


The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 18, Number 4

July / August 1999



**Dr. Toben Free After Seven Months
in German Custody**

**Wartime Germany's Anti-Gas
Air Raid Shelters**

Samuel Crowell

New CODOH Campus Furor

**Enduring Impact of
the 'Garaudy Affair'**

Theodore J. O'Keefe


'Political Correctness' in Germany

Claus Nordbruch

"Americans ... will find its indictment as sickening as it is incredible."

— Pat Buchanan

**New Revised and Updated Edition of
the Book that Tore the Shroud of Silence
from Eisenhower's Death Camps**



OTHER LOSSES

by James Bacque

Other Losses was the first book to alert the conscience of the world to the shameful treatment of Germany's defeated soldiers by the U.S. and its allies after World War II.

The inhumanities inflicted on German POW's in Stalin's USSR are well known, but it took *Other Losses* to break the story of how, on the orders of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the disarmed soldiers of a defeated Germany were stripped of their rights as prisoners under the Geneva Convention, herded together in vast enclosures where, often forced to dig primitive shelters with their own hands, subsisting on grass and water, deprived of medical treatment, they died like flies.

First published in 1989, *Other Losses* stirred up a media storm in North America and in Europe, earning respectful treatment from such media giants as CBS, *Time*, *Der Spiegel*, and the *New York Times*. Praised by Pat Buchanan and revisionist historian Alfred de Zayas, *Other Losses* is must reading for revisionists.

This timely new edition, updated with Bacque's answer to critics of the first printing, together with shocking new evidence of the crimes the Allies were committing against their German captives — even as they were preparing and staging the Nuremberg trial! — is once again available from the first American publisher to sell and stock the first edition: the Institute of Historical Review



Other Losses:

**An Investigation into the Mass
Deaths of German Prisoners at
the Hands of the French and
Americans After World War II**

by James Bacque

Softcover, 365 pp., Introduction,
photographs, source references,
bibliography, index. (#0890)

\$18.95 postpaid

(California orders add \$1.27 tax)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Editor: Mark Weber
Associate Editors: Greg Raven
Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokesmen of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District (ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Electrical
and Computer Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Santa Fe Springs, California

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
Professor of French Literature (ret.)
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The Agorist Institute
Beverly Hills, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Vlotho/Weser, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

C. ZAVERDINOS, Ph.D.
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 18, Number 4

July / August 1999

IN THIS ISSUE

German Court Sentences Australian Holocaust Skeptic	2
CODOH's <i>Revisionist</i> Distribution Prompts Media Furor	6
Wartime Germany's Anti-Gas Air Raid Shelters: A Refutation of Pressac's 'Criminal Traces' <i>Samuel Crowell</i>	7
Origin and Enduring Impact of the 'Garaudy Affair' <i>Theodore J. O'Keefe</i>	31
'Political Correctness' in Germany <i>Claus Nordbruch</i>	36
Letters	39

On the Cover: Fredrick Toben

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review**, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: \$40 per year, \$65 for two years, and \$90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add \$10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add \$30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

Single copies of most *Journal* issues published since Spring 1986 (Volume 7) are available for \$7.50 each, plus \$2.00 shipping. Ask about the availability of specific issues. Hardbound annual volumes of the *Journal* for the years 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 are also available for \$40.00 each, plus \$3.50 shipping. Write for our booklist and prices.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on diskette. Send all correspondence to **P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659**. E-mail to: ihr@ihr.org. Web site: <http://www.ihr.org>.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: \$40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

German Court Sentences Australian Holocaust Skeptic

Dr. Toben Free After Seven Months In Custody

Dr. Fredrick Toben, an Australian scholar and educator, is free after seven months in German prison for having disputed Holocaust extermination allegations. He was taken into custody in Mannheim on April 8, 1999, and detained, without bail, until his trial in November. Toben, 55, is a leading Holocaust revisionist writer and publicist in Australia, where he founded and (until his arrest) directed the Adelaide Institute, an important revisionist research and publishing center.


At the conclusion of the three-day trial on November 10, 1999, a Mannheim district court found Toben guilty on charges of incitement to racial hatred, insulting the memory of the dead, and public denial of genocide, because he had disputed Holocaust extermination claims in writings sent to persons in Germany. Presiding Judge Klaus Kern said that there is no doubt that Toben is guilty of "denying the Holocaust," and that because there is no sign that he would relent his views and activities, a prison sentence was required. The court then sentenced him to ten months imprisonment.

Taking into consideration the seven months he had already served in custody, Judge Kern ruled that Toben could be released on payment of a bail or fine of 6,000 marks (about \$3,500) in lieu of the three months remaining of his prison sentence. German sympathizers quickly raised the money, and he was freed within 24 hours of the verdict.

Important Court Ruling on Internet

In a ruling with potentially far-reaching consequences, the Mannheim court declared that German law has no jurisdiction over Toben's "on-line" writings or publications. It declined to consider the extensive evidence presented by the prosecution taken from the Adelaide Institute's Internet web site. Judge Kern said the court could take into account only the material Toben had mailed to or otherwise physically distributed in Germany. Material published on the Internet is not published in Germany. Instead, he went on, its distribution requires the Internet user, acting on his own initiative, to connect with the Adelaide Institute web site, and then to download material from it.

"This is a victory for free speech," Toben commented upon his release. "We have saved the Inter-



Fredrick Toben inside the "gas chamber" at the Auschwitz I main camp, April 1997.

net as a place we can tell the truth and not be punished for it." The German court's Internet ruling may be relevant, for example, in the current legal case before the "Human Rights Commission" in Tor-

onto, Canada, which charges Ernst Zündel with distributing "hate" through an Internet web site based in southern California.

Expressing concern that the Mannheim court's verdict sets a dangerous precedent, prosecutor Hans-Heiko Klein immediately lodged an appeal. "This is the first time," he said, that "a court in Germany has decided that some things which are said in [sic] Germany on the Internet cannot be subject to German laws. This is a very bad thing. It will undermine our laws which are very important for ensuring that history in Germany is not repeated."

Toben's attorney is likewise appealing the court's sentence.

Toben remains defiant. "I will not be silenced," he vowed. "I intend to keep using the Internet to promote discussion on these issues. I believe in seeking the truth. Why are they so afraid in Germany of allowing open discussion about the so-called Holocaust? It can only be because they are afraid of the truth."

Intimidation of Defendants

On the first day of the trial, November 8, Toben announced that he would not defend himself against the charges because by doing so he would likely be charged for additional violations of Germany's "Holocaust denial" and "incitement" laws. His lawyer, Ludwig Bock, similarly announced that he would offer no defense on behalf of Toben because he risked being charged himself. "If I say anything I will go to jail myself, and if he says anything there will be another trial," Bock told a reporter.

Prosecutor Klein later confirmed that such fears were entirely justified. "If they [Toben and Bock] had repeated things in this court which are against the law I would have charged them again," said Klein. Bock did however read a statement to the court that compared the prosecution of Toben and other "Holocaust deniers" to the trials of witches in the Middle Ages, and which called Germany's anti-revisionist laws a gross violation of the principle of freedom of speech.

In the German legal system no privilege protects the evidence of witnesses in court. If a defendant, or his attorney, says something in court that repeats the "crime" for which he is being tried, he can be charged again. This makes it all but impossible for defendants in such "thought crime" cases to present effective arguments and pertinent evidence.

"The problem we have," said Geoff Muirden, Adelaide Institute acting director, "is that since it's against the law to produce hard evidence to prove aspects of the Holocaust are wrong, we can't mount much of a defense."

"I wanted the court to go with me to Auschwitz and see the evidence," said Toben. "In any case



Dr. Toben, center, during his visit at the IHR office, April 1, 1997, with Mark Weber, left, and Greg Raven, right.

where murder is alleged, there has to be a murder weapon. I have been to Auschwitz and I know there is no mass murder weapon there. The so-called [homicidal] gas chambers do not exist."

Bock, who is well-known in Germany as a defender of Holocaust "thought criminals," meanwhile is awaiting the outcome of an appeal of his own conviction (and 9,000-mark fine) earlier this year on a charge of inciting racial hatred because, in defending another revisionist skeptic, Günter Deckert, he had criticized German political leaders and judges for suppressing debate on the Holocaust issue.

In similar cases in the past, German courts have simply refused to consider evidence supporting revisionist claims. In effect, truth is no defense. For example, some years ago German courts fined best-selling British historian David Irving 30,000 marks (about \$21,000) for publicly saying what is now authoritatively conceded. He was punished for having told a Munich meeting in April 1990 that the structure in Auschwitz that has been portrayed for decades to tourists as an extermination gas chamber is a "dummy" (*Attrappe*).

Irving was found guilty of thus "disparaging the memory of the dead," a German criminal code provision that effectively "protects" only Jews. The judge refused to consider any of the evidence presented by Irving's attorneys, including a plea to permit Dr. Franciszek Piper, senior curator and archives director of the Auschwitz State Museum, to testify in the case.

Also in Switzerland, "thought crime" defendants are intimidated by the authorities. During a July 1998 "Holocaust denial" trial in Switzerland, the public prosecutor threatened to charge a court-qual-

ified engineer with “racial discrimination” for having given sworn testimony as an expert witness that confirmed technical arguments the defendants had made. (See “Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists,” July-August 1998 *Journal*, pp. 2-12)

Toben firmly rejects the premise of German authorities that revisionists are dangerous neo-Nazis:

It's time we got rid of this conceptual prison in our language which brands anyone who seeks the truth about the Holocaust as neo-Nazi or anti-Semitic. I am neither of these things. There are Jewish people who agree with me that we should establish the truth. The Holocaust is a matter of belief for many people. I respect that. But it is not a matter of fact. I only want to deal in facts.

Toben also rejects the “Holocaust denier” label. “No one denies that this terrible thing happened,” he has said. “We are looking at allegations that Germans systematically killed people, specifically Jews, in homicidal gas chambers.”

Free Speech Groups Protest Detention

In Australia, John Bennett promptly denounced Toben's detention. The nationally renowned civil rights defender said that Toben had been arrested “under draconian anti-free-speech laws.” Calling this a “classic free speech case,” Bennett urged people to contact German embassies and other appropriate German agencies to protest the arrest. Bennett also helped organize a legal defense fund to secure the historian's release.

Since 1980 Bennett has been president of the Australian Civil Liberties Union (P.O. Box 1137, Carlton, Vic. 3053, Australia). For decades he has also been a leading revisionist writer and publicist in Australia.

In London, historian David Irving promptly condemned Dr. Toben's arrest as an “outrage.” The best-selling British author is himself banned from Germany for his dissident views on Second World War history.

Electronic Frontiers Australia (EFA), an independent on-line free speech group, also spoke out against Toben's arrest, expressing particular concern that German authorities are treating material posted on an Australia-based web site as if it had been published in Germany. EFA chairman Kimberley Heitman, who is also a lawyer, said that the German government is, in effect, trying to legislate for the entire world.

Mark Weber, director of the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), strongly protested Toben's arrest and detention. The southern California-based revisionist history “think tank” closely monitors restrictions on free speech and free historical inquiry in Germany and other countries.

Toben was arrested in April in the office of Hans-Heiko Klein, Germany's best-known public prosecutor of “Holocaust deniers.” He was taken into custody during a private meeting with Klein to discuss with him German laws that prohibit disagreement with an official view of Second World War history, especially regarding the wartime treatment of European Jews. “Some people have claimed that I deliberately provoked my arrest in Germany to bring attention to myself. That is absolutely untrue,” said Toben. He was in Europe as part of a European research tour that took him to Poland, Germany, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Ukraine and Germany.

He was held for seven months in “investigative custody,” without bail, on the basis of arrest warrants of April 9 and May 3. Referring to the pertinent sections of the German criminal code, the warrants specifically alleged that Toben, on repeated occasions, had

A. in a manner suited to disturb the public peace,

1. incited a portion of the population to hatred, and,

2. attacked the human *dignity* of others, by insulting, by malevolently making contemptuous, or by libeling a portion of the population, B. publicly denied, in a manner designed to disturb the public peace, a [genocidal] act ... carried out under National Socialist rule,

C. insulted others, and

D. denigrated the memory of the [Jewish] dead.

Reflecting the special status enjoyed by Jews in Germany today, the April arrest warrant also declared:

The claims of the accused as well as the literature offered and distributed by him are suited to awaken and stir up emotionally hostile attitudes toward Jews in general and, in particular, against Jews who live in the Federal Republic of Germany. They are also suited to shake the confidence in public security of the targeted Jewish portion of the population.

Jewish groups predictably expressed satisfaction with Toben's conviction. In Australia, the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission — similar to the ADL in the United States — responded by calling for stricter legislation in Australia against “racial vilification.”

Disputing Holocaust extermination claims is

legal in most countries, including Australia, but it is a crime in Germany, Israel, France, Switzerland, and several other European states. In 1994 Germany's parliament sharpened the law against "popular incitement" to make it apply more directly to "Holocaust denial." The new amendment made it a crime for a person "in a manner that could disturb the public peace, publicly or in a meeting" to "approve, deny or whitewash" genocidal actions "carried out under National Socialist rule." Offenders are liable to fines and up to five years imprisonment. Noteworthy is the fact that the German law applies only to the Third Reich regime and era. It does not criminalize "denial" of genocidal actions carried out by Communist, Zionist, Democratic or other regimes.

Dr. Fredrick Toben (Töben) was born in northern Germany in June 1944, but emigrated to Australia when he was ten. He has lived most of his life in his new homeland, and is an Australian citizen. He studied at Melbourne University in Australia, as well as at universities in Heidelberg, Tübingen and Stuttgart in Germany, where he earned a doctorate in philosophy. He also holds a Master's degree in education, and has worked as a school teacher in Victoria, Australia.

Centered in South Australia's largest city, and funded by donations, the Adelaide Institute plays a major role in the worldwide struggle against the historical blackout. It was founded in 1994 by Toben, who (until his arrest) directed its work and edited its important newsletter (P.O. Box 3300, Norwood 5067, Australia. E-mail: freadin@adam.com.au). It also maintains an information-packed Internet web site (www.adam.com.au/freadin/adins.html).

In radio and television appearances, Dr. Toben has been an outspoken voice for historical accuracy and free historical inquiry. Over the weekend of August 7-9, 1998, the Adelaide Institute hosted Australia's first-ever revisionist conference, a successful meeting that included speakers from the United States and Europe. (See "The Adelaide Institute Conference," Nov.-Dec. 1998 *Journal*, pp. 6-10.)

All this enraged the powerful Jewish-Zionist lobby. In 1997 the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), the country's main Jewish community organization, brought legal action against Toben to shut down the Institute's web site. In this case, the first test of the country's Racial Discrimination law involving the Internet, Toben was brought before the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). Outraged by its guiding principle that truth is no defense, Toben walked out of the Commission hearing and refused to cooperate further with it.

Could You Survive a Nuclear Attack?

Why I Survived The A-Bomb

By Akira Kohchi (Albert Kawachi)

Until now, the *real* story of the first nuclear holocaust had not been told. Previous books on the atomic bombings of Hiroshima approached it only obliquely: technical works hailed it as a marvel of nuclear science, and books written from the military perspective honored the men who gave and carried out a difficult order. Even the eyewitness accounts, numbering some two thousand — and almost all yet to be translated from the Japanese — are overwhelmingly stories of *personal* misery. The total picture — the background, scope, and consequences of the catastrophe — has, until now, never been presented.

Why I Survived the A-Bomb tells a unique and fascinating story as seen from inside Japan 48 years ago and today. The author is eminently qualified — he lived through the experience of a nuclear attack and walked through the flaming, radioactive city of Hiroshima!

Albert Kawachi, a longtime United Nations finance officer, explores the attempts at political and economic justifications for the atom-bombing as he describes the day-to-day living experiences of his family in its wake. His story is dramatic, informative, and historically revisionist.

What was it really like to survive the massive devastation, then deal with the suffering and humiliation wrought by this American doomsday weapon? Who was behind the use of the bomb in the first place? And what did it really accomplish? We need real answers to these hard questions before we speak glibly of defense and disarmament, and before we argue over trade imbalances and deficits, for what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could be our tomorrow.

Chapters include: At the Beginning • The Pacific • The Home Battleground • Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 • The Days After • The Surrender of Japan and Her Recovery • My America and "Pearl Harbor" • Hiroshima and Me • At the End

Why I Survived the A-Bomb

Hardbound, 230 pages, photos, notes, appendices (#0935)

\$16.45 postpaid (CA sales tax \$1.08)

Institute For Historical Review

PO Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA



Holocaust survivor
and author
Albert Kawachi

CODOH's *Revisionist* Distribution Prompts Media Furor

Bradley Smith is back in the news. The veteran revisionist activist has touched off a major furor that has received nationwide newspaper and television attention with the distribution at Hofstra University in Long Island, New York, of his new 28-page magazine-format publication. He arranged to distribute 5,000 copies of *The Revisionist: A Journal of Independent Thought* as an insert with the October 28, 1999, issue of the student newspaper, *The Chronicle*.

Jewish students and faculty, as well as officials of Jewish-Zionist groups, responded with predictable rage when they learned of the distribution. In a letter published in a subsequent issue of the Hofstra student paper, a Regional Director of the Jewish-Zionist Anti-Defamation League (ADL) complained:

We are outraged that the *Chronicle* chose to include an entire Holocaust denial publication, *The Revisionist*, as an insert in the issue of October 28.... [It] contains 27 pages of repeated denials that there ever was a Nazi program to extermination directed at the Jewish people.

While Smith and his Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) are no strangers to generating campus media excitement, the uproar over the distribution of *The Revisionist* at the large New York City-area university has been magnified by the publication's length, evident intelligence, and earnestness of content. It contains thoughtful, topical and informative writing by several revisionist writers, including Smith and IHR *Journal* Associate Editor Ted O'Keefe. *The Revisionist* includes a look at historical fakery by the US Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC, a critical review of Daniel Goldhagen's much-discussed study *A Nation on Trial*, and a sympathetic look at the work and impact of British historian David Irving. (This same issue of *The Revisionist* was distributed to *Journal* subscribers along with the last *JHR* issue.)

Distribution of *The Revisionist* represents a new level of CODOH activism. Whereas past campus outreach efforts by Smith often seemed to have prompted debate only about the issue of free speech for revisionism, "Holocaust lobby" officials seem concerned that this new CODOH initiative will generate wider campus discussion of wider historical and social-political issues.

Chronicle editor Shawna Van Ness said that the paper's editorial board decided overwhelmingly to accept the CODOH insert because rejecting it "would be censorship on our part." This has been a consistent policy of the paper, which ran CODOH



Bradley Smith reports on his work at the Eleventh IHR Conference

advertisements in 1997 and 1998.

Smith, who has worked closely with the IHR, has focused much of his attention on campus outreach. Over the years, dozens of student papers around the country have published CODOH advertisements calling for open debate of the Holocaust issue. CODOH also maintains a major revisionist web site: www.codoh.com. (For more on Smith's activism, see, for example, "Bradley Smith's 'Campus Project' Generates Nationwide Publicity for Holocaust Revisionism," July-August 1994 *Journal*, pp. 18-24; "Brad Smith's Campus Project," May-June 1993 *Journal*, pp. 17-20; "Smith Steps Up CODOH Ad Campaign," Nov.-Dec. 1993 *Journal*, p. 22; "Smith and Cole Appear on 'Donahue' Show," May-June 1994 *Journal*, pp. 19-20.)

The IHR Needs Your Help

Only with the sustained help of friends can the Institute for Historical Review carry on its vital mission of promoting truth in history. If you agree that the work of our Institute is important, *please support it with your generous donation!*

Wartime Germany's Anti-Gas Air Raid Shelters: A Refutation of Pressac's 'Criminal Traces'

SAMUEL CROWELL

As Holocaust historians concede, hard evidence for mass killings in Second World War gas chambers has proven to be elusive. After an extensive search, especially of wartime German records held in Polish archives, French author Jean-Claude Pressac acknowledged in his detailed 1989 study, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, that he was unable to find any direct proof of wartime gas chamber killings at Auschwitz (including the its nearby satellite camp of Birkenau). Instead, he offered 39 documentary "criminal traces" of such gassings — what he called "indirect proofs."

These "traces" are wartime documents, mostly from the Auschwitz central construction office, that contain passing references to "gas tight doors," "gas detectors," and such. In the view of Pressac, and other defenders of the standard Holocaust story, these are implicit references to equipment or devices that were part of homicidal gassing operations.

In the following essay, American researcher Samuel Crowell presents detailed evidence of benign explanations for these "criminal traces."¹ His basic argument is that the documents cited by Pressac as "traces" of homicidal "gas chambers" are references to air raid shelters, or to their fittings or equipment. Specifically, he contends, the Birkenau crematory morgue rooms — the supposed "gas chambers" where, it is alleged, hundreds of thousands of Jews were killed with "Zyklon" pesticide — were modified to also serve as air raid shelters with features to protect against possible Allied attacks with poison gas.

Crowell extensively cites contemporary German specialized literature on wartime air raid shelters and measures against possible air attacks with poison gas to argue that such shelters, and their equipment, were widely used throughout wartime Germany, including in the concentration camps. He contends that seemingly damning documentary ref-

erences to "gas tight doors" and so forth actually refer to normal civil air defense equipment. He therefore concludes that there is no documentary proof — direct or indirect — of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Crowell provides an important new perspective on the "gas chamber" issue that merits thoughtful consideration. May his work encourage further investigation and discussion of this crucial issue.

— The Editor

It is well known that although poison gas was used extensively in the First World War, it was not used in the Second. As a result, we tend to forget that in the years before the outbreak of war in 1939, many people expected gas warfare to be a feature of any future conflict. German civil defense literature of the time reflected this anxiety, describing in detail how bomb shelters were to be made secure from both bombs and poison gas. In other words, German bomb shelters were also designed and built as anti-gas shelters.²

While the German wartime literature on bomb shelters or anti-gas shelters has been neglected, it is of enormous value to historians as a primary source. It is particularly relevant for historians of the Holocaust, because this literature uses many of the very same terms that are commonly associated with extermination gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

In 1989 an important work by French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac appeared in English, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*.³ This massive, illustrated book of 564 oversize pages was instantly acclaimed as an authoritative refutation of revisionist critics. In it, Pressac sought to prove, strictly on the basis of wartime German documents, that extermination gas chambers were built in each of the four crematory facilities at Birkenau. The core of his demonstration is a list of 39 "criminal traces" of these elusive gas chambers.⁴

But there is something curious here: every one of these "criminal traces" describes a feature of an ordinary German bomb shelter. In other words, every "trace" cited by Pressac as evidence of homicidal gas chambers can also be interpreted as evidence of German bomb shelters or, more precisely,

Samuel Crowell is the pen name of an American writer who describes himself as a "moderate revisionist." At the University of California (Berkeley) he studied philosophy, foreign languages (including German, Polish, Russian, and Hungarian), and history, including Russian, German and German-Jewish history. He continued his study of history at Columbia University. For six years he worked as a college teacher.

This essay is copyright © 1999 by Samuel Crowell.

their anti-gas warfare features.

Significantly, others have already noted similarities between the alleged extermination gas chambers and German wartime bomb shelters. To some extent this is even suggested in the Holocaust literature. For example, Miklos Nyiszli, an important source for Pressac, claims in his memoir that during air raids prisoners would take shelter in the gas chamber.⁵

In *Auschwitz and the Allies* Jewish-British historian Martin Gilbert quotes the testimony of a Jewish woman survivor of Auschwitz who describes how, during an air raid, she and many other new female arrivals were led into a dark space and kept until the raid was over.⁶ Interestingly, this testimony describes how several of the women became hysterical during the raid, believing themselves to be inhaling poison gas.

(By inference this testimony confirms that the SS camp personnel took care to protect Jewish prisoners during air raids.)

Among independent researchers, the observation of Wilhelm Stäglich is noteworthy. In 1944 he was stationed at Auschwitz as an anti-aircraft artillery officer, and after the war he served for years as an administrative judge in Hamburg. In his detailed study of the Holocaust issue, first published in German in 1979, he noted that the presence of gas-tight doors in the cellars of the Auschwitz crematory facilities suggested their use as air raid shelters. "At that time," wrote Stäglich, "gas-tight doors were not uncommon, since every cellar had to double as an air raid shelter... Air raid shelters had to be secure not only against explosives, but against gas as well."⁷

American researcher Friedrich Berg has also recognized the importance of German wartime civil defense literature, even though his main research interests lay elsewhere.⁸ Among a handful of European researchers, Robert Faurisson made some suggestive comments in an article published in 1991.⁹ American scholar Dr. Arthur R. Butz suggested, in an article first published in 1996, that Morgue #1 of crematory facility (*Krema*) II at Birkenau was in fact a "gas shelter."¹⁰

In general, though, the anti-gas features of German wartime bomb shelters has been overlooked. This article seeks to redress this neglect by showing



Jean-Claude Pressac

that anti-gas warfare features were basic to German wartime bomb shelter design and construction. In doing so, we cite important but neglected contemporary literature. Finally, we compare this evidence of German wartime anti-gas shelter design and equipment with Pressac's "criminal traces."

This article comprises two main parts. After a brief discussion of the background of poison gas warfare, Part One takes a closer look at contemporary German bomb shelter and anti-gas shelter literature. This section's rather detailed citations from primary source literature are appropriate, we believe, not only because of the importance of this relatively inaccessible evidence, but because the conclusions drawn from it are inherently very contentious, given the very emotion-laden nature of this subject. Part One finishes with some pointed conclusions about characteristics of German bomb shelters.

Part Two deals with each of Pressac's "criminal traces," with references to evidence and points from Part One, as well as to some of the documents in Pressac's own book. Every one of these "criminal traces," we show, can be interpreted in two ways: either as sinister indications of homicidal gas chambers (Pressac's view), or, more plausibly, as benign anti-gas warfare features of common German wartime bomb shelters.

The obvious implication is that there is no contemporaneous documentary evidence whatsoever of homicidal gassings at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Part One: A Review of German Wartime Anti-Gas Shelter Literature

Poison Gas Warfare Prior to World War II

It is generally agreed that the era of poison gas warfare as we know it began during World War I on April 22, 1915.¹¹ On that day, German forces released a cloud of chlorine gas against French military positions at Ypres. From that date on, both sides used poison gas, causing hundreds of thousands of casualties, of which, however, only a small percentage died.

Poison gas was used in warfare after World War I, but not in Europe. It was used in Russia against Bolshevik "Red" troops, both by British forces and by anti-Communist "Whites." It was also used by British forces in Afghanistan, and by French military units in Morocco. The most infamous use of poison gas during the interwar period was by Italian forces in Ethiopia in 1935, where 15,000 fell victim to mustard gas. With regard to the World War II "gas chamber" issue, the Ethiopian campaign usage was important because the Italian military deployed poison gas by air, which forged the conceptual con-

nection between gas attacks and bombing raids. In line with these all these developments, the Soviet Union began developing large stores of poison gas in the 1920s, as well as hydrogen cyanide, which were produced at the Karaganda works.

Hydrocyanic acid (HCN), or hydrogen cyanide gas — the odorless and invisible poison supposedly used at Auschwitz-Birkenau to kill hundreds of thousands of Jewish prisoners between 1941 and 1944 — was adapted in 1924 in the United States as a means of legal executing criminals.¹²

In the years prior to the outbreak of the Second World War, the major European powers, including Germany, prepared for the use of poison gas in any eventual war. These preparations naturally also involved the possible use of hydrogen cyanide. For example, a relatively early Third Reich guide (published in 1936) to protective measures against poison gas specifically discusses hydrogen cyanide (*Blausäure* or *Cyanwasserstoff*).¹³ Of the nine gas mask filters described, it mentions that the “G” filter is specifically designed for protection against HCN, with a capacity for 3.6 grams.

The author of this 1936 guide is “Fire Warden” (*Branddirektor*) Hans Rumpf. Given his title, it should not surprise us that he would draw on his practical experience with fires in discussing the potential dangers of poison gases. Thus, for example, in a table of poison gases, the common pesticide Zyklon B is listed separately from HCN (*Blausäure*) because of its normal irritant properties.¹⁴ Rumpf also discusses the development of poisonous gases in fires, mentioning, for example, how gases generated by flames will drift to areas with a lower temperature than their boiling point, and then condense into a mist or smoke. He also observes¹⁵

We know, for example, that leather, celluloid, and proteinous substances give off nitric gas as well as cyanide, while rubber will produce sulphur gas and sulfuric acid. All of these gases are poison gases.

Further confirmation of the threat of cyanide gas usage came during World War II itself. In the summer of 1941, at the time of the outbreak of war with Soviet Russia, the German military obtained a Soviet gas mask with a high tolerance for HCN, and a short time later, it obtained Soviet contingency plans for using cyanide gas by spraying it from low flying airplanes. As a result, in early 1942 the German military conducted its own field tests using farm animals, and also developed the FE 42 gas mask filter, with a particular tolerance for HCN.¹⁶

To sum up, poison gases had been used for 24 years before the outbreak of war in 1939. During World War I hydrogen cyanide had been used on a



Standard German armed forces gas mask, type GM 38, widely issued during World War II. This one is fitted with a special “J” filter, for use with Zyklon.

limited scale by the Allies against German troops. In 1941 German authorities learned that the Soviet military had developed stocks of HCN, as well as contingency plans for using it. By 1941 the Germans feared gas attacks with HCN, and made appropriate preparations to deal with them. It should therefore not be surprising that the Germans would have produced masks and detectors designed to defend against and detect hydrogen cyanide gas.

Publicly-available literature published in Germany in the late 1930s and during the Second World War shows clearly that it was widely known and understood during the war years that air raid shelters could and should be built so that they also protect against possible poison gas attacks. Accordingly, the need for “gas tight” doors and such in this regard was widely understood.

In 1939 a Berlin publisher issued *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (“Civil Air Defense Through Construction”), a rather comprehensive work that describes how bomb shelters should be constructed, operated, and furnished. One section has two pages of line drawings showing all the things one would expect to find in a normal German bomb shelter, including a container for contaminated clothing, a gas-tight door (*gasdichte Tür*), a washstand, a medicine cabi-




Bild 2. Anordnung der Schutzraumbelüfter.

This diagram, captioned “Arrangement of defense shelter ventilators,” appeared with an article about air raid shelters published in a 1939 issue of the German trade periodical *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*. It identifies the following: “A-Exhaust outlet, E-Drainage, L-Air intake, GT-Gas tight door, N-Emergency exit, S-Stop valve, and U-Pressure release valve.”

net, emergency lighting, benches, and a ventilation system. It also includes a blown-up diagram of an emergency exit showing the exit tunnel, a frame, a gas-tight shutter (*Gasglocke*), and a protective screen (*Trümmerschutz*), which looks like a mesh screen with a wide edge around it.¹⁷

Another section describes the layout of a regular bomb shelter: one enters a small foyer (*Vorraum*) where the bucket for contaminated clothes is kept, and where one can clean one’s shoes in a tray full of sand. From there one moves into a gas lock (*Gasschleuse*), where one can sit down, and preferably with a cold water tap for washing up.¹⁸ Farther on in the bomb shelter proper (*Schutzraum*), there are benches, tables, and folding chairs. Apparently conscious of space limitations, the book notes that modern bomb shelters are also designed to also serve as washrooms and dressing rooms (whereas such rooms were separated in earlier shelters).

At another place in the book, the shelter’s ventilation system (*Schutzraumbelüfter*) is described in greater detail. Air is drawn from a pipe at about ceiling level, first passing through a dust filter (*Staubfilter*). Then as the air pipe turns downward, the flow can be interdicted by a stopcock. Then the air passes through two more filters, including a gas filter (*Gasfilter*). Finally, after passing through the extraction or pumping mechanism, which can be powered by hand or by electricity, and the now fresh air enters the shelter near the ground level.¹⁹

Another section of the book describes some of the

devices used for protection from rubble and debris:²⁰

Among new constructions we mention above all the grill or protective grille. The overhead exit of a light shaft is closed with a strong, rubble-resistant steel grating. One half of the grille is closed from below, so that if the grille is covered by rubble from a building it possible to open a space for an emergency exit from the bomb shelter. The opening of the grille is secured with a chain. On the inside of the cellar opening there is a gas tight shutter.

Further on the book discusses bomb shelters appropriate for factories or large work places. Such a bomb shelter complex (*Schutzraumbau*) comprises several sections, including a command center (*Befehlsstellen*), an emergency room (*Rettungsstellung*), and a decontamination center (*Entgiftungsanstalten*).²¹ The entire structure is equipped with gas detectors (*Gasspürer*),²² and the entrance has a gas-tight steel door. To accommodate many people comfortably during an air raid, the waiting room should be rather large. The book goes on to explain:²³

From the waiting room, doors lead on the one side to the treatment rooms and on the other side to sleeping quarters. Among the treatment rooms for the wounded and for those exposed to poison gas there is a doctor’s office and an operating room. In large layouts the doctor’s office and the operating room are separate. Farther on there will be sleeping quarters, shelters for lightly wounded, and decontamination centers.

As we can already see, the German wartime bomb shelter is a rather sophisticated facility, based on a systematic design and with a division of functions. In addition, the references in this authoritative work to gas-tight doors, buckets for contaminated clothing, wash rooms, changing rooms, and decontamination centers reflects a very real concern with the possibility of poison gas attacks.

Another noteworthy publication is a booklet published in Berlin in 1939 entitled *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (“Air Raid Shelter Room Seals”).²⁴ Written by an engineer named Scholle, it describes in great detail how to make an air raid shelter (*Schutzraum*) gas tight. Indeed, Dr. Scholle emphasizes the need to make a shelter secure from poison gas (*gassicher*), debris (*trümmersicher*), and bomb splinters (*splittersicher*).²⁵ Scholle specifies that windows or emergency exits should be protected on the outside from debris and bomb splinters, while the protection from gas should be on the inside.²⁶ This would mean, in practical terms, that any screening or

grille-work would be on the outside of an opening, and any gas tight cover would be on the inside.

In this booklet Scholle also describes the need for bomb shelter doors to be gas tight and to have a gas tight peephole.²⁷

Every anti-gas bomb shelter door must be equipped with a peephole. The peephole should be made round, without the use of putty or other easily hardened materials to be made gas tight, and it should have a view of 40 millimeters. The disc of multi-layered glass of at least six millimeters in thickness should be protected from damage with a perforated steel plate.


The purpose of the peephole in a bomb shelter door was to enable the Fire Warden to check on the inhabitants of a shelter, to ensure their needs and safety, or to enable the inhabitants to check outside conditions before opening the door. The thin glass disc could, in practice, be recessed either on the outside or the inside of the door, depending on its location. The recessed side would be protected from damage.²⁸ Although a perforated steel plate would be the preferred protection, a number of other means could be used.²⁹

Another important publication in this regard is the trade periodical *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* ("Gas Defense and Civil Air Defense"). An article published in 1939 in this periodical describes the latest advances in civil air defense technology as shown at a recent trade exhibition in Leipzig.³⁰ Attention is given to all the usual features of bomb shelters, including mechanisms for achieving darkening (*Verdunklung*). Darkening was considered very important. In an above-ground bomb shelter, it was the first thing to achieve in the event of an air raid.

This article also discusses modifications for bomb shelters, including doors and window shutters, which can be made of several materials, as well as a discussion of ways of making chimneys and smoke stacks gas tight.³¹

Bomb shelter doors and window shutters come in many different varieties, they are made out of steel, steel-saving constructions, wood, and other building materials ... Among gas protective chimney seals there is a novelty that does not use a steel frame ... consisting of a rubber flap that is pressed against the frame of the concrete chimney flue by means of a bolt.

This construction not only saves steel but also solves the problem of the frame rusting. Another construction for a chimney seal uses a rubber plate which normally hangs loose, but which can be placed into position by means of a



The Repal company of Leipzig offers "air defense shelter doors and shutters, in steel" in this advertisement, which appeared in a 1942 issue of the German trade periodical *Baulicher Luftschutz*. Such doors were gas resistant. Note the protected peep hole.

hook on the inside of the external flue in order to achieve gas tightness in the chimney shutter.

Another article published in this same periodical in 1939, "Work Place Emergency Rooms", contains a floor plan for a typical anti-gas shelter: "A - Exhaust, E - Drainage, L - Air intake, GT - Gas tight door, N - Emergency exit, S - Stop valve, and U - Pressure release valve."³² This article, written by Dr. Ing. Karl Quasebart, also contains recommendations on setting up an emergency room (*Werkrettungsstelle*), particularly for gas attacks, as part of the bomb shelter complex.³³

Those who have been exposed to Yellow Cross or are suspected of same [however] are divided by sex in the undressing rooms, and go from there to the shower rooms, and to the dressing rooms, where extra clothes are available, and from here back to the waiting room, for further transport or direction to the doctor's office.

("Yellow Cross," according to the German gas classification system of the time, denotes vesicants, or blister gases.)³⁴ Thus, undressing rooms and showers were part of the decontamination process, and (as we have already seen)³⁵ were envisioned as an integral part of the bomb shelter complex.

Dr. Quasebart's article also contains photographs of such decontamination facilities. A shower room (*Duschraum*) could contain showers, of course, but the photograph in this article captioned *Duschraum* shows not showers but three water faucets

**Gasschutzfüren
und Blenden**

geprüft
R L 3-37/234

**Unbedingte
Betriebssicherheit!**

Die einfache Bauart
ermöglicht leichte,
schnelle Bedienung

ALBUS
Stahltürenwerk

Dortmund u. Ruf 34 455/56



“Gas Tight Steel Doors” are offered by the Albus company of Dortmund in this advertisement, published in a 1942 issue of the German trade periodical *Baulicher Luftschutz*. Potential customers are assured that the company’s doors and shutters provide “Absolute safety in use!,” and that “the simple method of construction enables easy, quick usage.” (Note the protected peep hole.)

with hoses attached and coiled around exposed upright pipes. Another photo, captioned “Bath and Shower Room for Gassing Victims” (*Bade- und Duschraum für Kampfstoffverletzte*) shows a bathtub with a more typical shower arrangement attached.³⁶ Clearly, the concepts of “shower room” and “decontamination facility” were rather elastic in their actual application.

Another article in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* appearing in 1939, this one detailing “Practical Lessons for Work Place Bomb Shelters,” recommends *Baustahlgewebe*, described as “wire mesh of varying gauges that has been welded together at certain points,” to protect bomb shelter apertures. This is a good substitute, readers are told, especially for constructing covers.³⁷

In March 1940 this periodical changed its name to *Baulicher Luftschutz* (“Civil Air Defense Construction”). A particularly noteworthy article, “Makeshift Bomb Shelters: Right and Wrong,” appeared that year in the journal.³⁸ Written by engineer Ernst Baum, it contains several photographs “gas tight window shutters” (*gassichere Fensterblende*), most of them constructed of wood. It also describes an incorrect method for fixing a shutter up against the grating of the window grille:³⁹

Making a window gas tight, according to the regulations, is one of the easiest measures. But even so one observes many mistakes relating to gas tight shutters. It is wrong, for example, to

wrap a board in cloth and press it up against the grating of the window grille with a Christmas tree pole.

The article includes a specific reference to “shutters made of wood” (*Holzblende*).

Another 1940 *Baulicher Luftschutz* article of interest, “Remarks on the Ordinance and Regulations for Building Makeshift Air Raid Shelters,” written by a Reich Air Ministry specialist, offers a series of recommendations for building improvised or do-it-yourself bomb shelters. Among them is a suggestion that when they are not serving to protect in air raids, bomb shelters should be, or at least can be, used for other purposes.⁴⁰

It should be noted that these specifications pertain to makeshift or improvised shelters, that is, shelters which would not be expected to have a sophisticated ventilation system. As we shall see, the maximum limits of occupancy for ventilated shelters were different.

“Hygienic and Psychological Conditions for Building Air Raid Bunkers,” a lengthy article by a Reich Health Office specialist, appeared in a 1942 issue of *Baulicher Luftschutz*.⁴¹ Among other relevant topics, it deals with recommended temperatures and air circulation for bomb shelters.

Also, citing Regulation No. 7 for air raid bunkers, the article recommends air temperatures of 17 C (62.6 F) degrees, and surface temperatures of 16 C (60.8 F) degrees.⁴² Hence, efforts to heat or warm air raid shelters by the use of stoves or heated air would be entirely in keeping with these regulations.

A lengthy article by an Air Ministry engineer, “The Role of Heating and Ventilation in Planning Air Raid Bunkers,” published in a 1942 issue of *Baulicher Luftschutz*, covers such air circulation systems in much greater detail, and with several accompanying drawings.⁴³

Several advertisements for relevant products appear in various 1942 issues of *Baulicher Luftschutz*. One offers wire grille products (*Drahtgeflechte*) produced by the Otto Christ Drahtwarenfabrik of Mannheim-Käfertal. Another advertisement offers gas tight doors and shutters (*Gasschutztüren und Blenden*) produced by the Albus Stahltürenwerk of Dortmund. Potential customers are assured that the products provide “Absolute safety in use!,” and that “the simple method of construction enables easy, quick usage.”⁴⁴

German measures against possible Allied use of poison gas were also noted in a confidential 640-page guide prepared during the final months of the war by the US War Department. This carefully researched and well-illustrated *Handbook on German Military Forces* was published in March of 1945.⁴⁵ The section on “Chemical Warfare Equip-

ment” presents detailed information, for example, about decontamination vehicles for clothing, a variety of gas protection devices for personnel, horses, and even dogs and pigeons, and decontamination trucks for personnel (which could shower 150 men in an hour).

German anti-gas shelters are specifically mentioned, while a subsection cites a variety of German gas detectors, including detector sets for fortifications, and gas detection laboratories. Widely distributed German gas masks, it mentions, were designed to protect against attacks by HCN and other gases. This shows widespread German awareness of the potential danger of hydrogen cyanide gas attacks, and suggests that the available gas detectors could detect the presence of cyanides in the atmosphere.

Also in this book is a photograph of several air raid bunker ventilators (*Schutzraumbelüfter*), which the *Handbook* calls “collective protectors.”⁴⁶ The photo shows the extensive overhead ductwork suspended from the ceiling by “stirrups” (*Bügel*). Because the ceiling appears to be of concrete formwork, we would suspect that the stirrups are attached to some other element, possibly flat wooden squares. It is worth noting also that such “stirrups” are frequently used on the outside of above-ground bomb shelters to brace fortifying elements — timber, sandbags, concrete, and so forth.⁴⁷

Allied Bombings of Auschwitz

The German “Air Raid Guide Emergency Program” (*Luftschutz Führer Sofort Programm*) of November 1940 specifically required that: “All new constructions, especially in buildings of the armaments industry, are henceforth to be equipped with bomb-proof air raid shelter rooms.”⁴⁸ This unquestionably applied to Auschwitz. During the course of the war, the concentration camps — of which Auschwitz was one of the largest — played an increasingly important role in the German war economy.⁴⁹

German authorities had good reason to be concerned about Allied air attacks against Auschwitz. In fact, the camp complex was repeatedly bombed during the war. Because of its critical importance as a major gasoline production center, Auschwitz III (Monowitz) was a target of several Allied bombing raids, and was consequently heavily defended with anti-aircraft flak batteries. Bombers of the Allied Mediterranean Air Force carried out four major raids against Monowitz in 1944: On August 20, September 13, December 18, and December 26.⁵⁰

During the September 13 attack, for example, 96 US air force B-24 heavy bombers dropped almost a thousand 500-pound bombs. Besides Monowitz, the Auschwitz main camp and Birkenau were also hit. Fifteen SS men and 40 inmates, including 23 Jews,



Das MANNESMANN SK Fenster
für Schutzraum und Keller
Kenn-Nr. RL 3 37 96

ist ohne Gasglocke ein normaler Kellerrast. Licht und Luft haben ungehinderten Zutritt. Bei Luftgefahr wird die Gasglocke (Abbildung) in die mit Sperrflüssigkeit gefüllte Dichtungsrinne eingesetzt, und der gassichere Abschluß für den Luftschutzraum ist hergestellt. Auch als Notausstieg ist das SK-Fenster verwendbar und zugelassen, selbst stärkste Personen können es leicht passieren. Der Einbau ist denkbar einfach, jeder Maurer kann diese Arbeit ausführen.

1. Schnitt durch die Zarge (Dichtungsrinne) mit Gasglocke und Rast.
2. Schnitt durch den Lichtschart (Notausstieg) mit den Aussparungen zum Einbau des SK-Fensters.
3. Lichtschart von oben gesehen (Grundriß von Bild 2).

A Zarge B eingesetzte Gasglocke
C aufgelegter Abdeckrost
D Stampfbeton E Hauswand


MANNESMANN-STAHLECHBAU AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT **BERLIN C 2**

The Mannesmann company of Berlin, in this advertisement from a wartime German trade periodical, offers special grated “windows” for air defense shelters and cellars. During air raids, the ad text explains, these “windows” could quickly be made gas-tight, and also serve as emergency exits.

were killed at the main camp, and 30 civilian workers were killed at Birkenau. A further 65 inmates and 28 SS men were badly injured.⁵¹

In mid-November 1943, Auschwitz commandant Arthur Liebehenschel issued an order on measures to be taken in the camp against Allied air raids.⁵²

Important in this regard are three wartime documents from the Auschwitz central construction office (*Zentralbauleitung*) that were recently discovered in Moscow archives. These documents — from October 1943, November 1943, and November 1944 — deal with an extensive network of air raid shelters (*Luftschutzdeckungsgräben*) at Auschwitz.⁵³ They indicate that, from the summer of 1943, many such shelters for the protection of prisoners were ordered, planned and under construction at Auschwitz. (We don’t know how many were actually completed.) Designed to hold 50 persons each, the shelters were to have ventilation and drainage. The



Birkenau crematory building (Krema) III. Along with Krema II, this was among the most "bomb safe" structures in the entire Birkenau camp, and thus, as Samuel Crowell argues, particularly suitable for adaptation as air raid shelters.

WVHA agency in Berlin, which ran the German concentration camp system, budgeted 110,000 Reich marks for building materials for this large-scale project.


It is noteworthy that the SS authorities would go to considerable trouble and expense to build air raid shelters for Jewish prisoners who, supposedly, were already condemned to death.⁵⁴ (Similarly, German authorities provided building materials to the Warsaw ghetto for the construction there of air raid shelters to protect the Jewish inhabitants from Allied bombing attacks.)⁵⁵

Because German air raid shelters were routinely built to protect against possible poison gas attacks, they were often fitted with gas tight doors and other related fixtures. We should naturally expect to find many such shelters at Auschwitz and Birkenau, together with quite a few "incriminating" gas tight doors and similar items. (As already suggested, the "incriminating" items found at Auschwitz at the end of the war, and cited in the years since by Pressac and other defenders of the standard Holocaust story, were most probably features of anti-gas air raid shelters, or of non-homicidal disinfestation facilities.)

It is worth noting that, until now, no mainstream historian has bothered to take notice of the German wartime civil defense equipment, facilities and measures, in relation to the gas chamber claims.

On the basis of the foregoing, the following conclusions may be safely drawn:

1. After 1940, German bomb shelters were routinely constructed to also serve as anti-gas shelters.
2. German bomb shelters, including anti-gas shelters, were built according to a sequential organization plan that allowed for decontamination and several other functions. In large structures, separate rooms were reserved for each of these functions.
3. Decontamination procedures involved a sequence of steps, including undressing, showering or washing, and medical attention. In large structures, a separate room was devoted to each function.
4. Facilities and rooms designed for a variety of purposes could be, and often were, adapted for alternative use as bomb shelters, as needed.
5. Bomb shelters, although usually underground, could be and sometimes were built above ground.
6. In the event of an air raid, particular attention was paid to the darkening of shelters.
7. German air raid shelters often featured an elaborate system of ventilation, which drew air from ceiling height and filtered it out near the bottom. The ventilation ductwork was suspended from the ceiling. In addition, the regulations recommended ventilation capacities allowing for anywhere from 15 to 18 air exchanges. Regulations recommended that the air in bomb shelters be heated to 17 C (62.6 F) degrees.
8. A standard feature of a German wartime shelter was a gas tight door, which could be made of either wood or steel. The seal could be achieved with either rubber or felt.
9. These gas tight doors had glass peepholes, which were usually protected from damage with a perforated steel plate, although other means could be, and were, used.
10. A flat iron bar was frequently bolted along the base of a gas tight door to help insure a gas tight seal.
11. Windows and emergency exits were usually covered with grating, mesh, or grille work of some kind to protect against splinters and rubble.
12. Shelter windows and emergency exits normally were both covered with gas tight shutters, which were installed inside a grating, mesh, or grille. The shutters could be made of steel or wood.
13. An advertisement for wire mesh (*Drahtnetz*), appearing in a 1942 issue of the specialized German periodical *Baulicher Luftschutz*, suggests that this material was commonly used for win-




Features of Birkenau camp (Auschwitz II):

1. Rail siding and "selection" ramp 2. Crematory facility (*Krema*) II 3. Crematory facility (*Krema*) III 4. Crematory facility (*Krema*) IV 5. Crematory facility (*Krema*) V 6. "Disinfection and Disinfestation Facility," also known as the "Central Sauna" 7. "Canada" section, where inmates' belongings were sorted and stored 8. Hospital or sick bay section 9. "Gypsy Camp" section 10. "Men's Camp" section 11. "Hungarian Camp" section 12. "Family camp" section 13. "Women's Camp" section 15. Entry gate for rail transport

dow or emergency exit gratings, mesh, or grilles. There is also a specific reference here to using wire mesh screens for splinter and debris protection.

14. Chimneys and smoke stacks were also designed to be gas tight.
15. Gas detectors were a common feature of German military equipment. That German military personnel were equipped to detect HCN is an entirely reasonable inference.
16. The extensive and publicly available German

literature on civil defense used a large number of synonyms and neologisms. This is typical of any new field, which takes time to standardize its vocabulary. For example, poison gas victims are described variously as "*Gelbkreuzverletzte*," "*Gasvergiftete*," and "*Kampfstoffvergiftete*." Hence, when reviewing documents and other contemporary material about bomb shelters, we should expect similar variability in the use of terms.



The Auschwitz-Birkenau camp, from an enlarged portion of an Allied aerial reconnaissance photograph taken on May 31, 1944.

Part Two: Pressac's 'Criminal Traces'

In his much-heralded book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Jean-Claude Pressac attempted to prove, on a strictly material and documentary basis, the existence of extermination gas chambers in the four crematory facilities at Auschwitz-Birkenau (*Kremas II-V*).

Specifically, he offered 39 "criminal traces" as "indirect proof" for homicidal gassings. He readily acknowledged that there is no "direct proof" for the alleged murder of millions of Jews in gas chambers, such as a document or diagram that refers, even in passing, to a "gas chamber for killing Jews" or even a document that specifically mentions a homicidal gas chamber. Pressac also acknowledged that the "witness testimony" that is usually cited as evidence is unreliable. He further explained that he was offering these "traces" in response to the insistent

demand by French revisionist scholar Robert Faurisson for "one proof, one single proof" of the supposedly incontrovertible mass gassings.⁵⁶

As we shall show in the following pages, a benign interpretation for each of Pressac's "criminal traces" is possible. Therefore there is no proof — even indirect — of "criminal" gassings of Jews at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Criminal Trace 1: The 'Gassing Cellar' Letter

This document, which is the oldest and best known "criminal trace," has been cited for years as evidence of homicidal gassings at Birkenau. It is a January 1943 letter about Birkenau crematory facility (*Krema*) II from SS Captain Bischoff of the Auschwitz central construction office (*ZBL*) to the WVHA in Berlin. Bischoff's passing mention in this letter to a "gassing cellar," or *Vergasungskeller*, is regarded by Pressac as a "slip" and an "enormous gaff," because supposedly this was a thoughtless ref-

erence to a homicidal gas chamber.

For more than 20 years, revisionists have offered alternate explanations of it. In an essay published in 1996 and 1997, Dr. Butz persuasively proposed that this "gassing cellar" referred to an air raid "gas shelter."⁵⁷

Each of the various interpretations offered by revisionists is plausible because the word *Vergasungskeller* is a neologism, a newly coined term that is also apparently unique. This point should be stressed: The term *Vergasung* or *Vergasungskeller* occurs in no other known document or item of literature from this era.⁵⁸

Just what was this "gassing cellar"? No explanation can be definitely proven, but as we shall see, several of the other "trace" documents cited by Pressac contain similarly unconventional wordings.

Clearly this document is not, in itself, a "criminal trace" because benign interpretations of the term *Vergasungskeller* are possible, if not probable. It could be considered a "criminal trace" only with further corroborating evidence.

Criminal Trace 2: Ten Gas Detectors

This is a February 1943 telegram order for ten gas detectors (*10 Gasprüfer*), sent to the Topf company in Erfurt that manufactured the Birkenau crematory ovens. As already noted, gas detectors (*Gasprüfer* or *Gasspürer*) were common in German chemical warfare equipment and in anti-gas shelter equipment.⁵⁹ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore it is not a criminal trace.

There is more to this "trace," however. In a book on the "crematories of Auschwitz," published in German and French in 1993, Pressac cited a newly discovered letter of March 2, 1943, from a Topf company engineer to the Auschwitz construction office, reporting that he had not been able to acquire the requested ten gas detectors.⁶⁰ The letter, headed "Crematory, Gas Detectors," refers to the items as "Indicators for residual hydrocyanic acid" (*Anzeigegeräte für Blausäure-Reste*), which shows that the specific gas to be detected in this case was HCN. (There is no record that the requested detectors were ever located or delivered, much less evidence that they were ever used for the purpose assumed by Pressac.)⁶¹




At no time were any of Auschwitz-Birkenau's four crematory buildings ever hidden, concealed or "camouflaged." They were in plain view, and even newly arriving Jews could easily see them. Crematory buildings (*Kremas*) II and III were particularly visible. In this photograph, taken in May or June 1944, *Krema* II can be plainly seen in the background. In the foreground are Jews who have just arrived at Birkenau from Hungary.

This "criminal trace" can be readily dismissed: Germans had been gassed with HCN in the First World War, and they prepared for its possible use in the Second. Gas detectors for HCN have no "criminal" significance at all.

But there is still a problem. We know that the Degesch company that manufactured the HCN pesticide Zyklon had HCN gas detectors, and that the German military had its own gas detectors. Why, then, would one ask for gas detectors from a crematory oven manufacturer (Topf)? And why ten in number? Perhaps the most plausible answer is that these gas detectors were meant for the ten three-muffle crematory ovens of Birkenau crematory facilities (*Kremas*) II and III, and that they probably had some characteristic (heat resistance?) that made them usable in or near the ovens.⁶² It makes sense that the gas detectors would be meant for *Kremas* II and III because, as Pressac himself notes, the Birkenau crematory facilities were always discussed as pairs (II and III, IV and V),⁶³ and because *Kremas* IV and V did not have ten but rather four double muffle ovens each.

We must next ask what the function of these detectors might be. Pressac argues that they prove homicidal gassings with Zyklon in the Birkenau crematory morgue cellars (*Leichenkeller*). Why else



Detail from an Allied aerial reconnaissance photo, taken on June 26, 1944, shows crematory facilities (*Kremas*) II (top) and III (bottom) at Auschwitz-Birkenau. (In 1979 the CIA incorrectly dated this photo as August 25, 1944.) In none of the Allied reconnaissance photos taken in 1944, including this one, is there any trace of the mass exterminations that supposedly were being carried out at the time.

would anyone want gas detectors for a morgue room?

But if so, the responsible personnel certainly would not have needed devices to let them know that near by there were dangerous concentrations of HCN gas. In other words, this request for detectors most plausibly suggests a wish to detect the presence of HCN residues created by processes other than the release of HCN from Zyklon in crematory morgue cellars.

Arthur Butz has argued that burning certain fabrics in the incineration chute behind the crematory ovens of Birkenau *Kremas* II and III would have generated high levels of HCN in the crematory ductwork, and that this would explain the desire for such HCN detectors. There is merit to this argument.⁶⁴

Recognizing that the important issue here is not

the “criminality” of these detectors, but rather the question of why the Topf company was asked to supply them, I accept the general validity of Dr. Butz’ thesis, in the absence of a more convincing explanation.

Criminal Trace 3: Gas Door Handle

This document mentions “handle for a gas door, one item” (*1 Stck Handgriff für Gastür*), presumably meaning a “gas tight door.” As already shown, gas tight doors were a common feature of anti-gas air raid shelters.⁶⁵ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore this is not a criminal trace.

It’s worth noting that the German term *Stück* (“unit,” “piece” or “item”) is abbreviated or misspelled here as “*Stck*.” There are other such abbreviations or misspellings in the “trace” documents cited by Pressac.

Criminal Traces 4, 5, 10 and 12: Undressing Rooms and Undressing Cellars

In these four documents are passing references to an “undressing room” or an “undressing cellar” (*Auskleideraum*, *Auskleidekeller*). Undressing rooms were a common feature of bomb shelters, forming part of the decontamination sequence.⁶⁶ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore these are not criminal traces.

Criminal Traces 6, 11, 14 and 29: Gas Doors

These documents contain references to “gas doors,” presumably meaning “gas tight” doors. Probably the most important of these documents is one dated March 31, 1943, that mentions “three gas tight doors (3 *gasdichte Türen*) and a “gas door ... for morgue cellar 1 of crematory facility III ... with peephole” (*Gastür 100/192 für Leichenkeller I des Krematoriums III ... mit Guckloch*).⁶⁷ Because these specifications exactly match those of a typical bomb shelter door,⁶⁸ this should be regarded as a clear-cut reference to a typical anti-gas shelter door. As already noted, gas tight doors were a common feature of wartime German anti-gas shelters. A benign interpretation is possible, therefore these are not criminal traces.


Criminal Traces 7, 15, 17, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 29: Gas Tight Doors

These documents contain passing references to “gas tight doors.” As already noted, gas tight doors were a common feature of anti-gas shelters. Because a benign interpretation is possible, these are not criminal traces.

Criminal Traces 8 and 9: Wire Mesh Devices and Wooden Shutters

A March 1943 construction project inventory form for Birkenau *Krema II* contains handwritten mentions of “four wire mesh introduction devices” (4 *Drahtnetzeinschiebvorrichtung*) and of “four wooden shutters” (4 *Holzblenden*). Because these items are listed next to each other on the same document, are for four items each, and are both in the same handwriting, both we and Pressac assume that their functions are related. Pressac regards this document as “important evidence” that morgue cellar (*Leichenkeller*) 1 in Birkenau crematory facility (*Krema*) II was used “as a homicidal gas chamber.”⁶⁹

Pressac contends that these “wire mesh” items were column-like devices through which Zyklon B was poured from a roof opening into a Birkenau extermination “gas chamber.” He also cites this document in a 1994 article on the “machinery of mass murder at Auschwitz” (written with Robert-Jan Van Pelt). Here he translates *Drahtnetzeinschiebvorrichtung* as “wire netting inserting devices,” adding



Plan of Auschwitz-Birkenau Crematory Building (*Krema*) II:

1. *Leichenkeller* (morgue) 1. Below ground level morgue.
2. *Leichenkeller* (morgue) 2. Below ground level morgue.
3. *Leichenkeller* (morgue) 3. Below ground level morgue.
4. Furnace room. Ground level only. 15 cremation muffles.
5. Corpse elevator. Only a small central part of the building, where the furnace room joined
6. Corpse chute.
7. Cellar entrance.
8. Ground level entrance.
9. Ground level entrance.
10. Chimney and waste incinerator.
11. Supervisor's office, worker rest room, toilet, shower, tools, urn storage, fuel (coke) storage.

that these are “grillework columns for pouring Zyklon B into the gas chamber.”⁷⁰ However, there is no material or documentary corroboration for this thesis.

Pressac contends that the *Holzblenden* mentioned in this 1943 document were wooden “covers” or “lids” on the roof of the semi-underground morgue of Birkenau *Krema II*, which were lifted when dumping Zyklon into the chamber's wire mesh “columns” to gas Jews.

In fact, *Blenden* (tendentiously rendered by Pressac as “covers” or “lids”) were simply shutters or blinds. Made of either steel or wood, they were commonly used in German air raid shelters to make an opening, such as a window, gas tight.⁷¹ A benign interpretation of these *Holzblenden* is possible, therefore it is not a criminal trace.

Drahtnetzeinschiebvorrichtung is a neologism, and we cannot explain definitively what these “wire mesh” devices were. However, we offer the following probable explanation:

At least two advertisements in the pertinent literature depict wire mesh screens in an anti-gas shelter, one depicting a screen behind an *open shut-*



During a trial in France against revisionist scholar Robert Faurisson, lawyers for the Paris-based LICRA organization presented this photograph of a gas chamber door at Auschwitz as evidence of homicidal gassings at the camp. The small sign on the door warns "Poisonous Gasses! Mortal Danger on entering the room!" As French anti-revisionist researcher Jean-Claude Pressac has acknowledged, "this is not convincing proof of homicidal use." It is actually the door of a non-homicidal delousing gas chamber. Pressac further notes that shortly after the war the Soviets, as part of "a completely put up job," presented — as "proof" of homicidal gassings — similar photos from Auschwitz of gas-tight doors, with peep-holes, from delousing chambers. (Source: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 1989, pp. 46, 49)

ter. The anti-gas shelter literature also contains advertising for wire mesh (*Drahtnetz*).⁷² The pertinent literature also specifies that all windows and other openings of German anti-gas shelters must have some kind of mesh, netting, grating or grille work.⁷³

Auschwitz work order No. 353, dated April 27, 1943, contains an order for "twelve window gratings" or "window lattice-works" (*12 Stück Fenster-*

gitter 50 x 70 cm), which Pressac accepts as a reference to wire mesh screens or grilles for the 12 "gas tight windows" (or doors) (*gassdichten Fenster*) of Birkenau Kremas IV and V. These were functionally identical to "shutters" (*Blenden, Holzblenden*).⁷⁴

Therefore, we propose that the "wire mesh" devices cited here by Pressac were functionally related to the "wooden shutters" (*Holzblenden*) in the same way that the just-mentioned "window gratings" (*Fenstergitter*) were related to the "gas tight windows" (*gassdichten Fenster*) of Kremas IV and V.

In addition, given that the specialized literature specifies that such openings must be available for emergency exit, we further hypothesize that these inserts must be removable.⁷⁵

Auschwitz work order No. 78, of March 11, 1943, mentions (translated from Polish): "For the manufacture of screens with scantlings [or screens with edges] for crematory facility II (construction site 30), the gist of which is that wire gauze and wire mesh are to be used to meet the order."⁷⁶ This order is significant because it helps to explain the nature of the "wire mesh" devices cited by Pressac. The order's reference to screens is not a reference to induction devices, and indeed, they seem most likely to be the screens for emergency exits discussed earlier.⁷⁷

We believe, therefore, that the supposedly sinister "wire mesh induction devices" or "wire netting inserting devices" were most probably simply removable wire mesh screens that were placed into openings that the "wooden shutters" were designed to cover. A benign interpretation is possible, therefore this is not a criminal trace.

It should be noted that Pressac himself has candidly observed that the roof of morgue cellar (*Leichenkeller*) of Birkenau crematory building (*Krema*) II — for which these four pairs were designated — has only *two* holes in its largely collapsed but still intact roof. (It takes some courage to observe that there are two, not four, holes in the roof of morgue cellar 1 of Birkenau *Krema* II, and they are not where they are supposed to be.)⁷⁸ German chemist Germar Rudolf has demonstrated that these holes must have been made *after* the war.⁷⁹ In any case, though, because there are only two holes, in whatever manner these four pairs of "wire mesh" devices and "shutters" were meant to be used, they could not all have been used exclusively in the roof of this morgue cellar. This fact weakens Pressac's "homicidal" interpretation of their construction and purpose.

Criminal Traces 13 and 26: Flat Iron for 'Gas Doors'

These are references to flat iron bars for gas (tight) door fittings (*Flacheisen für ... Stück*

Gastürbeschlüge). Flat iron bars and similar items were often used to improve the seal on gas tight doors or gas tight shutters of German air raid shelters. For gas tight doors, such bars would be placed along the side or on the base of the door.⁸⁰ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore it is not a criminal trace.

Criminal Trace 16: Shower heads

A mention of 14 shower heads (*14 Brausen*) in a June 1943 inventory form is regarded by Pressac as a reference to dummy shower heads in morgue cellar (*LK*) No. 1 of Birkenau crematory facility (*Krema*) III. He says that this document, which also mentions “one gas tight door” (“criminal trace” 15), is “the only one known at present that proves, indirectly, the existence of a homicidal gas chamber in Leichenkeller I of Krematorium III.” This inventory form, his Pressac also writes, is “absolute and irrefutable proof of the existence of a gas chamber fitted with dummy showers” in *Krema* III.⁸¹

There is no material basis for Pressac’s assertion that these shower heads were fake. In any case, this “criminal trace” is only “relative” — that is, it is criminal only insofar as some other criminal trace(s) can be proved. Showers were a common feature of German wartime bomb shelters, forming part of the decontamination sequence.⁸² A benign interpretation is possible. Therefore, it is not a criminal trace.⁸³

Criminal Trace 17, 17A, 17B: Gas Tight ‘Doors’

This February 1943 document mentions twelve “gas tight doors” (*12 St. gasdichten Türen ca 30/40 cm*). I agree with Pressac that this is actually a reference to gas tight windows — not least because of their small size: 30 by 40 centimeters. These are in Birkenau crematory facilities (*Kremas*) IV and V. As already pointed out, gas tight windows were a common feature of German bomb shelters.⁸⁴ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore it is not a criminal trace.

The fact that these small openings — in spite of their small size: 30 by 40 centimeters. — are referred to as *doors* further strengthens our view that the engineers and construction workers at Auschwitz used unorthodox words to describe familiar, but differently named, objects. In addition, and as already noted, these objects are effectively identical to the shutters (*Blenden*) discussed above.

Criminal Traces 18 and 20, and 19 and 21: ‘Gas’ Windows and ‘Gas’ Chamber

“Traces” 18 and 20 mention putting “gass [sic] tight window” in place (*Gassdichtenfenster versetzen*), while “traces” 19 and 21 mention “concrete in gas chamber” (*betonieren im Gasskammer*).



Steel protective doors “for air defense, industry, [and government] agencies” are offered by the Panzerlit company in this advertisement from a wartime German trade periodical.

Pressac regards these “traces” — which are from February and March 1943 and relate to Birkenau *Kremas* IV and V — as very as very important evidence of homicidal gassings at Birkenau.


As already pointed out, gas tight windows were a common feature of German anti-gas shelters.⁸⁵ In addition, and as already noted, these objects are identical to the “shutters” (*Blenden*).

These four “traces” are dealt with here together because in each the word “gas” (*Gas* in German) is misspelled. In these four “traces” it is rendered as “Gass.” I do not agree with Pressac’s view that these are simple misspellings. Instead, I’m inclined to think that they are abbreviations: “tight windows for the [anti-gas shelter]” (*Gass[chutzraum]dichtenfenster*) and “[anti-]gas shelter” (*Gass[chutz]kammer*).⁸⁶

In any case, a benign interpretation is possible. Therefore, these are not criminal traces.

Criminal Trace 25: Gas Tight ‘Towers’

A construction office (*Zentralbauleitung*) letter of March 31, 1943, mentions “three gas tight tow-



This door on display at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, is portrayed as the door of an extermination gas chamber. This photo is taken from *The World Must Know* (p. 138), a book by Museum official Michael Berenbaum. The accompanying caption describes it as “a casting of the door to the gas chamber at Majdanek... from the outside, SS guards could observe the killing through a small peephole.” However, as even Jean-Claude Pressac concedes (on pages 555 and 557 of his 1989 *Auschwitz* book), this was a delousing chamber used to disinfect clothing. Similar doors, Samuel Crowell points out, were also commonly used with standard German wartime bomb shelters, as a protection against possible poison gas attacks.

ers” (3 *gasdichte Türme*). Pressac assumes that “towers” (*Türme*) here is nonsensical, and that it should instead read “doors” (*Türen*). If so, these would simply be references to gas tight doors. As already pointed out, such doors were a common feature of German bomb shelters. A benign interpretation is possible, therefore this is not a criminal trace.⁸⁷

But there is more to be said about this. There is no material or documentary support for Pressac’s view that these “towers” are really “doors.” Given

that this *Türme* spelling is repeated in this same document, his contention that this is merely a stenographic error seems strained.

I propose that “gas tight towers” is not an error, but may have been a reference to shutters for chimneys or smoke stacks, which, according to German anti-gas literature, were also supposed to be gas tight.⁸⁸ While the word *Turm* in German means “tower,” it (and its associated diminutive, *Turmchen*) can also mean, in German building parlance, a turret or ventilation chimney. Referring to the drawings of *Kremas* IV and V with their shuttered cupolas surmounting the roof, one might easily conclude that these may also have been referred to as “towers.” Supposedly the “extermination gas chambers” of *Kremas* IV and V were at the opposite end of the building. But this end of the buildings also had chimneys, although much smaller ones. In short, we propose that these “towers” (*Türme*) were gas tight chimneys of some kind.

Criminal Trace 28: Bolts for ‘Gas Tight’ Doors

This document mentions “anchor bolts for gas tight doors” (24 *Ankerschrauben für gasdichte [sic] Türen*). As already emphasized, such doors were a common feature of German wartime bomb shelters.⁸⁹ A benign interpretation is possible, therefore it is not a criminal trace.

Criminal Traces 30 and 31: Heating a Morgue

In two documents, both from March 1943, there are references to warming or heating “morgue cellar” (*Leichenkeller*) 1 in Birkenau *Krema* II. One mentions a “hot air supply” to the morgue, and the other mentions a “pre-warmed” morgue. These are “supplementary traces,” writes Pressac, because “heating a mortuary is nonsensical.” Still, they are “criminal” only to the extent that other traces are shown to be criminal.⁹⁰

Actually, warming or heating an anti-gas shelter is mentioned in the relevant literature, where specific temperatures are cited as ideal in keeping the humidity low.⁹¹ In addition, warming this semi-underground morgue cellar to keep it from freezing, such as in winter, would not be unusual.⁹² A benign interpretation is possible. Therefore these are not criminal traces.

Criminal Trace 32: Gas Tight Door Fittings

This 1943 work order for *Krema* V mentions “fittings for gas tight door” (*Beschläge für gasdichte Tür*). Because the date of this order is June 17, 1943 — that is, some time after *Krema* V had begun operation — Pressac argues that this new door was used to replace a faulty or damaged one. However, he offers no material evidence in support of this assertion. Anyway, and as already pointed out, gas tight

doors were a common feature to anti-gas shelters. A benign interpretation is possible, therefore this is not a criminal trace.

Criminal Trace 33: Key for Gas Chamber

This July 1943 work order mentions a “key for gas chamber” (*1 Schlüssel für Gaskammer*). Noting that “doors to the homicidal gas chambers ... were not fitted with locks,” Pressac offers this only as “a dubious ‘trace.’” Apparently he cited it only because it contains the word “gas.” Anyway, he adds, this documentary reference is “incomprehensible with our present state of knowledge.”⁹³

Perhaps the most interesting thing about this document (which is also the source of “criminal traces” 32 and 33) is a portion that Pressac does not mention. Under August 11, 1943, Number 708, there is an order for “30 fittings for red light lamps” (*30 Stück Befestigungskonstruktionen für Rotlichtlampen*) for Birkenau crematory buildings IV and V. As already noted, the relevant German literature stresses that darkening was very important for bomb shelters, and installing red light lamps in rooms of *Kremas* IV and V would therefore be very understandable if, as we believe, these rooms also served as bomb shelters, or at least were adapted or modified for that purpose.⁹⁴ If, as Pressac and other Holocaust historians contend, such rooms only served as homicidal gas chambers, the purpose of red lamps there seems pointless, or at least unclear.

Criminal Trace 34: Gas Chamber

This May 1943 work order mentions “fittings for a door with frames, air tight, with peephole for gas chamber” (*Beschläge zu 1 Tür mit Rahmen, Luftdicht mit Spion für Gaskammer*). Pressac regards this “trace” as merely “supplementary,” not least because the “gas chamber” mentioned here in this Polish extract or summary is explicitly identified as a disinfestation or delousing chamber (*Entwesungskammer* [sic]). Moreover, this fits the description of a normal anti-gas shelter door with a peephole.⁹⁵ A benign interpretation is possible, so no further commentary is necessary.

Some Additional Arguments by Pressac

At another place in his 1989 book, Pressac specifies eleven modifications of crematory facility (*Krema*) II that, he believes, are evidence of homicidal gassings there.⁹⁶ Here are these alleged “incriminating” modifications, with a brief response to each.

1. An access stairway was built to morgue cellar No. 2, allegedly the “undressing” room for gassing victims.

The addition of a staircase here at the nexus of the main building with the right angle under-

ground morgues makes complete sense in terms of access to a air raid anti-gas shelter. Without such a staircase, those seeking shelter there would have had to go another 50 yards out of their way.

Given their large size, these semi-underground morgue cellars would have provided effective shelter for many people in the event of a bombing raid or a gas attack. Morgue cellar 1 of Birkenau *Krema* II was 210 square meters in size, and morgue cellar 2 was 392.5 square meters in size. They could have held from 500 to 1,500 persons each.

Birkenau’s crematory facilities were among the most prominent and solidly-built structures in the entire camp. They were among only a handful of brick structures in Birkenau built by the Germans from the ground up. It seems only natural that they would have been modified or adapted to incorporate features and capacities in addition to their primary role as morgue rooms. Given their sturdy construction, and prominence, one can easily envision their secondary use as anti-gas air raid shelters, decontamination centers, or personnel shelters.

The location of Birkenau’s crematory facilities athwart or near rail lines alone would have insured their strategic importance. In the event of enemy attack with bombs or poison gas (or even artillery fire), there would have been no safer place in the entire camp than the morgue cellars of Birkenau *Krema* buildings II and III.

2. The double door of morgue cellar 1 of Birkenau *Krema* II was refitted to open outward.

Pressac contends that this new door was never actually installed. Anyway, an outward opening double door creates further problems for Pressac and other defenders of the standard Holocaust story, insofar as it blocks the corpse lift.

3. This double door was replaced with a single gas tight door.

Although Pressac cites a document to support this contention, it is not completely clear whether this door was meant for morgue cellar 1 or morgue cellar 2. In either case, as we have seen, gas tight doors of both types were used for air raid shelters. Oddly, Pressac claims⁹⁷ that the double door, with dimensions of 190 x 190 cm, was replaced by a single door 100 x 192 cm in size. A more reasonable explanation is that this single door was meant for morgue cellar 2, which no one has ever claimed was a homicidal gas chamber.

4. The drainage system was separated from the other drains in the building.

This is a design feature consistent with anti-

gas shelter design. If, as we propose, the drainage of morgue cellar No. 1 was designed to evacuate poison gas contaminants, one would certainly want to keep its drainage separate.⁹⁸

5. The efficiency of the morgue cellar 1 ventilation system was tested with Zyklon.

There is no material evidence for this claim.

6. A wooden wall was built in front of the corpse chute.

In this case as well, this modification is consistent with bomb shelter and anti-gas shelter design.

7. Four wire mesh induction columns with lidded chimneys were installed.

This is another claim (discussed above) for which no material evidence is offered.

8. Dummy wooden shower heads were installed in the ceiling of morgue cellar No. 1 (*Krema II*).

This is another non-material claim. The relevant document actually mentions 14 shower heads, and these are for *Krema III*. In any case, the decontamination section of an air raid shelter would naturally have showers and shower heads.⁹⁹

9. The three water taps were removed.

This is yet another non-material claim. The presence of water taps was typical in bomb shelters for cleaning and decontamination, and could certainly sustain shower heads, as we have seen.

10. Benches with clothes hooks were installed in morgue cellar No. 2 (*Krema II*).

The benches are typical of those in the front (waiting) room of large bomb shelters. The clothes hooks would be expected in the undressing rooms of large bomb shelters equipped with decontamination centers.

11. The area of morgue cellar No. 3 was reduced.

It appears that morgue cellar No. 3 (*Krema III*) was indeed subdivided to provide additional spaces or rooms. This is entirely consistent with the layout of a large bomb shelter. One of these new rooms was, naturally enough, for the collecting of gold and other metals from the dead. This is a perfectly logical procedure, when we recall that these morgues were after all morgues, and that metals are not consumed in cremation. Indeed, cremated tooth fillings emit mercury as a toxic air pollutant.¹⁰⁰

To sum up, Pressac provides no material evidence of unique or telltale adaptations indicating that the "*Vergasungskeller*" morgue cellar ever served, or could have served, as a homicidal (extermination) gas chamber. To the contrary (and Dr. Butz has argued), there are several reasons why the *Vergasungskeller* was most probably an anti-gas

shelter, an interpretation that is supported even by some of the modifications cited by Pressac. Moreover, and as we have shown, all of Pressac's "criminal traces" are consistent with German air defense shelter design.

The contemporary German technical literature explains the design, layout and equipping of these "morgue cellars" as morgues, with modifications for secondary bomb shelter use. We therefore conclude that these cellar rooms were, in fact, designed and constructed as morgues with a secondary or additional use as air-raid shelters. In this context, the morgue cellar with the gas tight door and the shower heads (or water taps) could only be one thing: a decontamination facility (*Entgiftungsanstalt*), with shower (*Duschraum*), for treating poison gas victims — in short, a semi-underground decontamination center, or *Vergasungskeller*.

Conclusions

Each one of Pressac's "criminal traces" can be explained as an anti-gas feature of an ordinary German wartime air raid shelter. More specifically, the "gas tight" features cited by Pressac were not designed to keep poisonous gas in, but rather to keep poisonous gas out. Pressac's "criminal traces" notion assumes that these "traces" must have a criminal interpretation. Our explanations, however, render them invalid. With these "criminal traces" no longer valid, it follows that there is no material or documentary evidence whatsoever for the existence of extermination gas chambers in the four Birkenau crematory facilities. Therefore, the only evidence of extermination gas chambers at these locations is witness testimony and postwar affidavits.

The contemporaneous German technical literature, a small part of which has been cited here, describes the design features, layout, and equipment of German wartime bomb shelters, or air-raid anti-gas shelters.

The design features, layout, and equipment of the alleged "extermination gas chambers" described by Pressac match those of morgues modified or altered to serve secondarily as air defense shelters with anti-gas warfare features.

The available material and documentary evidence shows that the alleged "extermination gas chambers" in the Birkenau crematory facilities were designed and constructed as morgues, with modifications for their additional or secondary use as anti-gas shelters.

How, or even if, these rooms were actually used as air raid shelters, or anti-gas shelters (in addition to their primary use as morgues), and what additional modifications may have accordingly been carried out, is beyond the scope of this article.

It should be noted that if these morgue cellar

rooms had in fact been used as extermination gas chambers, as widely alleged, additional modifications or adaptations of them would have been required for that use.¹⁰¹ There is no evidence of such additional modifications.

Notes

1. This article was first posted on CODOH Web site on March 23, 1997 (<http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconpressac.html>). It was expanded on April 30, 1997. A German translation, edited by Germar Rudolf, was published in the December 1997 issue of *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (Jg. 1, Heft 4), pp. 226-243. In that form it was slightly altered to include a section pertaining to air raid shelters in the concentration camp system, derived from a sister article, "Defending Against the Allied Bombing Campaign: Air Raid Shelters and Gas Protection in Germany, 1939-1945", which may be found at the CODOH site at <http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconabr.html>. The present version, edited by Mark Weber, is adapted from the English-language text prepared for the German-language version.
See also: Samuel Crowell, "The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes," posted on the CODOH site at <http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconshr123.html>.)
2. Throughout I have used the terms bomb shelter and anti-gas shelter interchangeably, because the original German terms "*Luftschutzraum*," "*Gasschutzraum*," and "*Schutzraum*," are used as synonyms in the German literature. I have adopted the (translated) term "anti-gas shelter" from a contemporaneous English-language source, *Handbook on German Military Forces* (published by the US War Department in March 1945, p. 518), which is further discussed in the body of the text.
3. *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* was published in 1989 by the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation (New York). This book was announced in a sympathetic article by Richard Bernstein in *The New York Times*, December 18, 1989. Reviews and analyses of Pressac's book that have appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review* include: M. Weber, Summer 1990 issue (Vol. 10, No. 2), pp. 231-237; C. Mattogno, Winter 1990-91 (Vol. 10, No. 4), pp. 461-485; R. Faurisson, Spring 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 1), pp. 25-66, and Summer 1991 issue (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 133-175.
4. Actually, the number of criminal traces is something less than 39. The "39" refers to 39 documents, which are photographically reproduced in Pressac's book.
5. Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account* (New York: Arcade, 1993), p. 128, or (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1965), p. 97. (This is at the beginning of chapter 22.)
6. Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981), p. 309.
7. Wilhelm Stäglich, *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (IHR, 1990), p. 53. This is a translation of *Der Auschwitz-Mythos*, first published in German in 1979.
8. Friedrich P. Berg, "The German Delousing Chambers," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1986 (Vol. 7, No. 1), pp. 73-94; F.P. Berg, "Typhus and the Jews," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1988-89 (Vol. 8, No. 4), pp. 433-481.
9. Analysis of Pressac's 1989 *Auschwitz* book, by Robert Faurisson, in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 1), pp. 25-66, esp. pp. 55-58. Specifically, Faurisson wrote (pp. 49, 65): "A gas-tight door is a *Gastür* or *gasdichte Tür*; English speakers use "gas-proof door" as well as "gas-tight door"; this type of door can be used either for delousing gas chambers or for airlocks (for example, airlocks in an oven room or in an air-raid shelter)... In a bombing attack, the door to an air-raid shelter is supposed to guard against two effects, among others, caused by exploding bombs: suction of the oxygen out of the shelter and penetration of CO into the same shelter."
10. Dr. Butz' "Vergasungskeller" article was first published on his Northwestern University Internet web-site on August 6, 1996, and has been revised at least twice since then. It appeared in the January 1997 issue (No. 51) of the Adelaide Institute Newsletter. A revised version was published in *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1997 issue (pp. 20-23) under the title "The Nagging 'Gassing Cellar' Problem." (See also note 57.)
11. This section draws on the following sources: Sterling Seagrave, *Yellow Rain: A Journey Through the Terror of Chemical Warfare* (New York: 1981); the article "Poison Gas Warfare" by Major General Sir Louis Jackson, in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 12th edition, 1923 (Supplementary volumes to the 11th edition, 1910), volume XXXII, pp. 110-117; and, the article "A Whiff of Death: Chemical Warfare in the World Wars" by David Tschanz, in *Command: Military History, Strategy & Analysis*, issue 33, March-April 1995, pp. 46-57. The author expresses his gratitude to Richard A. Widmann for providing this last reference. Perhaps the most detailed exposition of World War I gas usage is Dieter Martinetz, *Der Gaskrieg, 1914-1918* (Koblenz: Bernard & Graefe, 1996).
12. Stephen Trombley, *The Executioner's Protocol* (New York: Crown/Anchor, 1992), p. 12. (This book was reviewed in the March-April 1998 *Journal of Historical Review*, pp. 34-36.)
13. *Branddirektor* Hans Rumpf, *Gasschutz: Ein Leit-faden für den Gasschutzlehrer und den Gasschutz-mann* (Berlin: E.S. Mittler & Sohn, 1936/ 3rd ed.), p. 46.
14. H. Rumpf, *Gasschutz* (cited above), pp. 49, 52.
15. H. Rumpf, *Gasschutz* (cited above), p. 54.
16. Guenther W. Gellerman, *Der Krieg, der nicht stat-tfand* (Koblenz: Bernard & Graefe, 1986), pp. 186 f.
17. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (Berlin: Bauwelt Verlag,

- 1939), pp. 174-177.
18. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), p. 180.
 19. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), pp. 178 f.
 20. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), pp. 182 f.
 21. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), p. 205.
 22. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), p. 208.
 23. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), p. 210.
 24. Dr.-Ing. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (Berlin: W. Ernst & Sohn, 1939)
 25. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (cited above), p. 2.
 26. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (cited above), p. 3.
 27. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (cited above), p. 21.
 28. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (cited above), pp. 32, 37.
 29. Further research on this precise point indicates that the peephole might be variously shaped or covered, and might be recessed either on the inside or outside of the door, depending on the nature of the construction and available materials.
Thus, the peephole cited in R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), pp. 32, 37, shows the recess and covering on the inside. However, an article in the periodical *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (Berlin-Charlottenberg: Verlag Gasschutz und Luftschutz, 10. Jg., 1940, pp. 6 and 42) shows it on the outside. See also the photographs of such doors in: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), pp. 29, 46, 48, 49, 50, 61. The literature also shows that, while the perforated steel plate was preferred, many other expedients were used, sometimes wired glass or ordinary glass, and sometimes the peepholes themselves might be rectangular, *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1940, cited above), p. 42.
 30. "Der Zivile Luftschutz auf den Frühjahrsausstellungen 1939," by Heinz-Guenther Mehl, published in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (Berlin-Charlottenberg: Verlag Gasschutz und Luftschutz), 9. Jg. (1939), p. 106.
 31. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (cited above), 9. Jg. (1939), p. 111.
 32. "Werkretungsstellen" ("Work Place Emergency Rooms"), by Dr. Ing. Karl Quasebart, published in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 9. Jg. (1939), p. 236.
 33. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, p. 237.
 34. *Handbook on German Military Forces* (Washington, DC: US War Department, March 1945), p. 528. (Facsimile reprint: Louisiana State University Press, 1990 [with introduction by historian Stephen E. Ambrose].)
 35. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (cited above), p. 210.
 36. "Werkretungsstellen," in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939 (cited above), p. 239.
 37. "Aus der Praxis für die Praxis im Werkluftschutz" ("Practical Lessons for Work Place Bomb Shelters"), by Major a.D. (retired) Stein, in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, p. 263.
 38. "Behelfsmässige Luftschutzräume, falsch und richtig" ("Makeshift Bomb Shelters: Right and Wrong"), by Dr. Ing. Ernst Baum, in *Baulicher Luftschutz* (formerly *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*) 10. Jg., 1940, pp. 22 ff.
 39. *Baulicher Luftschutz* (cited above), 1940, p. 26.
 40. "Bemerkungen zur Verordnung und den Bestimmungen über die behelfsmässige Herrichtung von Luftschutzräumen" ("Remarks on the Ordinance and Regulations for Building Makeshift Air Raid Shelters"), by K. Otto, *Referent im Reichsluftfahrtministerium*, published in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1940, p. 8.
 41. "Hygienische und physiologische Grundlagen für den Bau von Luftschutz-Bunkern" ("Hygienic and Psychological Conditions for Building Air Raid Bunkers"), by Dr. W. Liese, *Reichsgesundheitsamt*, in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1942, pp. 104-110.
 42. *Baulicher Luftschutz* (article by Dr. W. Liese, cited above), 1942, p. 107.
 43. "Einfluß der Heizung und Belüftung auf die Planung von LS Bunkern" ("The Role of Heating and Ventilation in Planning Air Raid Bunkers"), by Dr. Ing. Hermann Schrader, *Regierungsbaurat im Reichsluftfahrtministerium* (Reich Air Ministry), published in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1942, pp. 110-116.
 44. Advertisements in *Baulicher Luftschutz* (cited above), 1942 issues, apparently pp. iv and v. Text portion translations: "Absolute safety in use!" (*Unbedingte Betriebssicherheit!*), and "the simple method of construction enables easy, quick usage" (*Die einfache Bauart ermöglicht leichte, schnelle Bedienung*).
 45. *Handbook on German Military Forces* (US War Dept., 1945. Cited above), pp. 518-527.
 46. *Handbook on German Military Forces* (cited above), p. 527 (Figure 125).
 47. *Baulicher Luftschutz* (cited above), 1942, p. 202.
 48. *Luftschutz Führer Sofort Programm* ("Air Raid Guide Emergency Program"), November 1940. Quoted in: Samuel Crowell, "Defending Against the Allied Bombing Campaign: Air Raid Shelters and Gas Protection in Germany, 1939-1945." The relevant portion of the text is posted on the CODOH Internet web site: www.codoh.com/incon/inconabr.html. Sources cited by Crowell for this document: Joachim Stahl, *Bunker und Stollen für den Luftschutz im Raum Siegen* (Kreuztal: 1980), pp. 23 ff., and, Georg Wolfgang Schramm, *Der zivile Luftschutz in Nürnberg, 1933-1945* (Nuremberg: 1983), pp. 327 ff. The wording in German is: "Bei allen Neubauten, insbesondere bei den Bauten der Rüstungsindustrie, sind von vorneherein bombensichere Luftschutzräume auszuführen. Sie sind in die gleiche Dringlichkeitsstufe wie die Bauvorhaben selbst aufzunehmen."
 49. Letter from Oswald Pohl, head of the SS agency that administered the concentration camps (WVHA), to SS chief Heinrich Himmler, with attached order by Pohl to all camp commandants, April 30, 1942. Nuremberg document R-129. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal*

(Nuremberg: 1947-1949), IMT "blue series," vol. 38, pp. 362-367.

See also: Himmler to Glücks, Jan. 25, 1942. Nuremberg document NO-500. *Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals* (1949-1953), NMT "green series," vol. 5, p. 365. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 3 vols., 1985), p. 917.

50. David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews* (New York: 1984), pp. 299-300; R. Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: 1985), pp. 981, 1128-1129; At least two of these raids were reported in *The New York Times*: Aug. 21, 1944, p. 6, and Sept. 14, 1944, p. 6.

51. Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies* (New York: 1981), pp. 315-316, and illus. # 32, opp. p. 193.

52. Order (*Standortbefehl*) Nr. 51/43 of November 16, 1943, by Auschwitz commandant, and SS officer, Liebehenschel. Quoted by Carto Mattogno in his "Reply to Samuel Crowell's 'Comments' About my 'Critique of the Bomb Shelter Thesis'," 1999, posted on CODOH web site: www.codoh.com/granata/reply.html.

In February 1943 Himmler issued an order on measures to be taken in the concentration camps in anticipation of Allied air bombing raids. Source: R. Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1985), pp. 913-914.

53. Memorandum (*Aktenvermerk*), Auschwitz, October 25, 1943. (*Betr. Luftschutz-Dekungsgräben*), signed by SS-Untersturmführer Dejaco (?). Original in the Central State Archives, Moscow. Document No. 502-1-26-178.

Memorandum (*Aktenvermerk*), Auschwitz, November 5, 1943. (*Betr. Luftschutzdeckungsgräben*), signed by SS-Untersturmführer Dejaco (?). Original in the Central State Archives, Moscow. Document No. 502-1-26-186 +186R.

Letter, from SS WVHA, Berlin, November 9, 1944, to *Bauinspektion* Kattowitz. (*Betr. Errichtung von Luftschutzdeckungsgräben*), Copy of copy. Original in the Central State Archives, Moscow. Document No. 502-1-281.

These three documents are posted, both in facsimile and retyped text, along with commentary, on David Irving's Focal Point web site: <http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/documents/LSKeller/MoscowDocs.html>

In addition, a document of November 10, 1943, by SS officer Jothann, mentions work on such air raid shelters (*Luftschutzgräben*). Cited by Carlo Mattogno in his "Reply to Samuel Crowell's 'Comments' About my 'Critique of the Bomb Shelter Thesis'," posted on CODOH web site: www.codoh.com/granata/reply.html.

54. On measures to protect inmates at Auschwitz (including Birkenau) against death by disease, especially typhus, see: M. Weber, "High Frequency Delousing Facilities at Auschwitz," *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1999, pp. 4-12.

55. "The Strop Report." Nuremberg document 1061-PS. Published in: IMT "blue series" (cited above), vol. 26, pp. 637-638, 672; Nuremberg Tribunal testimony of Joseph Bühler (April 23, 1946), in: IMT "blue series," vol. 12, pp. 75.

56. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (cited above), p. 429. On the following pages of his book (pp. 430-457), Pressac presents his 39 "criminal traces," with commentary, source references, and photographic reproductions of each.

57. Arthur R. Butz, "The Nagging 'Gassing Cellar' Problem," *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1997, pp. 20-23. (See also note 10.)

Dr. Butz argues here that the large concrete semi-underground morgues of Birkenau crematory facilities (*Kremas*) II and III, with their reinforced concrete roofs, and their intended berming, would have been ideal as air raid "gas shelters."

Actually, these morgue had features not only of anti-gas bomb shelters, but also of personnel shelters. Such personnel shelters, which were common in German emplacements, would preferably be underground, "or as low as the water level table permits." (See: *Handbook on German Military Forces*, cited above, p. 263). Also, they would be constructed of concrete reinforced with steel rods, have gas locks, be carefully camouflaged, and have four ventilation ducts, two of which would be dummies to thwart enemy attempts to introduce gas or explosives. (See: *Handbook on German Military Forces*, cited above, pp. 262-264).

Butz' research shows that "*Gaskeller*" can mean "*Gasschutzkeller*" or "gas shelter," and that "*Vergasungskeller*" can mean "*Gaskeller*." This is a good etymological argument, and important in this regard because, as we have seen, the construction workers and engineers were very creative in their use of the German language.

As already noted, the bomb shelter literature boasted an impressive vocabulary of synonyms and neologisms. Several nouns, that no one has heard before or since, were coined, using "*Gasschutz*-" or "*Luftschutz*-" as a prefix. In the subject index for one periodical year, we find at least 20 words that use *Gas*- or *Gasschutz*- as a prefix or suffix, including *Gasschutzbettchen* and *Kleinkindergasschutz*. *Luftschutz*- is even more productive, no less than 50 terms are listed, including such interesting terms as *Luftschutzhausapotheke*, and *Luftschutztürme* (See: *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, cited above, index.) A similar prolificacy affects bomb shelters (*Gasschutzraum*, *-keller*, *Gaskeller* [as Dr. Butz has noted], *Luftschutzraum*, *-haus*, *-keller*, *Schutzraum*, even *Selbstschutz*; *LS-Bunker* only rarely), poison gas victims (*Gaserkrankung*, *Vergiftungen*, *Kampfstoffvergiftung*, *Kampfstoffverletzte*, *Gaskranken*, *Gelbkreuzverletzte*, and others) as well as decontamination centers (*Entgiftungsanstalt*, *Bade- und Duschraum für Kampfstoffverletzte*, *Gasentgift-*

- ung, *Rettungsstelle*). Such terms as *Vergasungskeller* for *Krema II*, and *Gasskammer* for *Krema IV* and *V*, would follow naturally in this series of neologisms.
58. For more on this, see the full, "original" text of this essay, posted on CODOH web site: <http://www.codoh.com/incon/incompressac.html>. See also: S. Crowell, "The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes" [abstract], particularly Section 3 ["German Delousing Procedures"], posted on the CODOH site at <http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconshr123.html>.
 59. *Handbook on German Military Forces* (cited above), p. 525.
 60. J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz* (Munich: Piper, 1994), p. 93, and, J.-C. Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz: la machinerie du meurtre de masse* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1993). This letter is reproduced in facsimile, together with an English translation, by J.-C. Pressac and Robert-Jan Van Pelt in their article in: Y. Gutman and M. Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 230-231. See also the discussion of this letter in: Arthur R. Butz, "Gas Detectors in Auschwitz Crematory II," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1997, pp. 24-30.
- The argument that this document is an altered copy or forgery has been advanced by Werner Rademacher in: E. Gauss, ed., *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (Tübingen: Grabert Verlag, 1994), pp. 55-57. Carlo Mattogno has made this same argument, for example, in C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of the Legend* (IHR, 1994), p. 66, and in, C. Mattogno, "Auschwitz: Die Ende einer Legende," in Herbert Vorbeke, ed., *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten* (Berchem, Belgium: VHO, 1995), p. 147.
61. J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz* (cited above), p. 94.
 62. At this point it is worth mentioning that the word "Gasprüfer" in the contemporary German literature refers to a device for measuring the mix of gases in a furnace. See: *Hütte, des Ingenieurs Taschenbuch* (Berlin: Verlag von W. Ernst & Sohn [Akademischer Verein Hütte], 1931), vol. 1, p. 1013 (with specific reference to exhaust gas analysis). This page is reproduced in facsimile in: C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of the Legend* (cited above), p. 122, and pp. 65-67, 117-122. This is also given in: C. Mattogno, in H. Vorbeke, ed., *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten* (cited above), p. 152, and pp. 146-152.
 63. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), p. 452.
 64. "Gas Detectors in the Auschwitz Crematorium II" was published on Dr. Butz' Internet homepage on March 3, 1997, and revised several times thereafter. It was also published in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1997, pp. 24-30.
- One such source of HCN when burned is rayon. During the war years German military uniforms were made with an increasingly high proportion of rayon. (*Handbook on German Military Forces*, 1945, cited above, pp. 541, 543, 551.) It is also not unreasonable to assume that most concentration camp fabrics contained similar proportions of wool and rayon, and that highly flammable rayon fabrics would be treated with flame retardant, which would provide a catalyst for HCN release when burned. In addition, our review of the literature has shown that several other substances — including leather, celluloid, and proteinous matter — produced HCN when burned, and could have a poisonous effect. All of these could have been burned in the incinerator as well. (H. Rumpf, *Gasschutz*, 1936, cited above, p. 55.)
- A possible counter argument to Butz' thesis is that these gas detectors had special characteristics that made them appropriate for measuring HCN in connection with homicidal gassings. Aside from this being purely speculative, this counter argument offers no clue as to what these characteristics might be. Moreover, this argument would not explain why ten detectors would be needed, or how they would be used or consulted in a space that, after all, had only one door.
65. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), pp. 21, 24 f; Advertisements in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1942 issues, cited above; and, *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, p. 236.
 66. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (1939, cited above), pp. 180, 205, 210; *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 237.
 67. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), pp. 434, 436.
 68. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), pp. 21, 24 f; Advertisements in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1942 issues, cited above; and, *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, p. 236.
- The references in these other "trace" documents are to: "Gasdichttür," "Beschlüge für 1 Stück Gastür," "4 Gasdichte Türe," "Gastüren Verankerungen 210 stk," "4 dichte Türen, mit Türfutter," für 4 gasdichte Türen," "Gastüren einsetzen." Werner Rademacher in *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (cited above), p. 57, has argued that all these items would have been superfluous for use with the supposed gas chambers, or the gas chamber doors. However, my bomb shelter thesis answers this problem.
69. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), pp. 430, 436, 438.
 70. J.-C. Pressac and R.-J. Van Pelt in Y. Gutman and M. Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (cited above), p. 233. *Holzblenden* is translated here as "wooden lids."
 71. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 111, and, 1940, pp. 22 ff, 26.
- Elsewhere in his 1989 *Auschwitz* book (pp. 425-428), Pressac provides several photographs of shutters, which he identifies as the "gas tight windows" or "doors" of Birkenau crematory facilities (*Kremas*) IV and V. These shutters are generally identical in size, shape, and construction to ordinary wooden shutters (*Blenden*) for air raid shelters, as can readily be seen

by consulting the literature cited above, and they are also of about the right size for emergency exits. Thus, "gas tight windows," "gas tight doors," "shutters" or "wooden shutters" are, in this context, all the same thing. This is important not only because it demonstrates the propensity of Birkenau construction workers and engineers to describe things by unconventional names, but also because it helps put this "wire mesh" or "wire netting" in context.

72. Advertisements in *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1942 issues, cited above.
73. *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (1939, cited above), p. 182 f; *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1940, p. 26; *Baulicher Luftschutz*, 1940, p. 263. German terms used are *Rost*, *Gitterstäbe* and *Geflecht von Draht*.
74. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), p. 441.
75. There are several references in the German anti-gas shelter literature to various *Schieber*, that is, devices that slide in and block, filter, or mediate a space (such as *Absperrschieber*, *Rosettenschieber*, or *Aufbläseschieber*). In each such case, the *Schieber* is something that it is slid into something else. In no case does it refer to a device into which something else is slid. (R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse*, 1939, cited above, p. 5; *Luftschutz durch Bauen*, 1939, cited above, pp. 174ff, 182f.) Pressac's characterization of *Drahtnetzeinschiebvorrichtung* as "wire mesh induction devices" or "wire netting inserting devices" is therefore semantically incorrect.
76. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), p. 440. The relevant portion of the text, in Polish, reads: "na wykonanie zaslon i kontówek dla krematorium II / B.W. 301, z treści którego wynika, że dla wykonania tego zamówienia zużyto gaze druciana i druciana plecionke."
- The original (German-language) order is not available, because, Pressac believes, the original document was taken from the Auschwitz State Museum and has not been returned. (J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz*, cited above, p. 438). This seems to be the only original document that is missing. Pressac therefore relies on a Polish-language abstract, notarized by Jan Sehn.
77. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), p. 5; *Luftschutz durch Bauen* (1939, cited above), pp. 174ff, 182f.
78. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), pp. 354, 436. On page 436 he wrote: "According to the American aerial photograph of 24th August 1944, the four introduction points were located along a line running the length of the room in the EASTERN half. In the present ruins, two of these openings are still visible at the southern end but in the WESTERN half. Nobody up to now seems to have been concerned by this contradiction, nor to have explained it." However, on page 354 Pressac wrote: "The reason for this as yet unexplained difference could well be simply that the roof shifted considerably when dynamited."
79. R. Kammerer, A. Solms, eds., *Das Rudolf Gutachten* (London: Cromwell Press, 1993), pp. 26, 28. The text

is also on the Internet at: <http://www.vho.org>. (See also the English-language summary edition: *The Rudolf Report* [Cromwell Press, 1993], pp. 6-7.)

Rudolf argues that the two holes were crudely cut through the reinforced concrete after pouring, and that they could not be made secure or gas-tight under any conditions. Therefore they must have been made after the war.

For more about Rudolf and his *VffG* journal, see "Important New German-Language Revisionist Quarterly," in the May-June 1998 *Journal*, pp. 26-27.

80. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), p. 22.
81. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), pp. 429, 430, 438, 439.
82. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), 1939, p. 276.
83. It should be pointed out that this reference to 14 shower heads pertains to morgue 1 of Birkenau crematory building (*Krema*) III, not *Krema* II. (For *Krema* II we have the materially unsubstantiated claim that it had 24 shower heads.) According to the *Krema* II inventory, morgue 1 was equipped with either three or five water taps, which would be consistent with the facilities or equipping of a decontamination shower room. (See: *Gasschutz und Luftschutz*, 1939, cited above, p. 276.)
84. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 111; and, 1940, pp. 22ff, 26.
85. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 111; and, 1940, pp. 22ff, 26.
86. Traces 18 and 19 are time sheets filled out by the foreman of a civilian construction firm that worked on *Kremas* IV and V. These contain two similar spellings, which Pressac considers mistakes: *gassdichtenfenster*, and *Gasskammer*. Traces 20 and 21 repeat the "misspellings" in a log book. I consider these misspellings odd, because there is more than one mistake being made here.
- For more on all this, see the full, "original" text of this essay, posted on CODOH web site: <http://www.codoh.com/incon/incompressac.html>.
87. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989), pp. 452, 453. As Pressac notes here, Polish examining judge Jan Sehn arbitrarily changed *Türme* ("towers") to *Türen* ("doors") in producing an "authentic copy" of this document, which he "certified." Sehn certified as an "authentic copy" a document to which alterations had been made. Certification of altered documents could certainly be characterized as forgery.
88. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 111.
89. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 111; and, 1940, pp. 22ff, 26.
- See, for example, the small "towers" above *Krema* IV or V shown in the drawing on the front cover of Pressac's 1989 book.
- It should be noted that "gas tight" (*gasdichte*) is misspelled as *gasduchte*. But this comes from the Polish transcript, not from the German original document.

90. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), pp. 230, 433, 454.
91. *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), p. 276.
92. The heating of an underground morgue would sometimes be necessary to keep temperatures above the freezing point. See: E. Neufert, *Bauentwurfslehre* (Frankfurt: Ullstein Fachverlag, 1962), p. 423.
93. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), pp. 456, 457.

This Polish summary or extract of a German work order reads: *1 Schlüssel. für Gaskammer / Melden bei H.stuf der Apotheke im 44-Revier / . Bestellschein der Verwaltung BBD Nr. 87 Block vom 9.7.43.* Pressac translates this as: 1 key. for gas chamber. Report to SS captain of the SS hospital pharmacy. BBD administration Order No. 87 Block of 9th July, 1943.


I believe that alternate interpretations of this "trace" are conceivable, and that, anyway, there are several possible mistakes in this extract. Until the original German work order is found, I think it best to leave this "trace" alone.

94. "Der Zivile Luftschutz auf den Frühjahrsausstellungen 1939," by Heinz-Guenther, published in *Gasschutz und Luftschutz* (1939, cited above), pp. 5, 264, 323ff.
 95. R. Scholle, *Schutzraumabschlüsse* (1939, cited above), p. 21. Note the use of the word *Spion* for the peephole, instead of the more usual *Guckloch*. This is further evidence of the creative vocabulary of Birkenau construction workers.
 96. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), p. 286, with pp. 302-303, 310 and 312.
 97. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989, cited above), p. 434.
 98. Germar Rudolf has also made the point that it would be natural to segregate the drainage of this space if the cellar contained contaminated corpses. R. Kammerer, A. Solms, eds., *Das Rudolf Gutachten* (London: Cromwell Press, 1993). Also on the Internet at: <http://www.vho.org>.
 99. It has been mentioned in this regard that the architectural drawings for morgue cellar #1 of *Krema II* do not indicate the piping for the shower heads. As a matter of fact, they indicate no shower heads at all, but rather three water taps (actually, symbols indicating three points where water would be piped in) against the eastern wall (Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 1989, pp. 310, 312). It is strange that Pressac suggests (*Auschwitz*, 1989, p. 310) that this same drawing would indicate that the water taps were removed, but on closer inspection it turns out that the water taps were removed according to witness testimony only.
- Furthermore, it seems odd that Pressac would consider a lack of piping in any way significant. Elsewhere in this same book (Pressac, *Auschwitz*, 1989, pp. 55-57), he presents four drawings of a known delousing station for prisoners: all four indicate the 55 shower heads, but only one shows the piping for the shower heads, which are in turn led back to only four water outlets.

A photograph presented by Pressac (*Auschwitz*, 1989, p. 80) shows how such outlets, by the use of exposed piping suspended from iron rods attached to the ceiling, could sustain shower heads in a ratio of 14 to 1.

Therefore, it should be clear that this entire issue of piping, shower heads, water taps, and such is, from a documentary point of view, just not relevant.

100. Kenneth V. Iserson, *Death to Dust: What Happens to Dead Bodies?* (Tucson: 1994), p. 251.
101. In particular, it would have been necessary to reverse the screens and shutters. Normally (that is, in the case of air raid shelters), the screens would be on the outside, to protect against bomb splinters and debris, while the shutters would be on the inside, to afford gas protection. If not reversed, the intended gassing victims could simply have opened the emergency exits and climbed out. But if reversed, the debris, splinter, and gas protection features would be compromised. In short, converting these rooms to extermination gas chambers would have prevented their effective use as bomb shelters. There is no material or documentary evidence that such modifications were ever made.



Even Japan has learned what happens to those who commit sacrilege against the secular religion of the Holocaust. "Holocaust Pressure Groups Shut Down Japan's *Marco Polo Magazine*," a 30-page IHR Special Report, includes a translation of Dr. Nishioka's headline-making *Marco Polo* article, facsimile copies of numerous reports from American and Japanese English-language newspapers on the *Marco Polo* furor, a feature article from the March-April 1995 *Journal*, and more.

Holocaust Pressure Groups Shut Down Marco Polo
\$7.00 postpaid (CA sales tax \$.39)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Origin and Enduring Impact of the 'Garaudy Affair'

A French Scholar's Look at Israel's 'Founding Myths'

THEODORE J. O'KEEFE

When *Les mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne* — soon to be issued by the IHR as *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel* — was first published in France at the end of 1995, it unleashed a nationwide sound and fury unmatched by any other revisionist book on the Holocaust, before or since. No book by Paul Rassinier, by Arthur Butz, or by Robert Faurisson has precipitated anything approaching the tempest among intellectuals and the uproar in the media that accompanied the appearance of this work by well-known French scholar Roger Garaudy.

Nor did the impact of *Founding Myths* end with the literary controversy that swept France in the first half of 1996. Garaudy's trial and conviction in Paris in 1998 for Holocaust heresy ignited further conflagration across the Islamic Middle East and beyond. As Zionist organizations soon had cause to lament, influential persons and groups in Arab countries, and in non-Arab Muslim nations such as Iran, made, for the first time in the Islamic world, a show of concerted support for the Holocaust revisionist position.

How to account for the extraordinary affair aroused by Garaudy's book? As he himself emphasized throughout *Founding Myths* by his prominent citation of sources in the text, little if anything of the book's scholarship is original — neither the Holocaust revisionism expounded here, nor his summoning of recent Old Testament scholarship against the "chosen people" and "promised land" myths that justify modern Zionism, nor his citation of Zionist leaders and anti-Zionist Jews in evidence against Israeli policies.

Rather, the cause of the uproar lies in the extraordinary syzygy of a man and a movement. The man is of course Roger Garaudy, who has made

Theodore J. O'Keefe is book editor for the Institute for Historical Review, and an associate editor of the IHR's *Journal of Historical Review*. He previously worked at the IHR from 1986 until 1994, serving as chief editor of this *Journal* from 1988 until April 1992. He also addressed the IHR Conferences of 1986, 1987, 1989, 1990 and 1992. Educated at Harvard College, he is the author of numerous articles on historical and political subjects that have appeared in a range of periodicals.

This essay is adapted from the foreword to the forthcoming IHR edition of Garaudy's *Founding Myths*.



Roger Garaudy

a twentieth century odyssey through literature, philosophy, and politics, from Christianity to Communism, through Stalinism back to Christianity, and then to Islam, and at last to the radical revising of World War II history that French attorney Pierre Pécastaing called "the great intellectual adventure of the end of this century."

Roger Garaudy was born in Marseille in 1913. At 14 he became that rarity, a French Protestant, and then graduated from university with a bachelor's degree in philosophy. After service in the French army in 1940, he joined the anti-German and anti-Vichy *Résistance*, for which he was interned in a French camp in Algeria. After the war Garaudy joined the powerful French Communist Party, then at the height of its prestige following the triumph of Soviet arms.

Garaudy was much more than a mere "card-carrying Communist." He was elected a Communist deputy to the National Assembly, later serving as deputy speaker and then as a senator. For a quarter

century after the war, Garaudy was one of the French Communist Party's leading theoreticians, a respected philosopher and authority on Hegel, and an author of dozens of scholarly works, whose views carried weight well beyond party circles.

Although a Stalinist stalwart during the 1940s and 50s, at no time in his career did Garaudy abandon his interest in theology and religion. In the 1960s his growing interest in dialogue with the Catholic Church won him international notice, while his increasing disenchantment with Soviet Communism, signaled by his support for the anarchic student upheaval of 1968 and his condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in the same year, soon led to his expulsion from the Party. He continued to teach philosophy at the university level, and to develop his interest in art and literature from around the world. In 1982 Garaudy converted from Roman Catholicism to Islam, which he had come to see as a more authentic vehicle of the divine call. In the following years he became a respected commentator on Islam in the Muslim world, and a passionate advocate of the Palestinian cause. Despite his break with Communism, he never ceased to proclaim his anti-racist, internationalist, and socialist beliefs.

After two of Garaudy's books on the Palestine question fell victim to unofficial censorship through the familiar means of intimidation and blackout, Garaudy's growing awareness of the role the Holocaust plays in silencing critics of Israel led him to examine the revisionist case. In December 1995 Marxist writer Pierre Guillaume, whose leftist "Old Mole" house had published Robert Faurisson and other French revisionists, brought out Garaudy's *Les mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne* (reviewed in the March-April 1996 *Journal*, pp. 35-36).

Perhaps it should not surprise anyone that the rise of a French school of Holocaust revisionism antedates that of any other nation. The movement in France that struggles to subject to critical historical analysis the claim that millions of Jews were systematically killed on Hitler's order is closer to the French national genius than might be supposed. Despite its reflexive assignment to the right, the debunking of



Paul Rassinier

myths that have been enshrined by capitalist as well as communist powers, that have bolstered the mythologies of more than one nation, and that have been embellished with miraculous details to rival the legends of the saints, draws on a rationalist, critical, spirit that links French revisionism to such ancestors as Voltaire, Renan, and even Anatole France.

The "father" of Holocaust revisionism was Paul Rassinier, a French educator of Marxist and pacifist sensibilities who was arrested in 1943 for his underground *Résistance* activism and interned until the end of the war in the Buchen-

wald and Dora concentration camps. Like Garaudy, he was initially an admired figure in the postwar era, when he was elected to the National Assembly as a deputy of the Socialist Party (SFIO). Rassinier was an honest man, however, who — in his memoirs of wartime camp experiences — failed doubly in his duty to Holocaust "memory": he was not only unable to recall atrocities that had been fabricated after the fact, but also unable to forget the misdeeds and collaborations of certain of his fellow deportees who passed for heroes and martyrs after the war. The outspoken integrity and tenacity of Rassinier on what he had witnessed in the camps, as well as his diligent research into the alleged gas chambers, the six million claim, and wartime Germany's actual Jewish policy, resulted in his being pushed to the periphery of French intellectual society, as well as continual targeting in private lawsuits and state investigations.

Yet by the time of his death in July 1967, Rassinier had attracted a small but tenacious following in France, as well as backing from abroad that included, significantly, support from the eminent American historian, Harry Elmer Barnes, and a number of his colleagues.

In the late 1970s, university professor Robert Faurisson emerged as France's leading revisionist. After years of private research and study, this Sorbonne-educated authority on French literary texts, and specialist of document analysis, first made public his skeptical views about the Holocaust extermination story in articles published in 1978 and 1979 in *Le Monde*. Through his meticulous research, careful scholarship, writing, and tireless publicizing, and



Abbé Pierre

through the physical assaults and wearing court cases he has endured, he became the foremost French and European revisionist scholar. The "Holocaust" revisionist content of *Founding Myths*, and the scandal that its publication unleashed in France, would be inconceivable apart from Faurisson's contribution.

The appearance of a revisionist book on the Holocaust by an ex-Communist celebrity would have been scandal enough for France's ingrown intellectual community, many of whose members are Jewish. The appearance of Garaudy's *Founding Myths* provoked not only their shrill denunciations, it brought legal complaints under France's notorious 1990 Gayssot law, which makes it a crime to "contest" the "crimes against humanity" as defined by the Nuremberg Tribunal of 1945-46. (See "French Courts Punish Holocaust Apostasy," March-April 1998 *Journal*, pp. 14-18.)

It was the involvement on Garaudy's behalf, however, of an octogenarian Capuchin friar whose well-publicized engagement on behalf of the homeless and other unfortunates has made him one of the most popular men in France, that converted the Garaudy affair into a nationwide event rather than just another spat among the literati. Abbé Pierre, as the Frenchman born Henri Grouès became known during his underground work with the *Résistance* in smuggling Jews out of France, has the national charisma and presence that a Mother Theresa might have had in America had she been working in Harlem rather than Calcutta. A longtime friend of Garaudy, who had come to share his sympathy for the Palestinians, the Abbé made headlines in April 1996 by seeming to endorse the book. (See: R. Faurisson, "On the Garaudy/ Abbé Pierre Affair," July-August 1997 *Journal*, pp. 26-28.)

The Garaudy affair was soon enough the Abbé Pierre affair, and the baying pack of intellectuals dogging Garaudy was soon joined by the popular media and by France's most influential religious leaders, including the Archbishop of Paris, the Jewish convert to Catholicism Daniel Lustiger, and the chief rabbi of France, Joseph Sitruk. The controversy was not without its droll aspects: the Abbé Pierre seemed in constant retreat — acknowledging that he hadn't actually read the book, eschewing any allegiance to Holocaust revisionism, calling on Garaudy to correct any mistakes — but he accompanied each concession with a new thrust. He called for a national debate on the Holocaust — and at first got Grand Rabbi Sitruk to agree with him. He pointed out that some Holocaust claims must be wrong, and that there was room for revision. When at last the combined weight of church censure, rabbinical reprimand, the scolding of his left-wing friends, and his expulsion from the International

—Le guide des festivals de l'été

L'ÉVENEMENT DU JEUDI



"Holocaust: The Revisionists' Victory" proclaims the establishment French weekly magazine *L'Événement du jeudi* ("The Thursday Event") on the front cover of its issue of June 27-July 3, 1996. It appeared during the national furor over the revisionist book by French scholar Roger Garaudy on Israel's 'Founding Myths,' and the support he received from the widely respected priest Abbé Pierre (shown on the magazine's front cover).

League against Racism and Anti-Semitism (LICRA) and from the international Emmaus organization, which he had founded, led to Abbé Pierre's temporary flight from France to a monastery in Italy, he could still tell the press: "If the French church intervened to censure me, it did so only in response to the chorus of pressure from the media, inspired by an international Zionist lobby. I am absolutely convinced of that."

There was much truth to the headline that appeared, together with a photo of the Abbé Pierre, on the cover of the weekly *L'Événement du jeudi* (June 27-July 3, 1996): "La victoire des révisionnistes." As the journalist Jean-Francois Kahn had observed two months earlier, in response to Rabbi Sitruk's short-lived call for a debate among historians on the Holocaust, "Could Faurisson and [National Front chief Jean-Marie] Le Pen have hoped for more, even in their wildest dreams?"



Robert Faurisson

Two months later, in a two-part article that appeared in the newspaper *Le Nouveau Quotidien* of Lausanne, Switzerland, establishment historian Jacques Baynac described the paranoia that reigned among French intellectuals during the Garaudy affair, as accusations and denials of a secret devotion to revisionism flew in Paris salons, and Faurisson, though legally muzzled and socially ostracized, was, like a latter-day Scarlet Pimpernel, here, there, and everywhere. (See: R. Faurisson, "An Orthodox Historian Finally Acknowledges ...," July-August 1998 *Journal*, pp. 24-28.)

Many of those who frothed against *Founding Myths* gave voice to their embarrassment — real or pretended — at the French law that makes it a crime to question the Holocaust. They would prefer it to be thought that the 1990 *Loi Gayssot*, named for the French Communist deputy who sponsored it, with the blessing of the Jewish premier Laurent Fabius, makes it easy for the revisionists to maintain the moral high ground. Still, it was the mainstream LICRA and MRAP (Movement against Racism and for Friendship between Peoples) that brought the charges that caused the French state to try Garaudy for violating the Gayssot law. Leading intellectuals, moreover, offered only feeble opposition to the trial in January 1998 of a man who, in his Communist days, had once been one of their own.

Of the trial itself, it may be said that Garaudy was at best a reluctant champion of his own book's theses on the gas chambers, which had been pruned back in a second edition that appeared in 1995. He drew his strength, rather, from his stand on behalf of the Palestinians, and from the extraordinary support and acclamation that began to flow his way from the Arab and other Muslim countries. This did

nothing to deter the Paris court from deciding on a guilty verdict. On February 27, 1998, it fined Garaudy 240,000 francs (\$40,000).

Whereas the appearance of *Founding Myths* had made Holocaust revisionism a sensation in France, the trial of its octogenarian author made Holocaust revisionism a byword throughout the Middle East. In the course of just a few weeks, social, political and intellectual leaders throughout the Arab and Muslim world expressed support for Garaudy and their outrage at his treatment. From the Persian Gulf to the Nile, lawyers, writers and politicians protested publicly. At the trial's outset, for example, Sheikha Zayed ibn Sultan Al-Nahayan, the wife of the president of the United Arab Emirates, donated to Garaudy's defense \$50,000 — the equivalent of the maximum fine for violating the Gayssot Law.

Nowhere did Garaudy's star shine brighter than in Egypt, cultural center of the Arab world. Egyptian Nobel laureate in literature Naguib Mahfouz wondered at a society in which one was punished for denying the Holocaust, but free to deny God. As a guest of the country's Minister of Culture, Garaudy lectured and participated in symposiums associated with the annual Cairo Book Fair. His hero's welcome in the most populous Arab country included backing from an array of social and intellectual leaders. "Every Muslim should support Garaudy's thought and stand with all cultural, religious and diplomatic efforts," declared Egypt's highest religious authority, Grand Mufti Nasr Farid Wasel. "It is a duty to defend him and stand by his side."

In Iran, 600 journalists and 160 members of parliament signed petitions backing Garaudy, and during a visit to the country, he was received by the nation's supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, who congratulated the French scholar.

In the months since the Garaudy trial, Holocaust revisionism has continued its advance in the Islamic world. Impelled by the continuing persecution or repression of revisionists in the West, it has graduated from a novelty among Arabs and Muslims to an intellectual fashion and an ideological weapon. One consequence is that western revisionists are now regularly broadcast to Europe over Radio Iran.

Given this, it is not surprising that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and such American-based Jewish-Zionist support groups as the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Zionist Organization of America have designated such books as Garaudy's *Founding Myths* as the "number one threat to Israel."

Perhaps the best testimony to the service the Garaudy book has done in spreading revisionism to Muslims was given by German-Canadian revisionist publicist Ernst Zündel. During a taxi ride in

snow-bound Ottawa, he relates, he had this exchange with the cabbie:

[the] driver, an Iraqi, within a few sentences of our conversation, said, with a smile from ear to ear: "So, you have studied the Holocaust? Then you must be familiar with the work of Roger Garaudy!"

The success of *Founding Myths* in spreading the Holocaust revisionist thesis in the Muslim world — propelled by Garaudy's great prestige and the injustice done to him — is not without its ironies for revisionists. For all his courage, Garaudy, who has not hesitated to invoke Zündel, David Irving, and Fred Leuchter, was inhibited by fear or odd scruple from mentioning the name of Robert Faurisson, without whose influence Garaudy's treatment of the Holocaust would scarcely have been imaginable. Ironical, too, is the fact that in the tumult over the book, the numerous garbled or misattributed citations in the original, above all in the section on the operations of the Zionist lobby in America, seem to have escaped the notice of critics and defenders alike. In this edition, care has been taken to restore, in conformance with the original sources, the numerous citations that give this book its unique character.


For all that *Founding Myths* reveals of its author's frailty and fallibility, whoever reads it with an open mind and heart must marvel at the breadth of spirit, learning, and intellect that propels



"No, not child pornography videos. They're revisionist periodicals." In this cartoon, from the French weekly *National Hebdo* (June 26-July 2, 1997), "Konk" wryly comments on the legal persecution by French authorities of "thought criminals" who reject the orthodox Holocaust extermination story.

Garaudy onward in unending quest. That the Faustian striving and the humanist ideals of this old Marxist and recent Muslim have come to encompass the struggle for establishing the truth about the Jewish "Holocaust" attest to the power and magnetism of a vital and unstoppable intellectual movement.

OUTRAGEOUS OPINION, TERRIFYING FACT, BRACING REALISM, FROM GARET GARRETT'S



BURDEN of EMPIRE

"There is no comfort in history for those who put their faith in forms; who think there is safeguard in words inscribed on parchment, preserved in a glass case, produced in facsimile and hauled to and fro on a Freedom Train."

"A government that had been supported by the people and so controlled by the people became one that supported the people and so controlled them. Much of it is irreversible."

"We have crossed the boundary that lies between Republic and Empire."

"Garrett's three trenchant brochures are indispensable to anybody who wishes to understand 'the strange death of liberal America' and desires to do something to check these dolorous and fateful trends in our political and economic life." — **Professor Harry Elmer Barnes**, historian.

"His keen perception and his forceful direct language are unsurpassed by any author." — **Professor Ludwig von Mises**, economist.

"This triad is must material for those who would be informed of the past, aware of the present, and concerned about the future." — **State Senator Jack B. Tenney**, California.

"The most radical view of the New Deal was that of libertarian essayist and novelist Garett Garrett ..." — **Professor Murray Rothbard**.

Includes these timeless essays:

**The Revolution Was
Ex America
The Rise of Empire**

BURDEN of EMPIRE by Garett Garrett

Quality Softcover • 184 pages • \$5.49 plus shipping and tax (#0198)
from: IHR • PO Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659 • USA

'Political Correctness' in Germany

The Social Danger of Stifling Free Expression

CLAUS NORDBRUCH

Political Correctness, derived from an essentially well-intentioned "Code of Conduct," has become an instrument of moralistic terror in Germany. The self-appointed "politically correct" think of themselves as the sole possessors of the truth, and refuse anyone else the right to differ. As [German writer] Martin Walser has pointed out, this applies particularly to the best-known German taboos: Germany's National Socialist history, women and foreigners. When one attempts to deal with any of these themes, even in the most open-minded way, one is beaten down unmercifully with the "fascism club," a term coined by political scientist Helmut Knütter. Whenever, by means of this deadly method of argument, someone is successfully labeled a racist, fascist or sexist, he is degraded to the status of a leper, with no further opportunity to present his view.

The unfortunate thing about Political Correctness is that, as a result, disputations or discussions often either do not take place at all, or only in the form of a campaign of defamation or a show trial. This prescribed thought control has led to a stunting of intellectual freedom in the former "land of thinkers." Political Correctness reveals itself as the instrument of intellectual coordination, and, in modern cultural history, sets an extraordinary precedent for censorial manipulation of the process of building public political consensus.¹

Assault on Differentiation

Some telling examples will illustrate this manipulation: For some time now in Germany, presumably motivated by a rejection of discrimination, it is

Claus Nordbruch is the author of two books on freedom of expression in today's Germany: *Sind Gedanken noch frei? Zensur in Deutschland* ("Still Free to Think?: Censorship in Germany"), published in 1998 by Universitas (Munich), and *Der Vefassungsschutz: Organisation, Spitzel, Skandale* (Tübingen: Hohenrain, 1999). Dr. Nordbruch lives in Pretoria, South Africa. This essay is translated from the text that appeared in the prestigious Swiss daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, June 12, 1999, under the title "Die selbsternannten Tugendwächter im Visier: Schaltet Political Correctness das einstige Volk der Denker gleich?" A lengthier version of this essay, with footnotes, appeared in the quarterly journal *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Postfach 1629, 72006 Tübingen, Germany), June 1999, pp. 12-15.



no longer proper to speak of Gypsies [*Zigeuner*]. In German now the politically correct term is "Roma and Sinti." But this term is actually incorrect because these are merely the two main Gypsy branches or tribes. In reality, the generalized term "Roma and Sinti" is itself racist, inasmuch as it ignores, and thereby discriminates against, the smaller Gypsy branches, such as the Lallers, the Manuschi, the Joneschti, the Polatschia, the Sikligars, the Boschi or the Calé.

In the Spring of 1996, officials of the Lutheran missionary organization *Evangelische Missionswerk*, in their journal *Eine Welt* ["One World"], advocated human rights for apes! They based this demand on the fact that humans and chimpanzees are genetically very similar. On this basis the theologian Martin Brückner concluded that there is an "incredible similarity," and contended in all seriousness that the denial of human rights to apes was essentially no different than racism or the denigration of women. Today no idea seems too absurd to be considered as a new and generally valid guide to behavior. The price we pay for this is absurdity and

undermining of a sense of self-worth.

The direct consequence of enforcing politically correct modes of behavior, which can be observed daily in much of the German media, is the creation of a sexless, inexpressive and uniform mode of speech, one driven by political calculation. In this way those who were once referred to as alien workers [*Fremdarbeiter*] became guest workers [*Gastarbeiter*], and then as foreign employees and foreign fellow citizens, and are now regarded as immigrants. In the course of socialist equalization, the apprentice [*Lehrling*] became a trainee [*Auszubildender*], a term that quickly atrophied into the infantile “Azubi.” The cleaning woman [*Putzfrau*] has become a virtual “shooting star,” rising to room cultivator [*Raumpflegerin*] and then to parquet beautician. She no longer cleans, but rather devotes herself to the care of inner architectural beauty.

Fighting Against Thought Control

Today it is especially important to fight against restrictions of free thought in scholarship, research and education. Especially in these fields Political Correctness often impedes serious work by tabooizing from the outset certain research projects and problem areas, thereby putting them off-limits to investigation.

Politically correct or “anti-fascist” publications are by no means the only ones to denounce “political incorrectness.” The self-appointed guardians of morality have succeeded in extending their influence to high-level government agencies and positions. Not surprisingly, the Office for Defense of the Constitution [*Amt für Verfassungsschutz*] succumbs to this jargon. In its questionable view, those who “defend against Political Correctness seek to immunize themselves from criticism of their own extremist viewpoints.”² This denunciatory statement sweepingly categorizes as extremist not only political opponents and critical scholars, but every unprejudiced contemporary who seeks to make use of his right to freedom of information and expression. Imposing such a stigma extinguishes a free exchange of views.

Certainly the “Historian’s Dispute” [*Historikerstreit*] of the mid-1980s showed that for some time scholarship had been divided into political spheres of influence. What Ernst Nolte and other prominent historians demanded was nothing less than the beginning of a revisionist view of history.³ This does not mean anything disreputable or offensive. The critical re-examination of previous research is essential to all scholarship. The word “revision” is derived from the Latin word “*revidere*,” meaning “to look at again.” To examine the facts is the foremost and most natural task of any scholar. Historians as well are thus obliged continually to reevaluate and,



Ernst Nolte

if necessary, correct the writing of history on the basis of new insights, discoveries and research. This is the one and only tool of serious scholarship.

Revisionism in the Physical Sciences

At this point it seems appropriate to comment in a basic way about revisionism, because this is the target *par excellence* of the Politically Correct. One may perhaps still recall one of the many “historical facts” of this century that needed revising. Until rather recently millions of God-fearing pilgrims admired Christ’s “Shroud of Turin” — until laboratory tests established that it dated from the Middle Ages. To my knowledge the Pope did not excommunicate the scientists — revisionists! — who conducted the tests, nor were they accused of dishonest methods.

Almost daily new insights are gained, not only in the political and social sciences, but even more in the physical sciences and in technical fields. Here is a representative example from paleontology: most readers of these lines probably believe that the largest and earliest carnivorous prehistoric reptile was *Tyrannosaurus rex*. In September 1995, however, Argentine paleontologists uncovered in northern Patagonia the petrified remains of a previously unknown kind of dinosaur (*Giganotosaurus carolinii*), which was larger than *Tyrannosaurus rex* and lived 70 million years ago in the Cretaceous period. Yet those who then thought they were in possession

of “the truth,” that *Giganotosaurus* was the largest carnivorous reptile, learned better in May 1996 when, in Morocco, scientists discovered a creature 20 million years older and even larger, *Carcharodontosaurus saharicus*, a discovery that of course entailed inevitable revisionist consequences. What is valid for paleontologists, genetic scientists or nuclear physicists is naturally also valid for social science scholars. When he begins his scholarly work, the historian questions or reexamines the starting premises, the previous findings and the current state of research. Today, however, if he proceeds to conduct research on this basis, he is already suspect in the eyes of the politically correct. But scholarly research cannot be conducted except by investigating existing premises and by not assuming existing conclusions to be correct. Otherwise we would still be thinking that the earth is flat.

Barriers to Thought Instead of Discussion

Defaming revisionists out-of-hand as right-wing extremists has nothing to do either with an objective appraisal of their work nor with the necessary critical discussions within scholarship and research. In my opinion it is, instead, politically motivated. The operating motto is as simple as it is effective: “Make your political opponents contemptible instead of respecting them with counter-arguments, and thereby establish your position in a broad spectrum as the single force to be taken seriously.” What is left laying on the ground, of course, is the often-praised “democratic basic order,” which guarantees a free development of political opinion. Horst Mahler, who was once the defense attorney of the Red Army Faction terrorists, said recently: “In France it is estimated that today in Germany there are more political prisoners than there were in the DDR [Communist East Germany] in the year before it collapsed.”⁴ This is a shocking indicator of freedom of expression as it is practiced in this country.

Political Correctness sets up rigid barriers to thought that block an open discussion aimed at solving problems, and thus impedes further intellectual development.⁵ Freedom of research must not be restricted by any power that prescribes in advance what may be considered true. Otherwise research threatens to become the ideological instrument of an opinion cartel, and thus of a power cartel, and in so doing to lose its standing as a precondition of intellectually robust and creative people. Political Correctness is a threat to a politically free state, because ultimately it will produce a state of like-minded conformity and ideological uniformity. As the writer Reiner Kunze has put it, political correctness is nourished by the merciless ideological refashioning of intellectual life in Germany. Steffen Heitmann, Saxony’s Minister of Justice, regards

this as the symptom of a spiritually sick people. One need not be a psychoanalyst to recognize in this the source of German self-alienation.

Notes

1. Ethnologist Hans Peter Duerr regards Political Correctness as a flight from reality. Its exponents, he writes, create “a dualistic view of the world, an infantile Disney fantasy of good and evil people.” Source: “Ein Lügengespinst,” *Der Spiegel*, No. 28/ 1994, p. 162.
In the book *Die Diktatur der Guten: Political Correctness* (Munich: 1996, p. 9), Klaus J. Groth writes that “Political Correctness means, in fact, incorrectness, and comes close to being a liturgy of inhuman thought and struggle stereotyping, of leftist pressure for conformity, and finally, of censorship.”
2. See the interview with Ernst Nolte, professor emeritus of contemporary history (Free University of Berlin), in the Jan.-Feb. 1994 *Journal*, pp. 15-22, and, in the same issue, the review of his 1993 book *Streitpunkte* (pp. 37-41). See also Nolte’s remarks about Auschwitz in history in the March-April 1999 *Journal*, p. 36.
3. Source cited: *Verfassungsschutzbericht Nordrhein-Westfalen 1995*. This is the 1995 annual report of the “constitutional protection” agency of the German state of North Rhine-Westphalia.
According to the *Verfassungsschutzbericht Baden-Württemberg ’96*, (p. 113), “The goal of ‘revisionism,’ which has become one of the most important areas of agitation for right-wing extremists, is the rehabilitation of National Socialism by making it once again socially acceptable.”
Revisionism, according to the *Verfassungsschutzbericht Brandenburg ’97*, p. 137, is a “detestable expression of right-wing extremism.”
4. Horst Mahler, “Der Geheimagent des Weltgeists,” *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (München), Sept. 30, 1998.
5. See also: Ludwig Römbild, *Politisch nicht korrekt* (Bielefeld: 1998), p. 11.

Truth

“I believe in the truth. To seek and search for it, in and around ourselves, must be our highest goal. In doing so we serve the past, the present and the future. Without truth there is no security and no survival. Do not be afraid when the mob cries out, for nothing is hated and feared more than truth. In the end, every resistance to it will vanish, like night before day.”

— Theodor Fontane, German novelist, poet and critic (1819-1898)

Incredible

Your web site is incredible! You've greatly helped motivate me to learn all I can about historical truth. I've recently returned to school to study social science, with an emphasis on history, political science and economics.

N. K.
[by e-mail]

Fabulous Search Capability

Just a note of praise for the built-in keyword search engine in your web site. It's fabulous. It makes it possible to instantly locate just about anything one might want.

R. P.
Derry, New Hamp.

The Buchanan Challenge

In his new book, *A Republic Not an Empire*, Pat Buchanan argues that Hitler posed no threat to the United States in 1940. What is remarkable about this assertion is that a prominent public figure is making it in 1999. In 1940 this was the view of the great majority of Americans, as well as of such knowledgeable individuals as Charles Lindbergh, the pioneer aviator, and Joseph Kennedy, US ambassador to Britain (and father of the President). During the 1940 re-election campaign, President Roosevelt pledged, "again and again and again," that "your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." In November 1941, shortly before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and America's direct involvement in the war, a Gallup poll showed that a staggering 85 percent of the American people still wanted to stay out of the conflict then raging in Europe.

Today, of course, almost no one is willing to say that our war against Nazi Germany was a mistake, let alone someone who is

seeking to be elected President.

An important reason for this complete about-face in public sentiment is the impact of the Nuremberg Tribunal of 1945-46, which, through its dramatic revelations, seemingly proved the wartime Allied propaganda portrayal of the Hitler regime as both uniquely evil and a threat to world peace.

Also important in shaping public opinion in this regard is the relentless decades-long "Holocaust" campaign. Of the litany of Nazi horrors, none is more important than "the Holocaust" in stifling doubts about the righteousness of America's war against Third Reich Germany, and of the farsightedness of Roosevelt's secretive and illegal efforts to push a reluctant United States into the war. The "Holocaust" campaign also greatly intimidates free debate about Israel, and its well-documented record of expulsion and subjugation of the native Palestinians, and more generally, of United States support for the Zionist state.

"The Holocaust" provides essential justification for the US role in World War II, and for the postwar record of Zionism. Subtact "the Holocaust" from our view of 20th century history, and much of the moral legitimacy of the Allied cause in World War II, and of Israel in the decades since, evaporates.

Because so much depends on the "official" view of World War II history, and especially "the Holocaust," it is no surprise that challenging it is a crime in a host of countries, and that those who do are so ruthlessly denigrated, persecuted and even legally penalized.

If there is one thing that all sides in the still-raging debate on

20th century history agree on, it is that the stakes are indeed high — nothing less than the legitimacy of the entire postwar social-political order. The Establishment, and its court journalists and historians, attack Pat Buchanan so intensely because they regard him, correctly, as a threat to their interests.

M.J.
Great Neck, New York

Dangerous Perpetrators

I very much like your site. I'm with you, and I'm sure we'll see more sites like yours in the future. The Holocaust is a fraud, a cynical hoax that must be exposed. Those who perpetrate it are very dangerous, and we cannot permit them to continue with their lies. Count on me.

H.L.
Ponce, Puerto Rico
[by e-mail]

Causing Change

We are causing change worldwide. Thanks for being there.

J.G.
August, Ga.

Remembering World War II Outbreak

September 3, 1999, marks the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War, one of the greatest tragedies in history. One of the war's most important lasting effects has been the continuing psychological and political debilitation of European man.

The origins of this war were complex, and involved a number of nations. The Versailles Treaty (1919), which the victors dictated to a defeated and starving Germany, not only split the country in two but also subjected large parts of Germany (notably the "Polish Corridor") to the control of the newly reconstituted Polish state. Millions of Germans lived in these

areas, and were so badly oppressed that even as early as 1926 hundreds of thousands of them had left to escape ethnic oppression. In addition, the large and almost purely German city of Danzig was detached from the Reich and established as a "Free City."

In spite of these circumstances, in 1939 Germany proposed a compromise with Poland that would have involved the return of Danzig, a plebiscite in the "Polish Corridor" area, and a rail and motorway line connecting the detached East Prussia province with the main part of Germany. The Poles haughtily rejected this peace proposal because they were confident that their large armed forces could defeat Germany (as they had defeated Communist Russia in 1920), and because they relied on assurances of support given by Britain in March 1939.

On September 1, 1939, German forces attacked Poland, invading formerly German lands that had been taken over by the Polish state in the aftermath of the First World War. Three days later, Britain and France declared war against Germany, thereby converting the limited conflict between Poland and Germany into a world war. When, two weeks later, Soviet forces similarly invaded Poland, neither Britain nor France issued a declaration of war against the USSR. Unlike Germany, the Soviet Union was not a significant economic competitor with Britain for export markets, especially for manufactured goods.

So confident were the Poles that they would defeat Germany that some of them (including Polish military personnel) brutally murdered tens of thousands of ethnic Germans. No doubt the perpetrators were confident that they would never be punished for these crimes. These well-documented atrocities, often referred to as the "Bromberg Bloody Sunday," doubtless had an influence on the further conduct and prolon-

gation of the war.

Germany's attack against Poland, an action to protect the ethnic German minority living in the Polish state, was only a pretext for the Anglo-French declaration of war against Germany. This was demonstrated by the fact that in 1945 Britain and France cynically abandoned the Poles, along with the other nations of eastern Europe, to Communist tyranny.

Charles E. Weber
Tulsa, Okla.

John Demjanjuk: Victim of Injustice

In 1993 the Israel Supreme Court ruled that John Demjanjuk was, after all, not the notorious guard of Treblinka known as "Ivan the Terrible." And last year a US federal judge restored his US citizenship.

Now the Justice Department's "Office of Special Investigations" has revived the 22-year-old case by bringing a new legal complaint against the Ukrainian-born Cleveland retiree. Commenting on the matter, an official of the Jewish-Zionist "Anti-Defamation League" recently called the renewed OSI campaign a "matter of justice and the integrity of American citizenship."

What's really behind this campaign? The worldwide advance of Holocaust revisionism is a dire threat to Jewish-Zionist power and influence. Jewish groups accordingly have used the trial of Demjanjuk and other alleged "Nazi war criminals" to counter this danger to their interests.

Israel's Attorney General, Yitzhak Zamir, publicly admitted as much when he stated: "At a time when there are those who even deny that the Holocaust ever took place, it is important to remind the world of what a fascist regime is capable of ... and in this respect the Demjanjuk trial will fulfill an important function." (*Cleveland Jewish News*, March 21, 1986, p. 16)

Similarly, in April 1993, as the case against Demjanjuk was falling apart, an Israeli prosecutor close to the case acknowledged a

political motive for continuing the campaign. "So the important thing now," he said, "is at least to prove that Demjanjuk was part of the Nazi extermination machine ... otherwise ... we will be making a great contribution to the new worldwide movement of those who deny the Holocaust took place." (Quoted in: Y. Sheftel, *Defending Ivan the Terrible*, 1996, p. 402.)

When Jewish goals are laid out frankly, they understandably don't receive much support from non-Jews. That's why they are nearly always presented in terms of lofty-sounding, universal principles. As California psychology professor Kevin MacDonald has demonstrated, Jews often deceitfully frame their purely parochial interests and goals in universalist terms. (*Separation and its Discontents*, esp. p. 193.)

Accordingly, Jewish groups present their self-serving campaign against Demjanjuk and other "war criminals" as a cause for "justice." But if the ADL and similar Jewish groups were genuinely concerned about this universal principle, they would support efforts to bring Jewish criminals to justice. American-Jewish journalist John Sack has documented the torture and murder of large numbers of Germans by Jewish officials of the postwar Polish regime. Many of these criminals later moved to the United States. (J. Sack, *An Eye for an Eye*, 1993, p. 150.) Why the double-standard?

In reality, further legal action against John Demjanjuk will only prolong the undeserved sufferings of an elderly man and his family, and could even exacerbate tensions between Jews and non-Jews.

Paul Grubach
Lyndhurst, Ohio

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space. Write: Editor, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA, or e-mail us at editor@ihr.org

At Last ...

A full-scale debate on the Holocaust!



*A terrific
introduction to
the hottest, most
emotion-laden
controversy of our
time!*

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire: The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

You'll be amazed as Occidental College professor Michael Shermer squares off against *Journal* editor Mark Weber in this unforgettable clash of wits on the most politicized chapter of 20th century history.

Shermer, just back from an inspection of the sites of the wartime concentration camps of Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen and Dachau, cites a "convergence of evidence" in his defense of the Holocaust story.

Weber, Director of the Institute for Historical Review, delivers a powerful summary of the revisionist critique of the Holocaust story, and gives a devastating response to Shermer's arguments.

Shermer, editor-publisher of *Skeptic* magazine, makes one startling concession after another. He acknowledges that numerous Holocaust claims — once "proven" by eyewitnesses and courts — are obviously not true. Shermer concedes, for example, that an execution "gas chamber" at Majdanek — shown to thousands of trusting tourists yearly — is a fraud. (At Nuremberg the Allies "proved" that the Germans murdered *one and half million* people at this one camp.)

This two hour clash — at a special IHR meeting on July 22, 1995 — dramatically gives the lie to the often-repeated claim that the Holocaust story is "undebatable."

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire: The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

Quality VHS color video • 2 hours

\$19.95, plus \$2.00 shipping

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

WHO REALLY KILLED THE ROMANOVS... AND WHY?

**Today, 75 Years After the Brutal Murders,
A Long-Suppressed Classic Gives the Shocking Answers**

WHEN THE NEWS OF THE COLD-BLOODED MASSACRE of Tsar Nicholas II, his wife Alexandra, and their five children reached the outside world, decent people were horrified. But the true, complete story of the murders was suppressed from the outset—not only by the Red regime, but by *powerful forces operating at the nerve centers of the Western nations*. Nevertheless, one intrepid journalist, Robert Wilton, longtime Russia correspondent of the *London Times*, dared to brave the blackout. An on-the-scene participant in the White Russian investigation of the crime, Wilton brought the first documentary evidence of the *real killers, and their actual motives*, to the West.

A SKELETON KEY TO THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOVIET SLAUGHTERHOUSE


Wilton's book, *The Last Days of the Romanovs*, based on the evidence gathered by Russian investigative magistrate Nikolai Sokolov, was published in France, England, and America at the beginning of the 1920's—but it soon vanished from the bookstores and almost all library shelves, and was ignored in later "approved" histories. The most explosive secret of Wilton's book—the *role that racial revenge played in the slaughter of the Romanovs*—had to be concealed. And it continued to be concealed for decades—as the same motive claimed the lives of millions of Christian Russians, Ukrainians, Balts, and other helpless victims of the Red cabal.

AVAILABLE AT LAST FROM IHR!

Now, an authoritative, updated edition of *The Last Days of the Romanovs*, available from the Institute for Historical Review, puts in your hands the hidden facts behind the Soviet holocaust!

The new edition includes Wilton's original text—plus rare and revealing photographs—the author's lists of Russia's actual rulers among the early Bolsheviks—and IHR editor and historian Mark Weber's new introduction bringing *The Last Days of the Romanovs* up to date with important new knowledge that confirms and corroborates Wilton's findings.

Today, as the fate of Russia and its former empire hangs in the balance, as the Russian people strive to assign responsibility for the greatest crimes the world has ever seen, there is no more relevant book, no more contemporary book, no better book on the actual authors of the Red terror than *The Last Days of the Romanovs*!



THE LAST DAYS OF THE ROMANOVs by Robert Wilton
Quality Softcover • 210 pages • Photos • Index • \$8.95 postpaid
Institute for Historical Review • P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659