. Nazi Mass Murder, 151; Broad, "Reminiscences of Pery Broad", 182; Hoess, Death Dealer, 32 who mentions using wood to pile the bodies on.

213. Pressac, Auschwitz, 422; Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 639.

214. Gutman and Berenbaum, Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, 354; Hoess, Death Dealer, plate; Czech, Auschwitz Chronicle, 639; Dwork and Van Pelt, Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present, 342; Bezwinska and Czech, Amidst a Nightmare of Crime, 57; Michael Shermer, Why People Believe Weird Things (NY: 1997), 232; Piper and Swiebocka, Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp, plate; <http://www.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/camps/auschwitz/images/burning-pit.jpg>.

215. Teresa Swiebocka, Auschwitz: A History in Photographs (Bloomington: 1993) 174-175. Thirteen Sonderkommandos can definitely be identified on the photo while a background figure could be another Sonderkommando. For the conditions under which this photo was taken and the participants see the testimony of Sonderkommando Alter Fajnzberg in Swiebocka, pp. 42-43.

Mattogno was disingenuous when dealing with this photo. In 1996 he cited the incomplete version of the photo - even though the expanded version mentioned here was available in 1993 - as "not show[ing] hundreds of men from the Sonderkommando, or thousands of bodies, but rather, eight men in the midst of about thirty cadavers; that is all. Not only does this therefore fail to confirm the mass extermination thesis, it decisively refutes it." My Banned Holocaust Interview, 43. In fact Mattogno has completely misrepresented the true context of the photo.

First, it is impossible to tell how many Sonderkommandos were involved in this burning operation because the total area of Krema V is not shown in the photo. For all we know, there could have been an additional hundred Sonderkommandos dragging bodies from Krema V. It is impossible to tell how many additional Sonderkommandos and bodies were involved because the photo simply does not cover the total relevant area from Krema V to the pits.

Second, and more importantly, it is impossible to tell how many bodies are being burned because smoke is obscuring the pits. For all Mattogno knows there could have been hundreds of additional bodies being burned. The photo shows about 50 cadavers which have not yet been burned. The thick smoke from the photo shows that a significant burning operation is underway. This means that there were many more bodies than the 30 mentioned by Mattogno. What is particularly instructive about Mattogno's method of argumentation is that he used the fact that there is smoke obscuring the true dimension of the burning operation to argue that the burning did not really involve that many prisoners. This is quite typical of the way deniers argue.

It might also be noted that this burning did not take place during the Hungarian operation - which occurred from mid May to mid July 1944 -but in August 1944.

216. Muller, Eyewitness Auschwitz, 136.

217. Hoess, Death Dealer, 37.

218. Randolph Braham, *The Politics of Genocide* (NY: 2nd ed. 1994), Vol. 2 pp. 1403-1405. These records are incomplete as to the number of deportees and transports.
219. Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria", 162, 169
220. See the photo in Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 368
221. Photo in Swiebocka, *Auschwitz: A History in Photographs*, 174-175
222. John Ball, *Air Photo Evidence* (Canada: 1992), 64,71,76.
223. *Ibid.*, 48.
224. *Ibid.*, 63.
225. These are reproduced in Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle*, 63 (Krema II), 358 (Krema IV, fence in background), 426 (Krema III, fence clearly visible), 639 (burning pit area of Krema V). The Krema V fence is more clearly visible in Swiebocka, *Auschwitz: A History in Photographs*, 174-175. Photos of Kremas IV and III with fence also in Dwork and Van Pelt, *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present*, 332, 333.
226. Memo of April 23, 1943 entitled "Konzentrationslager Auschwitz" in AA file 502-1-11, reel 19; See also APMO, Dpr.- Hd/11a, Nr. 386, May 7, 1943, p. 93 and Nr. 516, June 17, 1943, p.94 for fence building around Krema III.
227. Letter by Pohl to Himmler dated April 5, 1944, NO 021 in NMT, Vol.5, 385-386.
228. Aktenvermerk: "Betr: Besprechung anlässlich des Besuches...", June 20, 1944 in AA file, 502-1-21, p.2, reel 19. See also the explanation in note 197 herein. BA I and II refer to Birkenau Sectors I and II, which held the women's camp and quarantine camp respectively. The crematoria were in Sector III . Professor Robert - Jan van Pelt has informed me that these morgues were constructed from horsestable barracks and that their designs and physical remains still survive. He explains that they were intended to give each of these camps "their own admittedly limited morgue capacity, probably because whatever opportunity had existed in the crematoria to accommodate the corpses of those who had died in the camp had been lost as the result of the constant use of the crematoria in the Hungarian action."
229. Hoess, *Death Dealer*, 37.
230. Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, 64, 71.
231. John Ball, *Air Photo Evidence* (<http://www.codoh.com/found/fndaeriaLhtml>) , 18. This is an update of the source cited in the prior note.
232. Ball analysis of the July 8, 1944 photo in <http://www.air-photo.com/english/julypic.html>.
233. Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, 64.
234. Bauleitung completion document for Krema II in Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 231 showing a separate fuel storage room and see *Les Crematoires d' Auschwitz*, photos 36 to 39 showing where the coke storage units were located in Kremas III, IV and V.

235. Ball, Air Photo Evidence, 36
236. My thanks to Mark Van Alstine for measuring the distance.
237. Mattogno and Deana, 33. My thanks to Mark Van Alstine for identifying the geographic area that Mattogno mentions.
238. John Ball, Air Photo Evidence note 231 herein, 18. This is an update of his book.
239. The CIA report does not take into consideration Krema I in the main camp, which was closed down in July 1943. Therefore, Kremas II-V in Birkenau are identified as Birkenau Kremas I -IV in literature which does not take the main camp crematorium into account.
240. Dino Brugioni and Michael Poirier, The Holocaust Revisited (Washington D.C.: 1979), 11
241. Pressac, Auschwitz, 484. Tauber's description mentions "four small chimneys through which the gas was thrown..."
242. Ibid., 436.
243. Brugioni and Poirer, The Holocaust Revisited, 7.
244. Ibid. ,9.
245. Ball, Air Photo Evidence, 46-47.
246. Ball, Air Photo Evidence, note 231 herein, 11-16.
247. John Morris, Where Is John Ball (<http://www.nizkor.org/features/ball-challenge/>).
248. Michael Shermer, Why People Believe Weird Things (NY: 1997), 233.
249. Lucas did not examine the Luftwaffe photo taken on July 8, 1944 because it was unknown at the time he conducted his research.
250. Ball, Air Photo Evidence, foreword which precedes the Table of Contents.

## INDEX

Adelsberger, Lucie, 61, 73

American Jewish Committee, 8, 173

American Jewish Yearbook, xiii, 28

App, Austin J., 121-122, 123-124

Arad, Yitzhak, 15, 88

Armia Krajowa, 138

Auschwitz-Birkenau, xi, 15, 18,19, 22, 23; 178-180;

air extraction, 195;

Block 11, 57-58, 98, 187, 189, 345;

bunkers for gassing, 75-76, 101, 206, 236-237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 246-248, 364,  
389, 391-392, 393;

Central Construction Agency (Bauleitung), 191, 195, 200, 202, 204, 205, 211, 222, 224, 227,  
232, 233, 249, 366, 370-371, 373-374;

Central Sauna, 199, 200, 204, 370-371, 375, 393;

corpse cellars, 191-195, 366, 367;

crematoria, 60, 61, 71, 75, 76, 77, 78, 83, 87, 99, 100, 185, 187-188, 205-234, 338, 365, 366;

Death Books, 54, 63-65, 99, 113, 207, 337;

gas chambers, 73, 75, 82, 83, 87, 101, 137, 197-198;

gassing cellar, 191-193, 196;

gas tight doors, 196-198;

Greek Jews (from Salonika), 66, 84, 258;

Hungarian Jews 42, 45, 48, 50, 86, 101, 114, 241, 242, 243, 322, 327;

Kanada, 115, 116;  
Netherlands' Jews, 53-57, 256-257;  
morgue register, 98, 207;  
photos of, 51, 52, 78, 99, 243-245, 246, 248-253;  
selections, 72;  
showers, fake, 77, 80, 101, 196-197;  
Soviet (Russian) POWs, 98, 207, 211, 337;  
special actions, 56-59; 207, 208, 211, 376-377;  
State Museum, 182, 183;  
trials, 73, 101, 109-112;  
typhus, 59-62, 65, 72, 85, 190, 206, 208, 327, 361  
undressing rooms, 194-195;  
vents on crematorium, 250-251  
ausrotten. See Irving, David  
Austrian Resistance Archives, 176  
Aynat, Enrique, 137-138, 368

Baltics, 27-30, 34-36

Baer, Richard, 110, 113

Ball, John, 248-253

Bauleitung. See Auschwitz Central Construction Agency

Baldwin, Hanson, 115

Bauer, Erich, 106

Beaverbrook, Lord, 160

Becker, August, 22, 358

400

Belzec, xi, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 56, 88, 89, 102, 105, 106, 133-134, 234, 345

Bendel, Paul, 76, 77, 79, 241, 246, 394

Berg, Friedrich, 136, 355-356, 362

Bergen Belsen, 175, 234, 246, 355;  
trials, 107

Berney, A.L., 355

Bernstein, Edward, 129

Bessarabia, 27, 36

Bialystok, 16

Bielitz, 113, 114

Birkenau (Auschwitz II), see Auschwitz-Birkenau

Block 11. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

Bock, Richard, 238

Bolshevik Revolution and Germany, 129-130. See also Communism

Boheman, Eric, 104

boycott, Nazi of Jews, 158-160

Brandt, Willi, 121

Brack, Victor, 24, 315

Braham, Randolph, 43, 51

Braun, Karl Otto, 125

Breitman, Richard, 138

British Broadcasting Corporation, 139

British Intelligence, 25

Broad, Pery, 64, 98, 100-102, 233, 238

Broszat, Martin, 145, 174-175, 176, 354

Brugioni, Dino, 243

Bryant, Dr Nevin, 245, 251

Buchenwald, 120, 175, 212

bunkers for gassing. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

Browning, Christopher, 344

burning pits. See cremations, open air

Butz, Arthur, xii, 16, 31, 41, 46, 73, 74, 78, 81, 91, 94, 108, 120, 123, 131-132, 139, 163, 174, 178, 191-192, 331, 332, 365, 368

Bruchfeld, Stephane, 359

Byelorussia (White Russia), 31, 312, 320

carbon monoxide. See gas, poison

Carlo, Willis, 119

Central Sauna. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

Chelmno, xi, 13, 21, 56, 88, 177

Chomsky, Noam, 142

Christophersen, Thies, 112-116

CIA, 251

Cobb, Augustus, 217

code words for killing, 21-26

Cohen, Dr. Elie, 73, 131

coke for ovens, 224-228, 235-237

Cold War, 142

Cole, David, 179, 359

Conway, John, xiv

Communism, German role in, 129-130; Jewish role in, 127-131

concentration camps, 13, 15, 18

Conquest, Robert, 142

corpse cellars. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

cremations, open air, 75, 76, 99, 100, 234-248, 360, 389, 390-391, 393-394, 395

cremations, oven. See crematoria

crematoria. See Auschwitz-Birkenau; in Germany, 218-219, in Paris, 217

Creteur, 245

Crowell, Samuel, 365, 371

Czech, Danuta, 55, 57, 66, 219, 236, 390

Dachau, 175-176, 212, 213, 223, 228

Daily Express, 157, 160, 161, 162

Dawidowicz, Lucy, 70

Death Books. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

DEGESCH MANUAL, 184, 185, 186

Degrelle, Leon, 124-125

401

Eichmann, Adolf, 337. See also Irving, David

Einsatzgruppen, 25, 31-36, 71, 132-133, 347

Encyclopedia Judaica, 30

Erichsen, Hugo, 245

Escapees Report, First. See Vrba-Wetzler

Escapees Report, Second, 86-88, 241

Euthanasia Program in Germany, 24, 25, 107

Evans, Dr Richard. 172

evacuation of Jews, 21, 24, 25

Eynikeyt, 28

famine. See starvation

Farrakan, Louis, 122, 174

Faurisson, Robert, 56-60, 113, 126, 135-136, 181, 186, 193, 194, 198, 328, 354, 362

Feinsilber, Alter, 228, 237, 238, 241, 242

Ferenczy, Laslo, 43, 47, 322

Final Solution, 91, 93, 248

Flat Earth Society, 141

food rationing, 11, 12

Ford, Henry, 122

Frank, Anne, 175, 354

Frank, Hans, 11, 14, 20, 39, 94-95

Franco-Prussian War, 245

Franke - Gricksch, Alfred, 107

Franz, Kurt, 105

Fuchs, Erich, 106

Galicia, 12

gas chambers, 22, 23, 355-356 (See also Auschwitz-Birkenau)

gas, poison, 22, 23, 25, 89, 355-356;

carbon monoxide, 176-178, 355-356, 371;

see also Zyklon B

gasmask, 185

gas vans, 151, 176-178, 200, 356, 357-358

General Government. See Poland

Gerlach, Christian, 320

German-Soviet alliance, 317

Germany, 6, 7

Gerstein, Kurt, 102-105

Globocnik, Odilo, 15, 18, 135, 163, 234, 344

Goebbels, Joseph, 24, 39, 45, 126, 155, 168, 342;

diaries, 162-165, gold teeth, 76, 77, 78, 80, 99, 101, 103, 331, 333

Goring, Herman, 91-93, 126, 159, 336

Greek Jews. See Auschwitz

Green, Dr. Richard, 259, 363-364

Greiser, Arthur, 26

Grubach, Paul, 361, 362

Gusen, 209, 212, 213, 215-217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 229, 232

Halt, 176

Headland, Ronald, 36  
Herbert, Ulrich, 36  
Herman, Chaim, 82  
Heydrich, Reinhard, 149  
Hilberg, Raul, 66, 203  
Hillis, Newell Dwight, 353  
Himmler, Heinrich, 12,13, 14, 18, 20, 21,26, 32; 37-39, 94, 135-136, 145, 146, 158, 165, 315,  
319  
Posen Speech, 24, 95, 148

402

Historians' Controversy (in Germany), 143  
Hitler, Adolf, 20, 36, 39, 92, 120, 121, 124, 130, 145, 146-147, 154, 157, 169, 313  
Hitler Diaries as fake, 32,  
Hoblinger, Karl, 238  
Hochstrasser, Dr. 103, 104, 105  
Hoess, Rudolph, 50, 72, 91, 97-100, 151, 189, 231, 236-237, 239, 240, 243, 249, 337  
Hoessler, Franz, 59, 109  
Holocaust History Project, 142  
Horthy, Miklos, 42, 93, 313  
Hoths, Herman Colonel-General, 33  
Hungarian Jews, deportations of, 41-52;  
used for labor, 47-50.

See Auschwitz-Birkenau

hydrocyanic acid. See Zyklon B

IHR. See Institute For Historical Review

Institute for Contemporary History (Munich), 3, 4, 307

Institute For Forensic Research, Report by, 98, 187-191, 206, 259-274, 363-364

Institute for Jewish Affairs, 8

Institute For Historical Review (IHR), 103, 119, 122, 124, 130

International Military Tribunal, 91, 96, 97

Irving, David, 92, 126, 224, 235;

on ausrotten; 153-155;

on Eichmann 149-153, 347, 352;

on Goebbels, 155-157, 162-165, 351-352;

on Hitler, 144-148; on Jews, 170-172;

on Kristallnacht, 350-351; a

at Zundel trial, 347;

civil lawsuit verdict, 172

Izbica Lubelska, 133

Jacobs, Dr. Benjamin, 73

Jager, Karl, report on killing, 35

Jakobskotter, Rudolph, 214, 230, 380

Joint Distribution Committee, 7

Jones, Mitchell, 315

Journal of Historical Review, 122, 123, 142, 156, 341

Kaltenbrunner, Ernst, 49, 93-94

Karski, Jan, 133-134

Katzman, General, 12, 13

Katyn Forest Massacre, 32

Kaufering Concentration Camp, 50

Kaufman, Theodore, 121, 128, 166-170

Kausch, Hans Joachim, 28

Kautsky, Benedikt, 114

Kennedy, John F., assassination of, xi, 69, 141

Kerensky, Alexander, 128

Kimmelman, Mira Rycke, 363

Kielar, Wieslaw, 63, 72

Kiev, 25 Kirsz, Stefan, 89

Klarseld, Serge, 66

Klein, Fritz, 108, 109

Klehr, Josef, 109-110

Klukowski, Dr. Zygmunt, 88-89

Korherr Report, 13, 15, 21, 23, 26, 88

Krakowski, Shmuel, 70

Kramer, Joseph, 108, 109

Kremer, Johann, 56-60, 61, 65, 72, 74, 98, 101, 238, 326, 328

Kristallnacht, 125-126, 161, 350-351

Kube, Wilhelm, 22, 312

Labor Needs, German, 34, 36-40  
Lachout Document, 176  
Lambert, Eric, 106  
Langowski, Juergen, 358  
Laqueur, Walter, 104, 144  
Latvia, 22, 35, 348  
League of National Socialist Lawyers, 159  
Legace, Ivan, 221, 222

403

Lenin, Vladimir, 128-129  
Lettich, Andre, 77, 79,  
Leuchter Report, 148, 181-187, 201, 221  
Liberty Lobby, 167  
Lipstadt, Deborah, 119, 172, 374  
Lingens-Reiner, Ella, 61, 64, 72-73, 328-329  
Lithuania, 35  
Lodz Ghetto, 11, 77, 246  
Long, Breckenridge, 6  
Lohse, Heinrich, 22, 24  
Lucas, Carroll, 242, 252,  
report by 242-244, 252-253, 276-301, 394

Lukacs, John, 144, 145

Luther, Martin, 14

Madagascar, 26, 352

Majdanek, xi, 84-85, 234, 246

Mark, Bernard, 81-82

Marsden, Victor, 122

Mattes, Herber, 105

Mattogno, Carlo, 36, 46, 48, 50, 102, 103, 185, 203-204, 205-254, 320, 322, 323, 332-333, 334,  
335, 365, 367-368, 369-371, 372, 373, 374-375, 377, 384, 385, 386, 387, 390,  
392-393, 393-394, 395

Mauthausen, 177, 209, 212, 215-217, 380

Mayer, Amo, 179-180, 359

Mein Kampf, 121, 158, 170

Mengele, Dr. Joseph , 61, 72, 73

Mentz, Willi, 105

Micheels, Dr. Louis, 73

Minsk, 312

Mirchuk, Petro, 61, 73-74, 363

Mogilev, 206

Moll, Otto, 77, 81

Monowitz, 96, 114

Mordowicz, Czeslaw, 86

Morgen, Konrad, 96

Morris, John, 251

Muller, Filip, 231, 238, 241, 242, 246, 393-394

Muller, Heinrich,

Muller, Major, 176

Multiple Body Burning, 223, 228-231

Nagyvarad, 45

Nahon, Dr. Marco, 73

Netherlands, deportations from, 53-56, 256-257

Netherlands State Institute For War Documentation, 17, 55, 56

New York Cremation Society, 381

Nizkor, 142, 251

Nolte, Ernst, 143, 145

Nuremberg Laws, 161

Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, 32, 91-96, 112

Nyiszli, Dr. Miklos, 73, 78, 79, 241, 242, 331-332, 393

Oberhauser, Josef,

Ohlendorf, Otto, 200, 371

Operation Reinhard, 12, 15, 18, 23, 105-107, 135, 234, 246, 339

Organization of American Historians, 142-143

Oswiecim, (Polish name for Auschwitz), 137, 139.

Paczula, Tadeusz, 233

Palestine, Jewish immigration to, 9

Perl, Dr. Gisella, 73

Petchinik, Aaron, 8.

Pfannensteil, Dr., 104

photos. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

Piper, Dr. Franciszek, 66, 179

Pipes, Richard, 128

Poland: General Government, 7,10, 14, 20, 234, 321;

Jewish emigration from, 3, 4, 6;

Soviet deportations of Jews from, 8, 9, 70

Poland Fights, 139

404

Polish Fortnightly Review, 137

Polish Government in Exile, 139, 207

poll on Holocaust, 173-174

Posen Speech. See Himmler

Pressac, Jean-Claude, 80, 185, 188, 191, 196-197, 202, 204, 224, 238, 251, 367, 373, 376

Protocols of Zion, 122, 158

Prufer, Kurt, 210, 220, 222, 387

Prussian Blue, 363-364

Prussian State Mint, 80

Prussic Acid. See Zyklon B

PS 501, 356-358

Pytel, Dr. Roman, 82

radio intercepts, 316

railroads, 16, 19

Rasher, Dr. Sigmund, 175-176

Rassinier, Paul, xii, 78, 79, 110, 120, 166, 169, 305, 331-332

Rauff, Walter, 177

Ravine, Macha, 363

records, absence of on Auschwitz, 232-234

Red Cross, 115;

International Committee of, 41-44;

Netherlands, 54, 55, 56, 325

Reich in Poland, 48, 321

Reich Bank, 80

Reich Main Security Office, 49

Reinhard. See Operation Reinhard

Reitlinger, Gerald, 9, 16, 54

Remer, Otto Ernst, 127

resettlement of Jews, 25

revisionism, 142

Riga (see Latvia)

Roper Organization, 173

Roques, Henri, 102

Rosen, Arnost, 86

Rosenberg, Alfred, 96-97, 154, 158, 348

Rosenberg, Walter, 82

Rothenberg, Joshua, 27

Rudolf, Gernar, 363-364

Rumania, 27, 29, 30

Russian Elections of 1917, 128

Sanders, Fritz, 221

Sauckel, Fritz, 37

SS (Security Police), 18;  
Court verdict, 35

Sanning, Walter, xiii, xiv, 3-10, 27-31, 41, 44, 53, 69, 120, 132, 309

Schmelter, Fritz, 48, 49

Schaner, Jenny, 64

Schiff, Jacob, 128

Sculch, Karl, 106

selections. See Auschwitz

Sereny, Gitta, 105

Smith, Bradley F.,

Smolen, Kazimierz, 62, 79, 80, 332-333

Sobibor, xi, 13,15, 16, 19, 54, 88, 89, 105, 106, 234, 345

Soederblum, Mr, 104

Sonderkommandos, 72, 76, 87, 221, 228, 229, 241, 242, 246, 247-248, 395;  
manuscripts by, 80-82

Soviet Union, 6, 7;

census in, 27, 29, 30, 36, 317-318;

document suppression alleged, 385, 387;

evacuation of Jews, 29;

resettlement (alleged) of Jews in, 16-21

Soviet POWs. See Auschwitz

Spanish Inquisition, 126-127.

special actions. See Auschwitz

special lodging, 110

special measures, 204, 373

special treatment (Sonderbehandlung), 21, 22, 23, 85-86, 94, 100, 110, 131, 202-204, 210, 314,  
373-374

Sprenger, 18, 233

Staglich, Wilhelm, xii, 74, 75, 76, 78, 81, 84, 93, 95, 101- 102, 109, 110, 111, 112, 120, 121, 132, 166,  
328-329, 330

Stangl, Franz, 105, 235

405

Stark, Hans, 110

starvation, 11, 12, 136, 344, 355

Streicher, Julius, 96, 155, 168-169

Stroop, Jurgen, 12, 13

Sydnor, Charles, 145, 154

Swedish Foreign Ministry, 103-104

Szmaglewska, Seweryna, 363

T 4 Organization, 107

Tauber, Henryk, 78, 229-230, 233, 234, 238, 241, 242, 251

Taylor, Simon, 158

Tesch and Stenbow, 368

Theresienstadt, 62, 78, 84

Todt Organization, 49

Topf and Sons, 205-209, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 227, 231, 233, 368, 380, 382, 387-388

Transport Ministry, German,

Treblinka, xi, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 54, 88, 89, 102, 105, 134-135, 234, 312, 344, 345

Trotsky, Leon, 128

Turner Diaries, 122

Turner, Harald, 200

typhus in the ghetto, 11, 136, 344;  
in Dachau, 213.

See also Auschwitz-Birkenau

Ukraine, 27, 28, 36

undressing rooms. See Auschwitz-Birkenau

United States: Jewish immigration and population, 4, 5

Urn, 381

Vaillant-Couturier, Madame, 74-75, 329, 330

Van Alstine, Mark, 243

Vassiliev, Nicolai, 239, 240

Veesenmayer, Edmund, 42, 43, 48, 51, 323

Volkogonov, Dmitri, 129

Von Ginant, General, 37

Von Horn, Otto, 106

Von Ludendorf, Erich, 129

Von Otter, Baron, 103-104

Von Thadden, Eberhard, 48, 323

Von Tonningen, Florence S. Rost, 125

Von Ribbentrop, Joachim, 93

Vrba-Wetzler Report, 82-86, 88, 239-240

Wannsee Conference, 9, 14

warm air induction device, 193, 369-370

Warsaw, 11, 12

Warsaw Ghetto, 135

Warthegau (See Chelmno)

Weber, Mark, 62, 70, 94, 126, 127, 131, 132-134, 136, 203, 343

Weckert, Ingrid, 125-126, 357-358, 358-359

Weekly World News, xi

Weizmann, Chaim, 120, 125, 126, 161-162

Wehrmacht (German Army), 33

Werner, Steffan, 311-312, 314

Wetzel, Ernst, 24

White Bunker. See bunkers for gassing under Auschwitz-Birkenau

White Russia. See Byelorussia

Wiernik, Jankiel, 89

Wiesenthal, Simon, 176

Willenberg, Samuel, 89

Williams, Robert, 127

Wischnitzer, Mark, 5, 31, 306

wood for cremations 231-232

Worl, Ludwig, 73

World Jewish Congress, 8, 13

406

Zabecki, Franciszek, 89, 336

Zentralbauleitung. See Central Construction Agency under Auschwitz -Birkenau

Zionism, 123, 127

Zukerman, Jacob, 8

Zyklon B, 25, 71, 98, 184-187, 189-190, 193, 196, 362, 363-364, 367-368, 372

Zundel, Ernst, 181, 221, 347, 383

## ADDENDUM

Hi John!!

Got your E- Mail and want you to know that you have my permission to use my report en toto in your book.

In answer to your question on "the Structure" You are correct in stating that it exists. In my notes I recorded the existence a small cluster of two, possibly three buildings that are situated approximately 550 feet outside of the Eastern Security fence of the Birkenau complex, approximately 1500 feet from the easternmost bulldozed mass grave, and approximately 950 feet from the Northeastern corner of what has been identified as Crematorium III. It can be seen on the 31 May Photographic image and also on the 21 December image. On the photography, the structures appear as a small farm house and a couple storage buildings. There is no evidence of security, and nothing that would indicate, or negate, the structure being a gas chamber. Such verification would have to come from other collateral data.

However, the interesting thing that brought it to my attention was the existence of a small unimproved road/trail that begins at this structure and traverses southeast to the security barrier next to the Birkenau water/sewage processing plant, continues on along the southernmost edge of this plant to the northwestern corner of the wall surrounding Crematorium III. The resolution is too poor in both images to determine whether it penetrates the wall. The light snow cover in the 21 Dec coverage allows one to observe the extent of the trail although the resolution is much poorer than the 31 May coverage. This implies a definite connection at one time between the structure and the Birkenau complex.

The second question concerned formations of prisoners marching toward Crematorium V on the 31 May image. My notes indicate "possible" lines of people moving between the open hand dug trenches toward Crematorium V. There is a broken line of four different irregular dark spots along the road. These may possibly be personnel assigned to digging the trenches or being marched to the Crematorium. The fact that one formation appears to be turning the corner into the area of the crematorium suggests the latter. However, the resolution of the photo is such that a clear call cannot be made. The call is strengthened by the independent analyses conducted by Cal Tech.

Your third question concerning the construction activity at Crematorium V is based primarily on the 31 May coverage which shows the building to be complete, but a lot of debris adjacent to the building. The presence of this outside storage and debris leads me to believe that though the building may be functional, internal construction may still be going on (internal walls, plumbing etc) Of course it may be that the builders had just left the debris after they were completed-though I doubt it, since it could be the source for all kinds of mischief by prisoners. I see no evidence of another building being built in this area.

Hope this clarifies some of the comments in my report, and it certainly indicates the amount of information that is available in these photos and the depth to which they can be analyzed.

Sincerely,

Carroll Lucas

#### Endnotes

1. The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex published by the Central Intelligence Agency, Washington DC February, 1979.
2. The support I received from Archive-2 personnel was, and remains, outstanding and their patience in answering my questions and requests, though severely tried, has been faultless.
3. See, for example, a detailed analysis of these facilities in a book entitled Air Photo Evidence, authored by John C. Ball and published by Ball Resource Services Limited, Delta BC Canada- undated, but after 1995
4. For an excellent history of World War-II photographic intelligence collection and analysis. Read Air Spy authored by Constance Babington Smith, dated 1957. Library of Congress catalogue card number 57-8194
5. 20X Zoom 240 oculars were brought into the Archives by the author to achieve this capability. With the built-in 3X maximum Zoom of the microscope, a maximum of 60X is made possible.
6. Historical Atlas of the Holocaust. Published for the United States Holocaust Museum by Macmillan Publishing Company, 1996 ISBN: 0-02-897451-4. Pages 94, 95
7. For other interpretations of this facility, see the Holocaust Revisited, by the CIA, and Air Photo Evidence, by John C. Ball.
8. I noted that the schematics in both The Historical Atlas of the Holocaust, and John C Ball's Air Photo Evidence, documented only 29 of the thirty prisoner barracks in the camp. Both missed the same obvious barrack between the last and next to last barracks in their schematics, in the northeast corner of the camp. I can't explain the coincidence from the photography alone.
9. For examples, see page 95, annotation 7, Historical Atlas of the Holocaust, page 33, annotation B, John C. Ball's Air Photo Evidence, page 7, annotation "Gas Chamber", in The Holocaust Revisited.
10. See Air Photo Evidence by John C. Ball- pg. 58.
11. There is some confusion on the date this mission was flown, however, titling of the film indicates this to be 26 June 1944
12. See Air Photo Evidence by John C. Ball pages 37-42.
13. Please refer back to pages 279-282 herein.

