

Fred Leuchter

The Second Leuchter Report

AAARGH

Copyright Samisdat Publishers Ltd. 1988. Please note: Commercial use and/or exploitation is expressly prohibited by copyright.

To contact the Zundelsite:

www.zundelsite.org

irimland@zundelsite.org

3152 Parkway #13, PMB109

Pigeon Forge TN 37863

USA

This text has been displayed on the Net as a tool for educational purposes, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Récits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (Aaargh).

The E-mail of the Secretariat is: aaarghinternational@hotmail.com. Postal mail can be sent to PO Box 81475, Chicago IL 60681-0475, USA.

We see the act of displaying a written document on the Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical questions apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in those places; they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by Article 19 of the Human Rights Charter: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." (The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.)

Table of Contents

Foreword by Dr Robert Faurisson	4
The Second Leuchter Report	17
Introduction.....	17
Purpose	17
Background.....	18
Scope	18
Synopsis and Findings.....	18
Methodology.....	19
The Leuchter Report.....	19
Dachau	20
Mauthausen.....	21
Forensic Considerations at Mauthausen.....	22
Specialized Hardware: Non-existence.....	24
Conclusion	24
Bibliography	25

FOREWORD

by Dr. Robert Faurisson

Fred A. Leuchter is a 46-year-old engineer who lives in Boston. He is a specialist in planning and building execution facilities for American penitentiaries. One of his particular tasks was the modernization of the execution gas chamber in the penitentiary at Jefferson City, Missouri.

Ernst Zündel is a 50-year-old German who lives in Toronto, where he had a brilliant career as a graphic artist and advertising man, until he was boycotted because of his revisionist opinions. Since then, he has spent almost all his time struggling against lies about the "Holocaust". I have helped him in that struggle, especially during the two trials which a Canadian Jewish organization forced him to undergo in 1985 and 1988. The first trial lasted seven weeks and ended with him being sentenced to 15 months in prison for "publication of false news". That verdict was thrown out on appeal because of serious errors made by District Court Judge Hugh Locke. The second trial lasted four months. This time Ernst Zündel was sentenced to nine months in prison by District Court Judge Ron Thomas. This second verdict may also be successfully appealed on the same grounds.

In 1988, Ernst Zündel asked Fred Leuchter to visit Poland to examine "the alleged execution gas chambers" in the three concentration camps at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek. The conclusion of that first Leuchter Report was quite clear: no such gas chambers ever existed in those three camps.

In 1989, he asked Leuchter to visit West Germany and Austria to examine the alleged "gas chambers" at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle. The conclusion of the second report, as you will read below, is just as clear: there never were any homicidal gas chambers in those three places.

People have called revisionism "the great intellectual adventure of the late twentieth century." That adventure really began shortly after the Second World War with the publication of the works of Maurice Bardèche and Paul Rassinier. It continued in 1975 with the masterful work, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, by Dr. Arthur Butz of the United States, and in 1979 with the creation of the Institute for Historical Review in Los Angeles. During the 1980s, thanks in particular to the activities of Ernst Zündel, revisionism worldwide has developed so much that future historians will probably talk about revisionism before and after Zündel. In a way, those politically motivated trials - which are a disgrace to Canada - will probably change everything. Zündel promised in 1985 that his trial, even if he were to lose, would put the Nuremberg Trial on trial and that the slanderers of Germany would meet their "Stalingrad" there. He was right.

Before Zündel

Before Ernst Zündel, Germany's accusers never even thought about proving the existence of the "gas chambers". They treated their existence as "proven".

According to exterminationist Serge Klarsfeld:

"It is clear that during the years after 1945 the technical aspects of the gas chambers were a subject that was neglected since no one imagined that someday we would have to prove their existence." (*Le Monde juif*, January-March, 1987, p. 1)

At the time of the Nuremberg trials, the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, and the Frankfurt trial, as well as at the time of many other infamous trials, including the Klaus Barbie trial in 1987, no one tried to prove the horrible accusation that has so long weighed upon the vanquished German nation. Those judicial travesties were similar to witchcraft trials in which the accused and their defence lawyers, did not question the existence of the Devil and his supernatural doings. In these modern witchcraft trials, it has been taboo to question the existence of "gas chambers" and their supernatural accomplishments, which defy all the laws of physics and chemistry. Even Klaus Barbie's French defence attorney, Jacques Verges, refrained from asking for even the slightest proof of the existence of the "gas chambers" to which Klaus Barbie allegedly sent the children of the French town of Izieu.

In all the trials of so-called "war crimes" or "crimes against humanity", all the supposedly civilized nations have for nearly a half-century ignored the elementary rules of criminal law.

To understand what I mean, let's take the example of some crime committed in France. Let's suppose that in this case there is a weapon, a body, and a killer (or assumed killer). Allowing for exceptions, the French court would normally demand four routine reports:

1. A technical study of the weapon used to commit the crime;
2. An autopsy report of the victim to show how and by what means death occurred;
3. A report on the re-enactment or simulation of the crime in the presence of the accused at the scene of the crime;
4. A report on a visit by the judges, the prosecutor, the defendant and the defence lawyers, to the scene of the crime.

Even if the defendant had confessed, the judges would never decide that no further investigations need be carried out; a confession, to have any great judicial value, must be verified and confirmed.

However, in nearly half a century no one has ever met those elementary standards in a case which involves not just an ordinary crime perpetrated by a single person with an ordinary weapon (whether "blunt instrument" or firearm), but instead is a crime that supposedly was unprecedented, that had been committed against millions of people,

using an extraordinary weapon that no judge had ever seen before in his entire life: a "super gas chamber" for thousands of victims, a virtual mass-production chemical slaughterhouse!

The first trials of Germans accused of having used "gas chambers" or "gas vans" to kill people began in 1943 in the Soviet Union. They continue to this day in Israel, West Germany and France and will soon take place in Australia, Canada and Britain. Today, after 46 years of such trials, we still do not have:

1. Any expert report concluding that a given place or a given van was used for homicidal gassing;
2. Any autopsy report concluding that the victim had been killed by the poison gas hydrogen cyanide, which formed the base of the insecticide, Zyklon B;
3. Any report on the re-enactment of a gassing operation, using the thousands of victims claimed and the steps taken, and taking into consideration the dangerous chemicals involved;
4. Any account of an on-site visit to examine a place or a van suspected of having been used for homicidal gassings, using the forensic investigative techniques used in modern criminology.

In the course of the trial concerning the Struthof-Natzweiler camp, in Alsace, an expert study was in fact made of the "gas chamber" and of the "gassed" bodies (kept at the civilian hospital in Strasbourg), but in each case, Professor René Fabre, a toxicologist, concluded that none had been gassed. As regards Dachau, there was in fact a kind of expert report carried out by Captain Fribourg, of the French army, but when the report concluded that it would be necessary to examine the room provisionally called the "gas chamber", no such examination was carried out.

Some on-site visits by the courts did in fact take place during some trials, notably the Frankfurt trial (1963-65). The scandal is that some parts of the Auschwitz camp were viewed then by the visiting official party, but not the supposed "gas chambers", in spite of the fact that they were there, either in their original condition (as claimed to this day by Polish Communist officials and publications) or in ruins from which much could be determined (see Wilhelm Stäglich, *The Auschwitz Myth*, Institute for Historical Review, 1986).

A re-enactment, which is by definition a simulation, would have been easy to carry out at Birkenau. It would have immediately shown the foolishness of the gassing accusations. Filmmakers sometimes shoot Hollywood-type docu-dramas at Birkenau, claiming to retrace the arrival of the Jewish convoys on the ramp at Birkenau, near the crematory buildings that were supposed to contain (a) a changing room where the victims would take off their clothes; (b) a homicidal gas chamber; (c) a room containing five crematory ovens with three retorts each. We are told that each group of victims numbered some 2,000 people and there were several such groups burned each day in each crematory. We can see from the size of the buildings and the arrangement of the surrounding area that any re-enactment would immediately result in fantastic tie-ups and overcrowding. The clogging up of the crematories would be

spectacular. Decomposing, rotting bodies would pile up all over the area! Assuming that it took the average funeral industry time of one and a half hours to incinerate one body, it follows that after one and a half hours had passed we would find ourselves with the original 2,000 bodies minus the 15 that had been burned, still leaving 1,985 bodies with no place to put them before burning! The "machinery of death" would break down with the first gassing. It would take eight days and eight nights to incinerate 2,000 bodies, assuming continuous operation of the crematoriums. According to cremation experts and crematory operating manuals, however, no crematorium can operate continuously, day and night, like that.

Let's talk about the witnesses who testified at these modern witch trials. In all of these inquisitions, persons have come forward to offer themselves as living witnesses of the "Holocaust" and of the "gas chambers". How did they, according to their own stories, escape the gas chambers? Their answer was very simple: every one of them had benefited from a miracle. As each survivor passed through one so-called "death camp" after another, he considered his life a sum of miracles. The members of the "Sonderkommandos" beat all the records. According to their stories, the Germans usually also gassed them every three months, which means that two years spent at Auschwitz and Birkenau would mean a total of seven or eight consecutive miracles for those champions. Only rarely at such trials have the lawyers or judges dared to betray their surprise at so many miracles and so many people saved by miracles. The Olympic champion of gas chamber survivors, Filip Müller, the immortal author of *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, had some problems with this question at the Frankfurt trial, but he found the perfect answer: he disdainfully explained that the story about the regular liquidation of the "Sonderkommando" was merely a legend. It is disturbing that the general public, historians, and judges let themselves be bamboozled to such an extent by these supposed witnesses to the "Holocaust". For Simone Veil, former French Minister and head of the European Parliament, to offer herself as a living witness to, and as living proof of, the extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz, is the height of impertinence. If she is the living proof of anything, it is that the Germans did not exterminate the Jews at Auschwitz. Veil, her mother and one of her sisters were always together: at Drancy (a French transit camp), at Auschwitz, at Bobrek (a sub-camp of Auschwitz), and at Bergen-Belsen. It was in that last camp that they contracted typhus, usually considered a deadly disease at that time in history. Veil's mother died there. Like her two daughters, she too had survived Auschwitz. Another daughter survived Ravensbrück.

Personally, I do not consider anyone a "witness" unless he or she successfully undergoes the test of being cross-examined, by competent and impartial interrogation, about the physical aspects of the facts which he or she reports.

Please read what I say here carefully: in no trial has a supposed witness of the "gassings" been cross-examined about the physical aspects of the gassing he said he had participated in or witnessed. Even in the trial of Tesch and Weinbacher, sentenced to death and executed from having made or sold Zyklon B, prosecution witness Charles Sigismund Bendel, on whose testimony the two were largely condemned, did not undergo that kind of cross-examination (see William Lindsey, Zyklon B, "Auschwitz and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch", *The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1983, p. 10-23). As a matter of principle and as a defence tactic, lawyers for the

accused have avoided the taboo of the "gas chambers" by limiting themselves to saying that while gas chambers existed, their clients did not gas anyone.

After Zündel

With the arrival of Ernst Zündel, the veil of such trickery was ripped asunder. This man had the courage not to let himself be intimidated. He showed that the emperor indeed had no clothes. He confounded the rascals with his direct, no nonsense approach. As a consequence, the prosecution's experts and witnesses suffered a severe defeat at his trial. And Ernst Zündel, moving to the counter-offensive, taught a superb lesson to historians and judges. He showed them what they ought to have done all along. Historians and judges ought to have, in a sense, begun with the beginning, which as we all know, is sometimes very difficult to do. Trying first and foremost to establish what physically had taken place, Ernst Zündel, at his own expense, sent to Poland a U.S. expert on execution gas chambers, along with his team. This expert, Fred Leuchter, took samples from the ground, the walls, and the floors of the alleged gas chambers and then had them analysed by an American laboratory.

I described elsewhere how the experts and witnesses for the prosecution were routed during the 1985 and 1988 Toronto trials (see Robert Faurisson, "The Zündel Trials (1985 and 1988)", *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1988-1989, pp. 417-431). I am not going to return to that subject. I would only like to make it clear that this judgment is not simply my subjective judgment. The proof that I am telling the truth is that at the 1988 trial, exterminationism's number one expert, Raul Hilberg, the "Pope" of the Holocaust Legend, refused to come back to testify since he still had painful memories of his defeat in 1985 at the hands of Zündel's defence attorney, Douglas Christie. He said as much in a letter to Prosecutor John Pearson, a letter that was supposed to have remained confidential but which the defence heard about and caused to be made public. Dr. Rudolf Vrba, the other star witness of the 1985 trial, did not come back either for the 1988 trial. Prosecutor Pearson, asked by Judge Ron Thomas whether some "survivors" would come, had to respond pitifully (I was present) that they would not come this time.

Because of my pity for them, I will not refer here (as I have already done in the above-mentioned article) to the statements made in 1988 by Red Cross representative Charles Biedermann, an apparently honest and intelligent man who, however, frequently gave evasive and misleading answers, and by Professor Christopher Browning, who gave a distressing display of what an American university professor can be: confused, ignorant, of unlimited naiveté, a lover of money and a man without scruples. In him, we had a university professor who accepted \$150 an hour from the Canadian taxpayer to come to Toronto to crush and help throw into prison just one man - Ernst Zündel - for publishing in Canada a 14 year old essay which had been distributed freely in Great Britain and in Browning's own country.

To me, one of the principal results of the first Leuchter Report was just that it made one simple fact strikingly clear: that no forensic expert study of the "weapon" used to carry out the "Holocaust" crime had previously been done. Since his report was made public, in April of 1988, Leuchter has not found a single person, including those who have shown their anger about his findings, who could refute his report with any other report that had previously been drawn up (I am not talking here, of course, about the

expert reports ordered by Instructing Magistrate Jan Sehn of Poland, reports that had nothing to do with the subject). As regards those who would criticise some parts of the Leuchter Report, I invite them to make their own investigation and get their own laboratory reports.

There still remains one solution outlined by Fred Leuchter himself in his paper given in Los Angeles in February 1989 during the Ninth International Convention of the Institute for Historical Review: the establishment of an international committee of experts on the problem of the gas chambers. As early as 1982, French historian Henri Amouroux, with whom I had discussed my research, confided to me that he hoped for such a solution. He told me in so many words that what he wanted was an "international" commission, definitely not a "national" commission, since the French seem incapable of any open-mindedness on the question of the gas chambers.

The Polish authorities, unless they develop a sudden appetite for glasnost, will oppose with all their strength any inquiry of that kind, just as they oppose all normal access to the archives of the State Museum of Auschwitz, especially to the death registers (Totenbücher), left behind by the Germans that would give us an idea of the real number of those who died at Auschwitz and the cause of their deaths. In 1987, Tadeusz Iwaszko, the director of the Archives in the Auschwitz Museum, told French journalist Michel Folco (in the presence of Pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac, one of Serge Klarsfeld's friends) that "If we were to carry out excavations that did not uncover any proof of the existence of the gas chambers, the Jews would accuse us other Poles of having suppressed the evidence." (Note: On August 8, 1989, Ernst Zündel wrote to Michael Gorbachov, informing him that he had learned of the capture of the Auschwitz death registers by the Soviet Union from the trial testimony of Red Cross delegate Charles Biedermann. He requested access to the registers and suggested that it would be a gesture of goodwill if the registers were released. In a perhaps happy coincidence, the Soviet Union released the registers one and a half months later.)

It is likely that the first Leuchter Report will for a long time remain the first and last word about the gas chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek. As a pioneering effort, it has opened a particularly fertile field of research for others to follow and expand upon.

The Second Leuchter Report

The Second Leuchter Report is also a pioneering work, this time on the question of the alleged gas chambers at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim.

I did not accompany Leuchter and his team to Auschwitz, Birkenau, and Majdanek, but I had thought since 1977 that the American gas chambers which used cyanide gas had to be studied to know the absurdity of the alleged German gas chambers which allegedly used Zyklon B, an insecticide which base is hydrogen cyanide. I hoped, without really believing it, that some day an expert on the American gas chambers would visit Auschwitz and carry out the kind of physical and chemical study that ought to have been carried out by any honest judicial or historical inquiry.

In 1979, at the time of the first international convention of the Institute for Historical

Review, I myself mentioned that idea to several people, especially to Ernst Zündel. In the years that followed, I abandoned all hope. I must say that even among some revisionists I did not find very much interest in my idea. Perhaps it appeared too bold or too unrealistic, but Ernst Zündel abandoned neither the idea, nor the hope of succeeding. In the preface to the first Leuchter Report, I told how, thanks to Ernst Zündel and to Canadian attorney Barbara Kulaszka, I was able to meet Fred Leuchter in Boston, and how the expedition to Poland was organized.

For the expedition into West Germany and Austria, I was part of the Leuchter team. In the report that you are about to read, Fred Leuchter gives us all the important information about the members of that team and about the nature and result of his mission.

Dachau

From 1945 to 1960, Allied propaganda and the Allied courts told us that homicidal gas chambers had been used at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim. Apparently, there was no lack of evidence to that fact. They especially emphasized the Dachau "gas chamber" and its victims. American propaganda was so overwhelming that, if there is any country in the world today where the "gassings" at Dachau are considered to be as well proven as the existence of the pyramids in Egypt, it's in the U.S.A.

One of the decisive days at the Nuremberg show trial was the one on which the prosecution exhibited a film about the German concentration camps. The ultimate horror came with a view of the "gas chamber" at Dachau. The narrator explained the functioning of the machinery which supposedly gassed "probably a hundred men at one time". We cannot overemphasize how much that segment - 6,000 feet selected from the 80,000 feet that had been shot - caught and influenced the imagination of people, including most of the German defendants. It is likely that the two events which most helped to stir up public opinion against the vanquished Germans were, first, the showing of that film, and second, the sort of public confession made before the tribunal by Rudolf Höss, "the Commandant of Auschwitz". Today we know that his confession was "dictated". The substance of it was made up by the sick imagination of a British Jew who was one of the men who tortured Höss after his capture (see Robert Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf Höss", *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter, 1986-1987, pp. 389-403).

But the story of the Dachau "gassings" was also made up out of thin air. We had to wait until 1960 for the liars to admit it. On August 19, 1960, in *Die Zeit*, the notorious Martin Broszat admitted that there had never been any homicidal gassings at Dachau. Two years earlier that same historian, to his everlasting shame, had published the "confession" of Rudolf Höss, supposedly written in prison after Höss was turned over by the British to the Polish Communists. In so doing, he had presented it as genuine and trustworthy, yet these "confessions" were essentially the same confessions obtained by the British, and were nothing more than a re-organized and expanded version of the British inventions, with a bit of a Polish flavour added! (In 1972, Martin Broszat became the director of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich, a semi-official propaganda institute of the West German state).

Today, every visitor to the "gas chamber" at Dachau can read on a movable panel the following statement in five languages:

GAS CHAMBER - disguised as a 'shower room' - never used as a gas chamber.

Since that panel is movable, the film makers who sensationalize evil, as well as other professional liars, can roll it out of view and film or photograph the room from all angles while persisting in saying that it was a gas chamber that was actually used to gas prisoners.

I am amazed at the cynicism of the officials of the Dachau Museum and the naiveté of the museum's visitors. The words on the panel really don't mean anything. In 1980, in my *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire* (1980, p. 197-222), I think I illustrated this point. I recounted how I completely embarrassed Barbara Distel, the Director of the Museum, and the late Dr. Guerisse, then President of the International Dachau Committee, headquartered in Brussels, by asking them why they called this room a "gas chamber". When people asked those two how it happened that the Germans did not find the time to finish that little gas chamber that they began in 1942, they said that the prisoners used to construct it either sabotaged it or refused to work on it. But how could those prisoners, who never in their lives could have seen something that did not exist anywhere in the world (a gas chamber for 100 people at a time), how could they know from the time they started work, that once the work was completed, they would have constructed a homicidal gas chamber? Do we have here yet another miracle, one of interpersonal divination and mental telepathy? Did successive work details of the prisoners pass on the word about this for three years? Did the Germans give them an ultra-secret mission without being concerned about finishing this murder instrument, if the killing of inmates was a German policy for the "Final Solution"? Furthermore, how did Barbara Distel and Dr. Guerisse know that the room was an uncompleted gas chamber? Can they explain to us what needs to be added to the "uncompleted" little gas chamber in order to complete it? Where did they get their technical information? Do they have building plans for "gas chambers" in their archives? Have they already seen some "completed" gas chambers? Where and when?

At the time of our visit to Dachau on April 9, 1989, Fred Leuchter, Mark Weber and I were videotaped by cameraman Eugen Ernst, first in the gas chamber, and then, after leaving it, on a sort of parade ground outside. It was on that parade ground that we decided to record our comments about the visit. The tourists who had just visited the room saw us and some stopped and listened. Fred Leuchter was able to make his report in peace, except for one not too serious incident provoked by one tourist who aggressively asked me if we doubted the reality of the "gas chamber". I evaded the question and he went away. When it was time for Mark Weber and myself to comment on camera about our visit, the tourists began to gather in very great numbers. Some of them betrayed a little nervousness. We could have interrupted our report and continued it somewhere else in the camp, but I decided to remain where we were and try to exploit the situation. After all, we had there in front of us the best possible audience: all of them had just "seen a gas chamber" and they later would probably tell their friends: "No one can deny the existence of the gas chambers. I saw one myself at Dachau." I therefore engaged in an improvised debate with the visitors.

I made it a point to say that they had not visited a gas chamber at all, but merely a room to which Mrs. Distel, director of the Museum, had given that designation. In so doing, she made a serious allegation for which she offered no proof (the few photos and documents hung in a room next to the alleged gas chamber proved nothing at all). But who dared to ask her for any proof? Apparently no one. I warned those tourists not to be tempted to go and tell their family circle that they had seen a gas chamber at Dachau. In reality, they had seen nothing of the kind. In the midst of my presentation I let them know that as far as we revisionists are concerned, there had been no homicidal gas chambers anywhere, including Auschwitz, nor had there been any German policy to exterminate the Jews.

The whole thing began to look like a sort of "happening". Some visitors reacted angrily, others agreed with us. All of them appeared either indignant or interested. One young German thought that I deserved to be thrown into prison for such statements. The most hostile ones escaped in the usual way: "Gas chambers or not, it doesn't make any difference". This is an argument which I, as a Frenchman, particularly enjoyed, since in France Jean-Marie Le Pen had been severely condemned by the courts, in response to complaints by Jewish groups, for having said exactly the same thing.

The magical "gas chamber" is the central pillar of the "Holocaust" religion. It is not the revisionists but rather the adherents of this religion who make such a fuss about the gas chambers. Consequently, we must ask them for some explanation for their attachment to the gas chamber. Of course, they must cling to this, for without a specific means of destruction, it becomes impossible to prove the existence of a systematic and specific destruction of the Jews. Without the gas chamber, there is no genocide. And, without genocide, the history of the Jewish community resembles the suffering of all others in the community of mankind endured in the Second World War.

Eugen Ernst was able to tape a good part of this happening that allowed me to give my first public presentation in Germany about the taboo of the "gas chambers" and the "genocide" claim, right across from the fake gas chamber of Dachau, one of the most important places used by the proponents of the Big Holocaust Lie.

Mauthausen

The minuscule gas chamber of Mauthausen has never been defended by very many of the Holocaust faithful. It is indefensible. In nearly a half century only two people have really tried to make us believe in its reality: Hans Marsalek of Austria and Pierre-Serge Choumoff of France. In their various publications they wisely refrain from showing a real photo of the interior of the room. The reason is simple: the room looks like nothing more than a simple shower room and one can see nothing that would lead him to think that it was a homicidal gas chamber with all the machinery which, if it were, would be indispensable and thus would still have to be there!

Marsalek and Choumoff usually don't show anything at all of it; very rarely they will show an exterior photo of one of its two doors (two doors to a gas chamber, a fact that would definitely double the problems of keeping the chamber air-tight), or sometimes they allow the reader to vaguely see a small part of the interior.

At the time of my first visit to Mathausen in 1978, I asked two officials of the museum, particularly the director, a former Spanish inmate, why amongst all the postcards of the camp that were on sale to tourists there was not a single one showing the so-called gas chamber. The answer was: "That would be too cruel." That is a rather surprising answer when you remember that all those concentration camp museums, including the one at Mathausen, are reminiscent of the "chambers of horrors" that can be seen at country fairs and exhibitions, and when you realize that a sort of "sex-shop anti-Nazism" is one of the most flourishing commodities in "Shoah Business".

During that same visit, I also wanted to know why they did not display, either in the "gas chamber" itself or in the museum, any document or any expert report proving that what looked like a shower room was in fact a homicidal gas chamber. The camp's director dared to reply that the text of such an expert report was in fact on display in the gas chamber itself. That was not true. He had to return and tell me about an expert report that could be found in Linz, but he gave no further details about it. It is clear that, if there were any such expert report, it would be reprinted in all the works devoted to Mauthausen and that it would be mentioned in all the "Holocaust" bibliographies.

During our inspection of Mauthausen on April 10, 1989, an incident took place involving the camp authorities. We visited the place at an early hour in the morning to allow Fred Leuchter to carry out his sample takings without too much risk. No sooner had he finished his task (which caused a great deal of noise) than some groups of visitors began to go through the "gas chamber". They were mostly children from schools where they are indoctrinated systematically to feel shame and hatred for what previous generations of Germans and Austrians supposedly did during the war (Austria is the chosen home of the rather odious Simon Wiesenthal). The guides, either museum officials or teachers, talked at length about the "gas chamber" and how it worked, giving the usual, typical explanations found in popular "Holocaust literature" that contradicted each other on many points.

Without any warning, Mark Weber and I, under the watchful eye of Eugen Ernst's rolling camera, began to ask questions of the museum tour guide, who seemed to be the highest-ranking on the scene. After being at first very sure of himself, the poor man, bombarded with questions, finally had to admit that no one knew very much about how that "gas chamber" had worked. It appeared that over the years the story had taken extremely varied forms. They had given visitors three successive contradictory versions of the gassing procedure:

Version No. 1:

The gas came from the ceiling through shower heads (still in existence): That version, the official told us, was abandoned when people noticed that, considering the low ceiling, the victims could have simply put their hands over the shower heads to block them up and prevent the spread of the gas;

Version No. 2:

The gas came in from the ceiling and was vented at the time of the airing-out process through a sort of chimney opening, still in existence, located on the west side: The official was not able to tell us why that version of the story also had to be abandoned;

Version No. 3:

The gas came through a thin, perforated pipe located on the east wall, about 80 centimetres above the ground. That is, it came from the part of the room diametrically opposite to where it had been in Version No. 2. There is no longer any trace of that pipe, or even of the opening through which it supposedly came from the adjacent room where the gas was generated. The adjacent room, however, was completely empty and contained nothing that gave any hint of what it had been used for.

All of that was already troubling, but perhaps the most troubling thing was that the whole explanation given on a metal plaque inside the gas chamber was that of Version No. 2. I mentioned that to the official, who explained that the text of the plaque was a mistake, that the procedure described there was no longer the right one. I observed that Version No. 3, the one currently considered to be authentic, had the problem of being physically extremely unlikely. Since it was located 80 centimetres above the ground, the perforated pipe, even if it had been partially embedded in the wall to resist the pressure of the bodies inside, would have been blocked up by the bodies of the victims jammed into the gas chamber. How would the gas have spread itself normally in the "gas chamber" so as to kill all the victims throughout the room's entirety? The official finally said that he was not a scientist and that his explanation was that given in the book written by...Hans Marsalek.

A few minutes after the museum tour guide left, two police officers (?) appeared and ordered us to stop all filming. They informed us that we could photograph all of Mauthausen except...the "gas chamber" and the crematory oven! However, there was no announcement advising tourists of that. In any event, thousands of visitors photographed the two places without any warnings from the camp authorities.

At Mauthausen, I had the feeling that the camp authorities lived in a sort of panic. They appeared to be haunted by the progress of revisionism in Austria and by the revisionist work of people like Emil Lachout, Gerd Honsik and Walter Ochensberger. (In passing, I would like to pay homage to the memory of another Austrian, Franz Scheidl. In the 1960s, at his own expense, he published a whole

series of studies bearing the general title *Geschichte der Verfemung Deutschlands* ("History of the Defamation of Germany"). It has remained largely unknown, even to many revisionists).

Hartheim Castle

Hartheim Castle can be seen from a great distance, sitting as it does in the middle of a plain. For an area that allegedly served as a place to carry out the most secret of crimes, it really is impossible to hide. That castle was, before and after the war, a sort of asylum and it still is today. It contains a small, inoffensive-looking room that makes one wonder why the practitioners of the Big Lie decided to call it a homicidal "gas chamber". It is one of the most insulting and most baffling inventions of the "Holocaust" religion. Today I can see only one use for it: to those who mock the religious superstitions of the past as if our era were more enlightened and more intelligent than the most distant centuries, I would gladly say: "Go visit the gas chamber at Hartheim Castle and then come tell me whether you feel humiliated to be treated like imbeciles by people who dare to say that it was once a gas chamber". I do not know of any publication that reproduces a photo of that miniscule "gas chamber". It was identified as such by Hans Marsalek, in the English version of the confession that he supposedly took from Franz Ziereis, Commandant at Mauthausen, regarding the: "large gassing establishment where, in Ziereis' estimate, between 1 and 1.5 million people were killed." (!)

The Revisionist Intifada

The current disarray of the defenders of the "Holocaust" has some curious effects. Up to the end of the 1970's, they believed that in Auschwitz, Birkenau and other camps located in Poland they had solid proof of the existence of the gas chambers and therefore of the genocide of the Jews. Up until that time they went so far as to say that there were some exaggerations and that the camps located outside present-day Poland probably or certainly did not have any gas chambers.

Beginning with the start of the 1980's, under the pressure of revisionist writings, the gas chambers in Poland and in particular those at Auschwitz and Birkenau seemed more and more doubtful. This then produced a reaction motivated by fear. In a movement comparable to that of religious or political fundamentalism, the exterminationists called for a return to the faith and to the original doctrines. They "re-established" the gas chambers that had been abandoned. They set out to reaffirm that there had indeed been gas chambers at Mathausen, Sachsenhausen, Ravensbrück, Neuengamme, Struthof-Natzweiler, and perhaps even at Dachau. I refer here to the book by Adalbert Rückerl, Hermann Langbein, Eugen Kogon and 21 other writers: *NS-Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, (Fischer Verlag, 1983).

As regards Mauthausen, some people, including Claude Lanzmann and Yehuda Bauer, went so far as to retract the story. In 1982, Bauer clearly wrote that "no gassings took place at Mauthausen." Lanzmann was just as clear. In 1986, during a bitter debate about the Roques affair on Europe 1 (a French radio network), he corrected cabinet member Michel Noir, who had mentioned the Mauthausen gas chamber. Lanzmann firmly contradicted the Minister on this score: never had there

been a gas chamber in that camp. But all of that did not prevent our two fellows from stating a few years later that there had indeed been a gas chamber at Mauthausen. (For Bauer's retraction, see pages 33-34 of the absurd book published in Vienna in 1989, by the Dokumentations-archiv des österreichischen Widerstandes under the title *Das Lachout- "Dokument", Anatomie einer Fälschung*. As regards Lanzmann's retraction, read his letter published in *Le Monde juif*, July-September 1986, p. 97). All those retractions and sudden changes of direction and constantly changing explanations add up to one further proof that the "gas chamber" and the "genocide" are nothing more than a myth. A myth constantly mutates under the influence of the dominant opinions and the necessities of the moment.

The exterminationists of today have only two refuges left them, two points where they hope to be able to anchor their faith: the "gas van" and "Treblinka." As regards the first point, I can tell them that the Frenchman Pierre Marais will soon publish a study entitled *Le Mythe des camions à gaz (The Myth of the Gas Vans)*. On the second point, I can tell them that they are going to lose "Treblinka" as they have lost "Auschwitz".

The promoters of the "Holocaust", for the foreseeable future, will keep their money, their power, their capacity to produce films, to stage ceremonies, to build museums, but those films and ceremonies and museums will be more and more devoid of meaning. They will be able still to find more and more ways of repressing the revisionists through physical attacks, press campaigns, the passing of special laws and even murder. Fifty years after the war they will continue to prosecute all those they call "war criminals" in show trials. The revisionists will reply to them with historical and forensic studies, scholarly and technical books. Those books and those studies will be our stones, in this our intellectual Intifada.

The Jews will have a choice: they can either follow the example of the rare few among them who have been courageous and honourable enough to denounce the Big Lie, or they can support the melodramatic activities of people like Elie Wiesel and Samuel Pisar and the shameful witch hunts carried out by people like Simon Wiesenthal and the O.S.I. in the United States.

David Irving, who rallied to the support of the Revisionist position in 1988, recently said:

"The Jewish community have to examine their consciences. They have been propagating something that isn't true." (*The Jewish Chronicle*, London, 23 June 1989)

I couldn't have said it better.

Dr. Robert Faurisson, August 1989

The Second Leuchter Report

Introduction

In March of 1989, I was asked by Mr. Ernst Zündel of Toronto, Canada, to investigate three (3) alleged execution gas chambers and crematoria in Germany and Austria. These locations, allegedly operated by the Germans in World War II, were Dachau, in Germany, and Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, both near Linz, Austria.

The findings of these investigations and forensic analyses at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim were to result in an engineering report and forensic study on the efficacy of these afore-mentioned facilities to function as execution gas chambers. Although these facilities seem now accepted by many established historians to have never functioned as execution gas chambers, Mr. Zündel wanted to dispel any future doubts and scientifically prove beyond any question whether these facilities were or were not used, and if they could ever have been utilized, as gas execution facilities. Resultant to Mr. Zündel's direction, I undertook this scientific investigation and evaluation. On Sunday, April 9th, 1989, I arrived at Dachau with the following team: Carolyn Leuchter as secretary/technician; Dr. Robert Faurisson, advisor and consultant; Mark Weber, historian and author of contemporary European history; Tjudia Rudolf, interpreter; Steven Devine, technician; Eugen Ernst, cinematographer; and Kenneth Ernst, assistant cinematographer. The following day, Monday, April 10th, we inspected Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, near Linz, Austria. This report and my findings are resultant to these investigations conducted at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim.

Purpose

The purpose of this report, and the investigations antecedent to it, is to determine whether the alleged gas chambers at three (3) specific locations, one (1) in Germany and two (2) in Austria, specifically, Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, respectively, could have operated in any manner resulting in single or multiple gas executions. Although cognizant of the fact that many established historians presently seem to concur that none of these installations ever functioned as a gas execution facility, the author is also aware that immediately after American capture of these locations during World War II a mass gas execution function was ascribed to these facilities, an assertion which was widely published in the international mass media at the time. It is to eliminate any further doubt or question that this investigation was undertaken and this report written.

This purpose includes the investigation and on-site inspection of physical facilities, design of these facilities and a description of the alleged gassing procedures utilized at the alleged executions. The purpose also includes estimates of the maximum number of inclusions (persons) who could possibly have fit into these alleged gas chambers

and estimated venting times. This purpose does not include a determination of any numbers of persons who died or were killed by means other than gassing, or as to whether an actual "Holocaust" occurred. It, further, is not the intent of this author to redefine "Holocaust" in historical terms, but simply to supply scientific evidence and information obtained at the actual sites and to render an opinion based on all available scientific, engineering and quantitative data as to the purpose and usages of the alleged execution gas chambers and crematory facilities at the investigated locations.

Background

The principal investigator and author of this report is an engineer and a specialist on design and fabrication of execution hardware and specifically has worked on and designed hardware in the United States used in the execution of condemned persons and by means of hydrogen cyanide gas ("Zyklon B" gas).

The investigator has inspected the alleged execution gas chambers in Poland and is the author of the report on these facilities: *An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland* (1988, Samisdat Publishers Ltd.). The author has been recognized by a Canadian court as an expert on gas chamber technology, and has testified as to the non-existence of execution gas chamber facilities at these sites.

The investigator has inspected the facilities at Dachau, in Germany, and Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, in Austria, made measurements and taken forensic samples. Further, he purchased official printed brochures published and offered publicly for sale at the three (3) museum sites and reviewed this literature. He also reviewed the procedural literature on delousing with hydrogen cyanide ("Zyklon B") gas.

Scope

The scope of this report includes a physical inspection and quantitative data obtained at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim, literature obtained at the three (3) museum sites, and a consideration of forensic samples taken at Mauthausen. For reasons explained below, no samples were removed from Dachau or Hartheim. Further, data on the design of U.S. gas chambers and the operational protocol utilized in gas executions in the United States coming from the investigator's own personal knowledge and experience in the field, as well as, knowledge gained in the investigation of the alleged Polish gas chambers was utilized in the production of this report. Additionally, operational procedures and equipment utilized at delousing facilities was considered. Utilizing all of the above data, the investigator has limited the focus of this study to a determination of the capability of the alleged gas chambers in question at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle to accomplish the mass murder (extermination) of human beings by the use of "Zyklon B" (hydrogen cyanide) gas.

Synopsis and Findings

After a study of available literature, examination and evaluation of the existing facilities at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, with expert knowledge of the essential design criteria for gas chamber operation and the expert knowledge gained in

the production of the previous study on the alleged gas chambers in Poland, the author finds no evidence that any of these installations, i.e., Dachau, Mauthausen or Hartheim Castle, frequently alleged to have been gas execution facilities, were ever utilized as such, and further finds, that because of the design and fabrication of these installations, they could not ever have been utilized as execution gas chambers.

Methodology

The procedures involved in the study and forensic analysis which resulted in this report were as follows:

1. A general background study of available material.
2. An on-site inspection and forensic examination of the facilities in question which included the taking of physical data (measurements and construction information), and a considered removal of physical samples (tile and mortar) which were returned to the United States for chemical analysis.
3. A consideration of recorded and visual (on-site) logistic data.
4. Data acquired on the previous study of the alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz I, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland.
5. A compilation of the acquired data.
6. An analysis of the acquired information and comparison of this information with recognized and proven design, procedural and logistic information and the requirements for the design, fabrication and operation of actual gas chambers currently in use in the United States.
7. A consideration of the chemical analysis of the materials acquired on-site.
8. Conclusions based on the acquired evidence.

The Leuchter Report

The Leuchter Report, which formed the basis of the author's expert testimony at the trial of Ernst Zündel, Toronto, Ontario given on April 20, 1988, is a study of the existing alleged gassing facilities in Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland. This report contains the definitive data for gas chamber application purposes for hydrogen cyanide, "Zyklon B", fumigation design and procedures, execution gas chamber design and protocol, U.S. gas chambers, medical and toxic effects of hydrogen cyanide, a brief history of the alleged German gas chambers with an emphasis on design characteristics, and a consideration of crematory technology, including a discussion of maximum cremation rates. Additionally, there is a discussion of forensic considerations of cyano-compounds and crematories.

The materials contained in the above paragraphs of the Leuchter Report (1988) are a necessary complement to this report.

The sites: Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle

These sites are considered separately and together, in that Dachau and Mauthausen have been at times described as camps which supplied prisoners to the Hartheim Castle site where they were allegedly executed.

Dachau

The alleged execution facility at Dachau is located in a building called "Baracke X". This installation was erected in 1942 and contained a crematory consisting of four (4) retorts. It was constructed primarily as a replacement for the older and smaller two (2) retort crematory located nearby. The facility also housed a morgue, fumigation cubicles (delousing chambers), related work areas and a room identified by a sign over the door as a "Brausebad" (shower room). It is this shower room which has been alleged to be the gas chamber and which tourists today are informed was the "gas chamber".

The alleged gas chamber has an area of some 427 square feet and a volume of some 3,246.7 cubic feet. It originally was a shower room but appears to have been modified sometime after Dachau's capture by the Americans. The present ceiling is some 7.6 feet in height and contains some seventeen (17) pseudo-shower heads, fabricated out of what appears to be soldered sheet zinc. Additionally, it contains some eight (8) recessed lighting fixtures which are not explosion proof. It also contains two (2) alleged gas inlet ports (dumps) with internal grates measuring 15.75 inches x 27.25 inches which are welded open to the outside. This alleged gas chamber also contains a ventilation port clearly added after construction. The walls are of tile and the ceiling of concrete painted white. There are two (2) 20.5 inch x 26 inch floor drains connected to the other floor drains throughout the building and the camp. It has two (2) doors with provision for gasketing, as do many European doors.

It appears from construction that the alleged gas chamber was originally a shower room, as found in all the other investigated camps. The pseudo-shower heads are fabricated from sheet metal of a cylinder and a cone with a sprinkler type head as found on a garden type watering can. The end is sealed and not threaded. They are not connected, nor are they capable of being connected to any piping system. They are designed to appear as functional shower heads when observed from below. The ceiling with the phoney shower heads seems to have been added at a time later than original construction, apparently after capture of the camp. The ceiling is fabricated of poured concrete, cast around the pseudo shower heads. It is typical suspended-slab concrete construction. Document No. 47 of the 79th Congress, 1st Session, of the United States, includes an investigation of Dachau. In this document, the gas chamber is described as having a 10 foot ceiling containing brass fixtures for introducing gas into the chamber. The present ceiling, as noted, is only 7.6 feet high and has none of the gas inlet fixtures described in Document No. 47.

Directly over the shower room are the steam and heating pipes, which is consistent with good and standard design for supplying hot water to the shower area. These pipes cannot be seen in the shower room today. Their existence, however, can be confirmed by observing the pipes entering into the shower room area from an off-limits corridor behind the shower room and visible only from a rear window of the

building. It is an inept and extremely dangerous design to put hot, high pressure steam pipes over a chamber containing potentially explosive gas. At one end of the chamber the ventilation port was clearly added. The ports alleged to have been "Zyklon B" introduction ports, not different from apartment incinerator garbage chutes, were obviously added after the original tiling. Both these modifications are clearly discernable from the uneven replacement of the interior tiles and the exterior brick. At one end of the room there are two (2) recessed electrical boxes with grates, something which should not be in a room containing potentially explosive gas. There is no means for sealing the room to prevent gas leakage and there is no system for exhausting the gas after use or any suitable vent stack (40 foot minimum is standard). The doors are not gas proof, or even water proof. They are only water resistant. There is no system for evaporating (heating) or distributing a gas into or within the chamber. The use of the improperly designed "Zyklon B" introduction port would prevent proper evaporation of the gas from the "Zyklon B" pellets because of insufficient surface area exposure. Most, if not all, of the "Zyklon B" pellets would remain in the dumping mechanism due to insufficient angular motion of the gas pellet dump.

On a sign posted within the alleged gas chamber, Dachau Museum officials state: "GAS CHAMBER - disguised as a 'shower room' - never used as a gas chamber". An examination of the alleged gas chamber clearly shows, however, that this facility was constructed as a shower room, used only for this purpose. The modifications to the room which include the addition of the ceiling, pseudo shower heads, air intake and gas inlet ports were made at a time much later than the original construction of "Baracke X" and the shower room, and for reasons and by persons unknown to this author. No samples were taken at this location due to excessively heavy tourist traffic inside the alleged gas chamber.

For the record, this alleged gas chamber would have held only forty-seven (47) persons utilizing the nine (9) square foot inclusion rule as accepted by standard engineering practice for air handling systems. Without an exhaust system or windows, it would require at least one week to vent by convection. This estimate is based on American gas chambers requiring twenty (20) minutes to vent with two complete air changes per minute, and a minimum of forty-eight (48) hours to vent a fumigated building with an abundance of windows.

An inspection of the four (4) new crematory retorts at "Baracke X" revealed that, although fired, none of these ever experienced much use, if any. These retorts were coal fired.

After an in-depth investigation of the alleged gas chamber at "Baracke X", Dachau, this investigator, in his best engineering opinion, categorically states that this installation could not have ever been utilized as an execution gas chamber. It was in fact a shower room (Brausebad) as originally labelled by the Germans.

Mauthausen

The alleged gas chamber at Mauthausen Concentration Camp was located between the hospital, the crematory and the jail. Like Dachau, it is generally considered by some established historians and the Revisionists to have never been utilized for executions.

The alleged gas chamber has an area of some 150 square feet and a volume of 1,164 cubic feet. It has a ceiling height of some 7.8 feet containing piping and working shower heads. It has a floor drain of some eight (8) inches by eight (8) inches and steam pipes on the north-west wall for heating. The walls are finished in ceramic tile. It has two doors and provision for gasketing as do many European doors. It has an alleged gas vent in the ceiling of the north wall but the purpose of this alleged gas vent cannot be verified since the ground above has been repaved. Additionally, an adjacent room is alleged to have been a control room for inletting gas (apparently not solid "Zyklon B" but actual hydrogen cyanide gas). There is no hardware in place for this function nor is there any evidence of its removal. The museum officials are very confused and incoherent about the operating function and offered a succession of varying explanations on how the gas was introduced into the chamber. It has been stated by museum officials that the gas was introduced: (1) through overhead shower heads; (2) through a shaft in a remote corner of the room; and (3) through a perforated pipe, which does not exist today. The lighting is not explosion proof but merely water resistant. There is nothing to indicate the alleged control room ever existed. The facility is entirely underground, as is the morgue, the hospital and the jail. The facility also housed the area for the condemned prisoners where they were executed by shooting.

It appears from the construction that this facility was constructed as, and further was utilized only as, a shower room. The installation has no provision to prevent gas leakage, the lighting is not explosion proof, the floor drain would allow leakage into the sewer system and there is no provision for inletting gas or for exhausting the air gas mixture after an execution. Further, there are steam heating pipes (radiator) on the northwest wall of the chamber, which would most likely result in an explosion if hydrogen cyanide gas were deposited in the room. Additionally, all shower heads are working and the overall design is unquestionably that of a shower room.

Forensic Considerations at Mauthausen

Four (4) forensic samples were selectively removed from the alleged gas chamber at Mauthausen and returned to the United States for chemical testing. Detailed analysis was completed on each sample for both iron and cyanide in accordance with the standard procedures utilized in the prior testing of samples from Auschwitz I and Birkenau. Resultant to this testing and comparison with known test results for insoluble iron cyanide compounds, it is demonstrated that this alleged gas chamber facility has never been exposed to repetitive concentrations of cyanide necessary for execution: referencing the delousing chamber control sample #32 (from Birkenau) as having 1050 mg/kg, the greatest concentration found at Mauthausen was 32 mg/kg, indicating fumigation of the building at some point in its history. This clearly indicates that this facility was not a gas chamber.

Resultant to an in-depth investigation of this installation, this investigator has determined that this facility was not capable of conducting executions by gas. In the best engineering opinion of this investigator this facility could never have supported gas executions and was never utilized as a gas execution chamber.

Adjacent to this facility is the morgue area, which contains a refrigeration unit for cooling the cadavers. This morgue also contains a dissection room and a crematory,

all adjacent and connected to the hospital. The existing crematory contains a furnace with one (1) retort. In an adjacent room, there are indications of another crematory furnace of one (1) retort which has been removed. This existing retort shows signs of considerable use, which is expected in a camp of this size with only two (2) retorts. Both units were coal fired.

For the record the alleged gas chamber would have held only seventeen (17) persons, utilizing the nine (9) square foot rule. Without an exhaust system, this investigator estimates that it would require at least a week to vent for the same reasons as explained for Dachau. -Hartheim Castle-

This facility consists of a masonry room adjacent to a tower of a centuries old castle. This castle was donated by the monarchy to the mental health service of Austria and was later placed under the control of the German Government when it acquired control of the Austrian Government and the mental health service. The facility had been utilized as a mental hospital and under German control it continued as such. Allegedly, mass gas executions were conducted at this location on prisoners transferred from Dachau and Mauthausen for this purpose.

The alleged gas chamber was a lower level room adjacent to one of the castle towers. This room has an area of 192 square feet and a volume of 1,728 cubic feet. It has a vaulted ceiling of some 8.9 feet at the highest point. The installation had one (1) door and one (1) window, although a rectangular aperture has now been made into an adjacent room. There are no facilities to inlet "Zyklon B" or evacuate the gas after use. The room now has been completely remodelled. It has recently plastered walls and ceiling. There are three (3) new floor surfaces, one on top of the other. Even the door has been changed to a modern conventional mental institution cell door with a shuttered view port. The window is alleged to have been original, but would leak gas if used for this purpose. Neither the door nor the window has any provision for gasketing. Allegedly, all gassing apparatus was removed by January, 1945. In truth, there was no gassing equipment in that the walls are very thick as characteristic of castle architecture and construction and not easily cut to accommodate the installation of gas vents or gas inlet ports. It and the adjacent room contain memorial plaques to those who allegedly died in gassings here. The castle is presently used as an apartment building.

It appears by construction that this facility would not lend itself for use as a gas execution installation, the walls being too thick for the installation of gassing equipment. Certainly, because of the construction, any changes would be visible, and not easy to conceal. There is no provision for a gas stack for evacuation of the gas-air mixture and no way to install one. The window would certainly leak, allowing large volumes of deadly gas to escape. No samples were taken at this location because of the extensive remodeling to the facility which decidedly would obscure any test results.

For the record, the alleged gas chamber would have held only some 24 persons, utilizing the nine (9) square foot rule. Without an exhaust system this room would require at least one week to vent (refer to Dachau).

Resultant to an in-depth investigation of this installation, this investigator

categorically states that in his best engineering opinion this facility was not ever utilized for, and could never have supported gas executions. The actual use of this room is unknown to the investigator. Based on a comparison with its mirror image on the other side of the facility, it could have been a store room.

There are no crematoria extant at this location.

It is perplexing to note that the official museum literature states that Dachau and Mauthausen, both having facilities equal to, or better than those at Hartheim Castle, sent inmates to Hartheim for gassing. It is unclear why this should occur since Hartheim's alleged facility would have been so difficult to construct, was so small and so distant from Dachau (200 km). Based on all the available evidence it becomes abundantly clear that no gassing facilities ever existed at any of these locations.

Specialized Hardware: Non-existence

In all the author's investigations in Poland, Germany and Austria, hardware or construction remarkable to gas chambers has never been found. There are no forty (40) foot stacks, no ventilators, no gas generators, no intake air preheaters, no special paint or sealants on walls, floors or ceilings, no safety devices for the operators, and no coherent design consistently utilized throughout the alleged gas chambers. It is inconceivable that the Germans, having the highly developed technology utilized on the delousing chambers, would never have applied this technology to the alleged execution gas chambers.

Conclusion

After reviewing all the material and inspecting all of the sites at Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim Castle, this investigator has determined that there were no gas execution chambers at any of these locations. It is the best engineering opinion of this investigator that the alleged gas chambers at the above inspected sites could not have then been, or now be, utilized or seriously considered to function as execution gas chambers.

Prepared this 15th day of June, 1989 at Malden, Massachusetts.

Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc.
Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

edited by Dr. Robert Faurisson

I The Leuchter Report, No. 1

- Fred A. Leuchter, An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland (Prepared for Ernst Zündel), 1988, 193 pp. [Report entered as a lettered exhibit at the "false news" trial of Ernst Zündel in 1988, Toronto, Canada; contains copies of the original Certificates of Analysis of brick and mortar samples.]
- Fred A. Leuchter, *The Leuchter Report: The End of a Myth*, Foreword by Dr. Robert Faurisson, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., 1988, 132 pp., Printed under licence in the U.S.A., P.O. Box 726, Decatur, Alabama 35602 U.S.A. [Illustrated edition of the Report; Results of the analysis of the brick and mortar are presented in condensed chart format.]

II Dachau

- IMT Doc. L-159: Document No. 47 of the 79th Congress, 1st Session, Senate: Report (May 15, 1945) of the Committee Requested by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to the Congress of the U.S. relative to Atrocities and other Conditions in Concentration Camps in Germany, IMT, XXXVII, pp. 605-626 at p. 621:

"A distinguishing feature of the Dachau Camp was the gas chamber for the execution of prisoners and the somewhat elaborate facilities for execution by shooting. -The gas chamber was located in the center of a large room in the crematory building. It was built of concrete. Its dimensions were about 20 by 20 feet, and the ceiling was some 10 feet in height! In two opposite walls of the chamber were airtight doors through which condemned prisoners could be taken into the chamber for execution and removed after execution. The supply of gas into the chamber was controlled by means of two valves on one of the outer walls, and beneath the valves was a small glass-covered peephole through which the operator could watch the victims die. The gas was let into the chamber through pipes terminating in perforated brass fixtures set into the ceiling. The chamber was of size sufficient to execute probably a hundred men at one time."

- IMT Doc. PS-2430: Nazi Concentration and Prisoner-of-War Camps: A Documentary Motion Picture, November 24, 1945, IMT, XXX, pp. 357-472, at p.470:

"Dachau-factory of horrors...Hanging in orderly rows were the clothes of prisoners who had been suffocated in the lethal gas chamber. They

had been persuaded to remove their clothing under the pretext of taking a shower for which towels and soap were provided. This is the Brausebad-the showerbath. Inside the showerbath - the gas vents. On the ceiling-the dummy shower heads. In the engineers' room-the intake and outlet pipes. Push buttons to control inflow and outtake of gas. A hand-valve to regulate pressure. Cyanide powder was used to generate the lethal smoke. From the gas chamber, the bodies were removed to the crematory."

- IMT Doc. NO-3859/64 and 3884/89: 28 pages of German documents and plans (1942) about "Baracke X" (Staatsarchiv Nürnberg) [None of these documents or plans indicate that a gas chamber existed.]
- O.S.S. Section, Seventh Army (U.S.A.), Dachau Concentration Camp, Foreword by William W. Quinn, Colonel, 1945, 68 pp. at p. 33:

"GAS CHAMBERS: The internees who were brought to Camp Dachau for the sole purpose of being executed were in most cases Jews and Russians. They were brought into the compound, lined up near the gas chambers, and were screened in a similar manner as internees who came to Dachau for imprisonment. Then they were marched to a room and told to undress. Everyone was given a towel and a piece of soap, as though they were about to take a shower. During this whole screening process, no hint was ever given that they were to be executed, for the routine was similar upon the arrival of all internees at the camp. Then they entered the gas chamber. Over the entrance, in large black letters, was written 'Brause Bad' (showers). There were about 15 shower faucets suspended from the ceiling from which gas was then released. There was one large chamber, capacity of which was 200, and five smaller gas chambers, capacity of each being 50. It took approximately 10 minutes for the execution. From the gas chamber, the door led to the Krematory to which the bodies were removed by internees who were selected for the job. The dead bodies were then placed in 5 furnaces, two to three bodies at a time."

- Mission Militaire Française auprès du 6e groupe d'armées, Guerre chimique, nr 23/7, Chambre à gaz de Dachau, rapports du capitaine Fribourg, 5 mai et 17 mai 1945, 5 pp.; 6 planches; 1 photo (25 mai 1945). Captain Fribourg did not reach any conclusion in his report concerning the gas chamber after a one day investigation at Dachau. Fribourg stated that a second visit would be necessary in order to discover the circulation of the toxic gas and the possible communication with the disinfection gas chambers. He also stated that the testing of all of the walls was necessary.
- Headquarters Third United States Army, Enemy Equipment Intelligence Service Team Number 1, Chemical Warfare Service, 22 August 1945, Report from Joseph H. Gilbert to Major James F. Munn: Subject: Dachau Gas Chamber (3 pp; enclosures) at p. 3:

"Based on the interviews noted above, and further, based on actual inspection of the Dachau gas chamber (it has apparently been unused), it is the opinion of the undersigned that the gas chamber was a failure

for execution purposes and that no experimental work ever took place in it. In view of the fact that much reliable information has been furnished the Allies by former inmates regarding the malaria, air pressure and cold water experiments, it is reasonable to assume that if such gas experiments took place, similar information would be available."

- Plan of Crematory Area (Dachau) in Philipp Rauscher, *Never Again/Jamais Plus*, Munich, 1945 (?)
- Stephen F. Pinter, Letter on "German Atrocities" in *Our Sunday Visitor*, 14 June 1959, p. 15: "I was in Dachau for 17 months after the war, as a U.S. War Department Attorney, and can state that there was no gas chamber at Dachau."
- Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe, 1939-1945*, Jason Aronson Inc., London, 1987 reprint, originally published in 1953, 638 pp. at p. 134:

"Thus, eventually every German concentration camp acquired a gas chamber of sorts, though their use proved difficult. The Dachau gas chamber, for instance, has been preserved by the American occupation authorities as an object lesson, but its construction was hampered and its use restricted to a few experimental victims, Jews or Russian prisoners of war, who had been committed by the Munich Gestapo."

- Dr. Martin Broszat, Institute of Contemporary History in Munich, Letter in *Die Zeit*, 19 August 1960, p. 16:

"Weder in Dachau noch in Bergen-Belsen noch in Buchenwald sind Juden oder andere Häftlinge vergast worden. Die Gaskammer in Dachau wurde nie ganz fertiggestellt und 'in Betrieb' genommen." [Translation: "Neither in Dachau, nor in Bergen-Belsen, nor in Buchenwald, were Jews or other inmates gassed. The gas chamber in Dachau was never completed and put 'into operation'".]

- Dr. Robert Faurisson, "The Müller Document", *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988, pp. 117-126. The Allied military police and their Austrian auxiliaries regularly received copies of the reports made out by the Allied Commissions of Inquiry on the concentration camps. Those reports were needed to conduct research on "war crimes". On October 1, 1948, Commandant Müller and his second-in-command, Emil Lachout, sent the following circular letter from Vienna to all interested parties:

"Military Police Service. Circular Letter No. 31/48. Vienna, 1 Oct. 1948. 10th dispatch. 1. The Allied Commissions of Inquiry have so far established that no people were killed by poison gas in the following concentration camps: Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, Dachau, Flossenbürg, Gross-Rosen, Mauthausen and its satellite camps, Natzweiler, Neuengamme, Niederhagen (Wewelsburg), Ravensbrück, Sachsenhausen, Stutthof, Theresienstadt. - In those cases, it has been possible to prove that confessions had been extracted by tortures and that testimonies were false. - This must be taken into account when

conducting investigations and interrogations with respect to war crimes. - The result of this investigation should be brought to the cognizance of former concentration camp inmates who at the time of the hearings testified on the murder of people, especially Jews, with poison gas in those concentration camps. Should they insist on their statements, charges are to be brought against them for making false statements."

- Comité international de Dachau, *Concentration Camp Dachau 1933-1945*, 1978, 229 pp. at p. 165: [Translation]:

"The gas chamber, disguised as a shower room, was never put into operation. Thousands of inmates destined for annihilation were sent to other camps for gassing or to Hartheim Castle near Linz."

- Dr. Robert Faurisson, *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*, Paris, La Vieille Taupe, 1980. Faurisson discusses at p. 204-209 the failure of Barbara Distel, Director of the Dachau Museum, and Dr. A. Guerisse, President of the International Committee of Dachau in Brussels, to provide him, in a series of correspondence in 1977-78, with any proof of the allegation that there was an execution gas chamber in Dachau.
- Dr. Robert Faurisson, "Response to a Paper Historian", *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1986. At p. 62, Faurisson analyses the testimony of Fernand Grenier contained in the latter's book *C'était ainsi (1940-1945)*, Editions sociales, 7th ed., 1970, where Grenier wrote the following at p. 267:

[Translation] "To the side of the four crematory ovens which never stopped working there was a room: some showers with sprinkler heads in the ceiling. In the preceding year [1944] they had given a towel and a piece of soap to 120 children, from 8 to 14 years of age. They were quite happy when they went inside. The doors were closed. Asphyxiating gas came out of the showers. Ten minutes later, death had killed these innocents whom the crematory ovens reduced to ashes an hour later."

- Rene Levesque, *Memoirs*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1986, at pp. 192-193:

"Before putting their prisoners to work the Germans always stripped them of all their possessions, including their gold teeth. Then they worked them to death, especially the last year when rations were becoming scarce. At the end of the road they were sent to the "baths" (Baden), shabby-looking sheds linked to a reservoir by a couple of pipes. When the baths were full to the seams they opened the gas, and then, when the last groans had ceased, the bodies were taken to the ovens next door. - When news of this reached Quebec, and for some time after, people refused to believe. Heavy scepticism greeted such stories, which surpassed understanding...I can assure you that it was real, all right, that the gas chamber was real in its nightmarish unreality. The loaders had gone, trying to save their skins, leaving

behind their last load of corpses, naked as worms in their muddy pallor."

- Sign exhibited in the Dachau "gas chamber" by museum authorities read until the mid-eighties as follows: "GAS CHAMBER disguised as a 'shower room' - never used". The sign was changed in the mid-eighties to read: "GAS CHAMBER disguised as a 'shower room' - never used as a gas chamber."

III Mauthausen Concentration Camp

- IMT Doc. PS-1515: Protocol by the Commander of the Mauthausen Concentration Camp, SS-Colonel Franz Ziereis (unsigned and undated by deponer). Staff Evidence Analysis of this document, dated 6 October 1945, states:

"In one village, called Hartheim, there was a large gassing establishment where, in Ziereis' estimate, between 1 and 1.5 million people were killed...Other physicians, so-called 'psychiatrists', proclaimed thousands of inmates as psychiatric cases and sent them to Hartheim...Ziereis claims to have seen the records which indicated that four millions were killed in this way...Ziereis estimates that in the Warsaw-Kowno-Riga-Libau area, 16 million people were killed." [Note: Prosecution was directed not to use PS-1515 as "this statement has been corrected and superseded. See= 3870-PS".]

- IMT Doc. PS-3870: Affidavit of Hans Marsalek, sworn 8 April 1946 (made more than 10 months following the death of Ziereis May, 1945), IMT, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 279-286. Marsalek swore that:

"Franz Ziereis was interrogated by me in the presence of the Commander of the 11th Armored Division (American Armored Division) Seibel; the former prisoner and physician Dr. Koszeinski; and in the presence of another Polish citizen, name unknown, for a period of six to eight hours. The interrogation was effected in the night from 22 May to 23 May 1945. Franz Ziereis was seriously wounded- his body had been penetrated by three bullets-and knew that he would die shortly and told me the following:... 'A gassing plant was built in Concentration Camp Mauthausen by order of the former garrison doctor, Dr. Krebsbach, camouflaged as a bathroom. Prisoners were gassed in this camouflaged bathroom...The gassing of the prisoners was done on the urging of SS Hauptsturmführer Dr. Krebsbach...SS Gruppenführer Glücks gave the order to classify weak prisoners as mentally deranged and to kill them by a gas plant which existed in the Castle Hartheim near Linz. There, about a million or a million and a half human beings were killed'."

- IMT Doc. PS-2285: Sworn statement of Lieutenant Colonel Guivante de Saint Gast and Lieutenant Jean Veith, both of the French Army, IMT, Vol. XXX, pp. 141-143:

"The K prisoners were taken directly to the prison where they were unclothed and taken to the "bathrooms". This bathroom in the cellars of the prison building near the crematory was specially designed for executions (shooting and gassing). - The shooting took place by means of a measuring apparatus. The prisoner [sic] being backed towards a metrical measure with an automatic contraption releasing a bullet in his neck as soon as the moving plank determining his height touched the top of his head. -If a transport consisted of too many 'K' prisoners, instead of losing time for the 'measurement' they were exterminated by gas sent into the bathroom instead of water."

- IMT Doc. PS-2430: Nazi Concentration and Prisoner-of-War Camps: A Documentary Motion Picture, November 24, 1945, *ibid.*, at p. 468. Unlike the segment of the film dealing with Dachau, the segment dealing with Mauthausen contains no footage of any alleged gas chamber. The film simply shows an American Naval Lieutenant from Hollywood, California, affirming that people had been executed by gas in the camp.
- IMT Doc. PS-2753: Affidavit of SS man Alois Höllriegl, Sworn 7 November 1945, IMT, Vol. XXXI, p. 93:

"The noise which accompanied the process of gassing was well known to me."

- IMT Doc. PS-3845: Interrogation Report of Albert Tiefenbacher, taken on 7 December 1945, IMT, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 213-229. The transcript reads:

"Question - Do you remember the gas chamber camouflaged as a bath house? Answer: Yes, we always helped to carry the dead from the gas chamber. Q. - There were no shower baths in the chamber? A. - Yes. Cold and warm water was supposed to come out of them, but the flow of the water could be regulated from the outside of the room and mostly the water was turned off. On the outside of the room was the gas reservoir and two gas pipes led from the outside into the room. There was a slot at the back and the gas emanated from this slot. Q. - Gas never came from the showers? A. - All the showers were plugged. It was just to make the effect that the prisoners were entering a bathroom."

- IMT Doc. PS-3846: Interrogation Report of Johann Kanduth, taken on 30 November 1945, IMT, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 230-243.
- Gerald Reitlinger, *ibid.*, at p. 474:

"On May 8th, when Patton's troops entered the camp, Ziereis was identified in the camp precincts and shot in the stomach. His dying confession, having been taken down by an inmate in the presence of American officers who could not understand German, is not very reliable."

- Hans Marsalek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen: Dokumentation*, Österreichische Lagergemeinschaft Mauthausen, Wien, 1980, 229 pp. at p.211:

[Translation] "Before gassings, an SS N.C.O. heated a brick in one of the Krema ovens and brought it into a small, divided room, located next to the gas chamber. This gas chamber contained a table, gas masks and a gas introduction unit connected with the gas chamber by means of a pipe. The hot brick was then laid on the bottom of the gas introduction unit; this served to accelerate the process of "Zyklon B" crystals changing into liquid gas. With sufficient gas in the chamber, death by suffocation occurred in about 10-20 minutes. - When an SS doctor, watching through an observation "peephole" ascertained the onset of death, the gas chamber was cleared of gas by ventilators sucking it out into the open air. - The whole gassing process for one group, consisting of approximately 30 persons - beginning with undressing, the so-called medical examination, murder, clearing the gas chamber of gas and removal of cadavers took about one and a half to two and a half hours."

- Pierre Serge Choumoff, *Les Chambres à gaz de Mauthausen, camp de concentration nazi*, Amicale des deportés de Mauthausen, 1972, 96 pp. [See below.]
- Pierre Serge Choumoff, *Les Assassinats par gaz à Mauthausen et Gusen, camps de concentration nazis en territoire autrichien*, Amicale des deportés de Mauthausen, 1987, 64 pp. The writings of Choumoff, a professional engineer, exhibit extreme confusion concerning the gas chambers. He provides no technical evidence or details as might be expected from an engineer, but instead relies on the usual "eyewitness" accounts (Kanduth, Ornstein, Roth, Reinsdorf,...). He appears to consider the mere presence of "Zyklon B" insecticide in the camp as proof of homicidal gassings. Choumoff estimates that at least 3,455 people were gassed in the alleged gas chambers at Mauthausen.]
- Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl, *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Frankfurt, S. Fischer, 1983, pp. 245-254 at pp. 245-246:

[Translation] "At the main camp, which had been established east of Linz in August 1938, the construction of a gas chamber began in the fall of 1941. The gas chamber was located in the basement of the hospital building, with the crematoria close by. It was a windowless room, camouflaged as a shower room, 3.80 meters in length and 3.50 meters wide. A ventilation unit was installed, the side walls consisted partly of tiles. There were two doors which could be closed airtight. All switches for electrical lighting, ventilation, water supply and the heating unit were located on the outside of this room. From an adjacent room, called the "gas cell", gas entered through an enamelled pipe that had a slot approximately 1 meter long cut into it on the side facing the wall which was therefore invisible to the occupant of this room. Remnants of this gassing unit are still discernible today."

- Yehuda Bauer, *A History of the Holocaust*, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, with the assistance of Nili Keren, Franklin Watts Publ., Toronto, 1982, at p. 209:

"Although no gassings took place at Mauthausen, many Jews, as well as non-Jews, died there in a process the Nazis called 'extermination through labor'".

- Michel de Boüard (former inmate at Mauthausen), honorary dean of the Faculty of Letters at the University of Caen, member of the Committee for the History of the Second World War, member of the Institut de France: Statement made in an interview published in *Ouest-France*, August 2-3, 1986, p. 6.:

"In the monograph on Mauthausen that I published in *"Revue d'histoire de la [Deuxième] Guerre mondiale"* in 1954, I mentioned a gas chamber on two occasions. When the time of reflection had arrived, I said to myself: where did you arrive at the conviction that there was a gas chamber in Mauthausen? This cannot have been during my stay in this camp, for neither myself nor anybody else ever suspected that there was one there. This must therefore be a piece of 'baggage' that I picked up after the war; this was [an] admitted [fact] but I noticed that in my text - although I have the habit of supporting most of my affirmations by references - there was none referring to the gas chamber..."

- Sign exhibited in the gas chamber at Mauthausen (as of April, 1989) reads:

"The Gas Chamber - The gas chamber was camouflaged as a bathroom by sham showers and waterpipes. Cyclone B gas was sucked in and exhausted through a shaft (situated in the corner on the right) from the operating room into the gas chamber. The gas-conduit was removed shortly before liberation on April 4th, 1945."

- During the investigation made of the Mauthausen "gas chamber" by the Leuchter team on April 10, 1989, an official of the museum stated that the explanation printed on the sign about a shaft was wrong. He explained that the gas had actually been inleted through a perforated pipe through an opposite wall. The pipe was no longer there, nor were there any remaining traces of its existence. The official stated that the first explanation provided regarding the operation of the chamber, by inmates who had said that the gas had entered the chamber through the shower heads, had long since been abandoned.

IV Hartheim Castle

- Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945*, New York, Bantam Books, 1975, 610 pp., at p. 178-179:

"Patients slated for killing...were then transferred to one of six 'euthanasia' installations (at Bernburg, Brandenburg, Grafeneck,

Hadamar, Hartheim, and Sonnenstein)...The procedure was pragmatically simple and convincingly deceptive. In groups of twenty to thirty, the patients were ushered into a chamber camouflaged as a shower room. It was an ordinary room, fitted with sealproof doors and windows, into which gas piping had been laid. The compressed gas container and the regulating equipment were located outside. Led into the chamber on the pretext that they were to take showers, the patients were gassed by the doctor on duty."

- No source is given for the description of this procedure.
- Hans Marsalek, "Hartheim, Establishment for Euthanasia and Gassing: Accessory Camp to the KZ (Concentration Camp) of Mauthausen", (abridged version for the Austrian Mauthausen Camp Community, translated by Peter Reinberg). 4 pp. Available at Hartheim Castle. (1989). This pamphlet states that approximately 30,000 people were gassed at Hartheim by "Zyklon B" gas.
- While books written about Mauthausen refer to the gas chamber at Hartheim Castle, very little information is given concerning it. In his above-mentioned 1972 book, P.S. Choumoff states at p. 41, footnote 18 and 19, that people were killed by carbon monoxide gas at Hartheim. Reitlinger, *ibid.*, states at p. 147 that people taken from Dachau "were gassed at Schloss Hartheim". Hilberg, *ibid.*, states at pp. 872-873 that Hartheim was one of several euthanasia stations "equipped with gas chambers and bottled, chemically pure carbon monoxide gas."

V 1988: Jewish Historians Confront the Problem of the Gas Chambers

- Olga Wormser-Migot, *Le Système concentrationnaire Nazi (1932-1945)*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968, 670 pp. The section at pp. 541-545 of this thesis is entitled in French: "The Problem of the Gas Chambers". The author does not believe there were any gas chambers in either Dachau or Mauthausen.
- Lucy Dawidowicz, in *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945*, *ibid.*, does not mention gas chambers or gassings at either Dachau or Mauthausen.
- Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Revised and Definitive Edition, New York, Holmes & Meier, 1985. In this "definitive" three volume work of some 1,274 pages, Hilberg makes no mention of gas chambers or gassings at either Dachau or Mauthausen.
- Arno J. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The "Final Solution" in History*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1988, at p. 362:

"Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable...Most of what is known is based on the depositions of Nazi officials and executioners at postwar trials and on the memory of survivors and bystanders. This testimony must be screened carefully, since it can be influenced by subjective factors of great complexity. Diaries are rare, and so are authentic documents about the making, transmission, and implementation of the extermination policy. But additional evidence may still come to light. Private journals and official papers are likely to surface. Since Auschwitz and Majdanek, as well as the four out-and-out killing centers, were liberated by the Red

Army, the Soviet archives may well yield significant clues and evidence when they are opened. In addition, excavations at the killing sites and in their immediate environs may also bring forth new information."

- Four (4) Drawings: "Baracke X", Dachau Shower room, Dachau Shower room, Mauthausen Alleged Gas Chamber, Hartheim Castle. All prepared for this report by S. Devine, Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc.
- Chemical Analysis - Four (4) samples Prepared by Alpha Analytical Labs For Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc.
- Assorted Photos by Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc./Samisdat/Eugen Ernst
- Sample Log
- Journal