


The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 20, Number 2

www.ihr.org

March/April 2001



Auschwitz in Our Sights

Forensics at Auschwitz, 1945-2001
Germar Rudolf

**Unregistered Inmates: From
Auschwitz to the Reich**
Richard Widmann

— Reviews —

**Real Showers,
Imaginary Gas Chamber**
Samuel Crowell

Beyond Auschwitz
Samuel Crowell

— And More —

Don't Settle for the Disney Version!

The Classic Unraveling of the 'Day of Infamy' Mystery



"... Perhaps the most brilliant and impressive monograph on diplomatic history ever turned out by a nonprofessional student of the subject ..."

— Harry Elmer Barnes

"With all the elements at hand, the reader has the ingredients of a mystery story. There are victims — 3,000 of them in the Pearl Harbor attack. There are a variety of clues. There are a multitude of false leads. There are numerous possible motives. Innumerable obstructions are put in the way of the discovery of truth. Many of the characters betray guilty knowledge."

— From the author's foreword to *Pearl Harbor*

Hailed by scholars Charles Beard, Harry Elmer Barnes and Charles Tansill, George Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* remains unsurpassed as a one-volume treatment of America's Day of Infamy.

Pearl Harbor: The ^{Real} Story of the Secret War

An indispensable introduction to the question of who bears the blame for the Pearl Harbor surprise, and, more important, for America's entry into World War II through the Pacific 'back door.'


In his introduction to this attractive IHR edition, Dr. James Martin comments: "Morgenstern's book is, in this writer's opinion, still the best about the December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor attack, despite a formidable volume of subsequent writing by many others on the subject."

Admiral H. E. Yarnell, former Pearl Harbor naval base commandant, wrote: "Mr. Morgenstern is to be congratulated on marshalling the available facts of this tragedy in such a manner as to make it clear to every reader where the responsibility lies."

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

Quality Softcover. 435 pages. Maps. Source notes. Index. (0978)
\$8.95, plus shipping (\$3.00 domestic, \$6.50 foreign)
California residents must add \$.69 sales tax

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



The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 20, Number 2

March / April 2001

— IN THIS ISSUE —

From the Editor	2
A Brief History of Forensic Examinations of Auschwitz <i>Germar Rudolf</i>	3
The Basement Showers of Crematorium III <i>Samuel Crowell</i>	17
Transfers to the Reich <i>Richard A. Widmann</i>	21
Beyond Auschwitz <i>Samuel Crowell</i>	26
An Exercise in Futility <i>A review by Samuel Crowell</i>	38
Not Quite the Hitler Diaries <i>A review by Mark Weber</i>	40
In the Name of the Holocaust <i>A review by Daniel Michaels</i>	43
D for History, A for Entertainment <i>A review by Scott L. Smith</i>	45
Letters	48

On the Cover: Bombs released over Auschwitz by a U.S. Army Air Force B-24 Liberator on September 13, 1944. While in this photo the bombs bracket crematoria II and III in Birkenau, they were aimed at the Auschwitz industrial complex at Monowitz some three miles to the west and fell well beyond Birkenau. During this raid American ordnance killed and wounded some 300 SS personnel, Jewish inmates, and civilian workers; three B-24s were shot down by German anti-aircraft fire.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the revisionist tradition of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A. J. P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier, and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: \$40 per year, \$65 for two years, and \$90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add \$20 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add \$40 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in U.S. dollars drawable on a U.S. bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

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

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

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

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

Director: Mark Weber
Editor: Theodore J. O'Keefe
Associate Editor: Greg Raven
Assistant Editor: Eric Owens

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

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

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

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Beverly Hills, California

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

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

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

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

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

GERMAR RUDOLF, Dipl.-Chem.
Hastings, England

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

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

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

Authoritative opinion has long held that Auschwitz is emblematic of twentieth century evil, the nexus of a high technology refined and perfected in the interest of a totalitarian regime and a fanatical ideology based on group hatred. So we are informed, with constant certitude and growing stridency, by statesmen and scholars, ecclesiastics and pundits, leaders of the left and the right, Germans and Jews.

Despite the fact that the opprobrium for the alleged extermination of more than a million Jews has steadily expanded from the Nazis to the Germans, to their wartime allies, to the neutrals, to the Catholic Church, to countries annexed or occupied by the Germans, and at last to the leadership of the Allies in the anti-German coalition, since the Second World War only the revisionists have dared ask the question: What are the facts?

This issue of the JHR is largely devoted to up-to-the minute research on the evidence for mass murder at Auschwitz. While revisionists have studied Auschwitz since the 1950s, if anything we often neglect to appreciate the insight and penetration of the pioneers who worked in the Cold War years, at a time when the Auschwitz site and the Auschwitz documents lay inaccessible behind the Iron Curtain. Working from the tiny trickle of arbitrarily selected and sometimes unreliable Auschwitz documents that had reached the West, Arthur Butz, Robert Faurisson, and their colleagues were able to lay the groundwork for the research that has followed the collapse of the Soviet system at the end of the 1980s.

Two methods are on view here. The first is forensic: it seeks to determine, from the best possible scientific and technical analysis, answers to key questions about physical evidence. Reading Gernar Rudolf's scintillating overview of revisionist forensics at Auschwitz, and of the evasive, slovenly, and dishonest efforts of the official authorities there, prompts one to wonder at the incuriosity of the many millions in thrall to Auschwitz. After all, in America as elsewhere, the twentieth century was a forensic century: while adults argued over the merits of Hauptmann's ladder or Oswald's rifle or the killer's DNA in the Lindbergh, Kennedy, and Simpson cases, young people were enthralled by Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes at work over his microscope, or devoured popular literature extolling the myriad capabilities of the FBI's crime laboratory. Rudolf's essay on forensic evidence and gassing at Auschwitz, unrivaled in English for its simplicity, scope, and immediacy, is

required reading not merely for revisionists but for all who understand that forensic evidence is vital in determining guilt or innocence, at Auschwitz and elsewhere.

While the emergence of thousands of new documents from Auschwitz might seem less dramatic than the on-site forensic investigations by Rudolf and Fred Leuchter, the evidence from the archives may ultimately be more telling. Here Samuel Crowell uses an Auschwitz document unearthed by JHR advisor Carlo Mattogno in the Moscow archives to further demolish the significance of a "criminal trace" that Jean-Claude Pressac, erstwhile protege of Serge and Beate Klarsfeld, believed was the "one proof, one single proof" demanded by his former mentor, Robert Faurisson.

Both Crowell and Richard Widmann explore findings from the documents, and from secondary sources, to investigate what actually happened to the Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz and elsewhere. Widmann offers, in a brilliant little essay, a thesis that links the expanding inmate population in the concentration camps of the Reich in 1944 to the numbers of Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz, but never registered as inmates there. Crowell, a fluent reader of Hungarian, uses research from post-Communist Hungary as well as more traditional sources to present an informed and rounded study of the fate of Hungarian Jewish deportees, and to conclude that whatever happened to these Jews, it was not mass extermination at Auschwitz.

This issue isn't all about Auschwitz, to be sure. IHR director Mark Weber exposes some documentary skullduggery on the part of the author of a series of alleged interviews with Gestapo commandant Heinrich Müller. Dan Michaels hails a new study of the World Jewish Congress's blackmail of Switzerland and its banks, and of the American politicians who facilitated it. And, since fictional media are increasingly shaping the public perception of history, Scott Smith signals what will be a larger focus in the JHR by reviewing a film set in Stalingrad.

The attack on the Auschwitz myth merits the last word, however. Crowell's dissection of an academic version of the foolish lamentations over America and Britain's failure, despite a dozen sorties over the camp, to target the alleged gas chambers, says all that need be said on that score. As for bombs over Birkenau, today it's we revisionists who are dropping them, on the Auschwitz legend.

Theodore J. O'Keefe

A Brief History of Forensic Examinations of Auschwitz

GERMAR RUDOLF

“Auschwitz” has come to symbolize the greatest crime in human history. The significance of the alleged murder of a million or more persons, most of them Jewish, by gassing at the German concentration camp of that name has elicited endless discussion among philosophers, theologians, and litterateurs as well as jurists and historians, and evoked numberless platitudes from journalists and politicians. The focus of this article, however, is on the following questions:

1. Should the alleged monstrous crime be subject to careful scrutiny by means of thorough forensic analysis?
2. What forensic examinations of the purported crimes scenes at Auschwitz have been conducted thus far, and with what findings? How are we to assess the results?

The Moral Obligation of Forensic Examination

In late spring 1993, the Max Planck Institute in Stuttgart issued an internal memorandum informing its employees that a doctoral candidate there had been dismissed for research he had done on Auschwitz. The

institute explained that in view of the horror of the National Socialists’ crimes against the Jews, it was morally repugnant to discuss the specific manner in which the victims had been killed, or to try to determine the precise number of the dead. That one of the world’s leading scientific research institutes stated to its personnel that to determine accurate quantities is not only unethical, but reprehensible, and cause for dismissal, is not without its own irony.

Does it really matter just how many Jews lost their lives in the German sphere of influence during the Second World War? Is it so important, after so many years, to attempt painstakingly to investigate just how they died? After all, it is surely morally correct that even one victim is one too many; and nobody seriously denies that many Jews died.

To affirm these things, however, is not to raise a valid objection — moral or otherwise — to the scientific investigation of a crime held to be unique and unparalleled in the history of mankind. Even a crime that is alleged to be uniquely reprehensible must be open to a procedure that is standard for any other crime: namely, that it can be — must be — subject to a

Germar Rudolf had completed his doctoral dissertation in chemistry while working at the renowned Max Planck Institute in Stuttgart, when publication of his forensic study of the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz caused university authorities to forbid him from completing the doctorate. In 1995 Rudolf was sentenced to fourteen months in jail for authoring the Rudolf Report; in the same year all available copies of *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, a collection of up-to-date research on the Holocaust problem, were seized and destroyed by court order (the English-language version, *Dissecting the Holocaust*, can be purchased from IHR). Rudolf edits the revisionist quarterly *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, and is currently seeking political asylum in the United States. He has submitted a lengthy affidavit in support of David Irving’s appeal of the adverse ruling in the Lipstadt trial.

detailed material investigation. Further: whoever postulates that a crime, alleged or actual, is unique must be prepared for a uniquely thorough investigation of the alleged crime before its uniqueness is accepted as fact.

If, on the other hand, someone sought to shield so allegedly unparalleled a crime from investigation by erecting a taboo of moral outrage, the creators of that taboo would, at least morally, themselves commit a singular offense: imputing an unparalleled guilt, beyond any critique and defense, to an entire people, the Germans. To demonstrate just what kind of double standard is being applied to "the Holocaust" (the definition of which usually includes the purposeful annihilation of millions of Jews by the Third Reich), let us note the international reaction to several recent examples of "crimes against humanity." After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, numerous mass graves, containing hundreds of thousands of victims of the Soviets, were discovered and investigated. Not only was the number of victims determined, but in many cases the specific cause of death as well. In the same regions where many of these mass graves were found, one million or more Jews are said to have been shot by the *Einsatzgruppen*: yet no such grave has ever been reported found, let alone dug up and investigated, in the more than half a century during which these areas have been controlled by the USSR and its successor states.

During the conflict in Kosovo in 1999, rumors about mass killings by Serbs spread around the world. After the fighting was over, an international forensic commission arrived in Kosovo, searching, excavating, and forensically investigating mass graves. These graves proved to be not only fewer than the Serbs' Albanian opponents had alleged, but to contain small fractions of the numbers of victims claimed.

Did the Allies attempt, during the war and in the years immediately following, to find and to investigate mass graves of persons said to have been victims of the Germans? So far as is known, only once: at Katyn. But the findings of the Soviet forensic commission, which blamed the mass murder of several thousand Polish officers buried there on the Germans, are today generally considered a fabrication. The report of the international forensic commission invited by the Germans in 1943, on the other hand, which found that the Soviets had carried out this mass murder, is today considered accurate even by the Russian government.

A Definition of Forensic Science

Forensic science is generally seen as a supporting

science of criminology. Its aim is to collect and to identify physical remnants of a crime, and from these to draw conclusions about the victim(s), the perpetrator(s), the weapon(s), and the time and location of the crime, as well as how it was committed, if at all. This science is relatively new, and entered the courtrooms only in 1902, when fingerprint evidence was accepted, in an English court, for the first time. The 1998 CD-ROM *Encyclopaedia Britannica* writes of forensic science:

A broad range of scientific techniques is available to law enforcement agencies attempting to identify suspects or to establish beyond doubt the connection between a suspect and the crime in question. Examples include the analysis of bloodstains and traces of other body fluids (such as semen or spittle) that may indicate some of the characteristics of the offender. Fibres can be analyzed by microscopy or chemical analysis to show, for instance, that fibres found on the victim or at the scene of the crime are similar to those in the clothing of the suspect. Hair samples, and particularly skin cells attached to hair roots, can be compared chemically and genetically to those of the suspect. Many inorganic substances, such as glass, paper, and paint, can yield considerable information under microscopic or chemical analysis. Examination of a document in question may reveal it to be a forgery, on the evidence that the paper on which it is written was manufactured by a technique not available at the time to which it allegedly dates. The refractive index of even small particles of glass may be measured to show that a given item or fragment of glass was part of a particular batch manufactured at a particular time and place.

Hence, forensic research is exactly what revisionists, starting with Robert Faurisson, have called the search for material evidence. The revisionists' demand for such material evidence is entirely consistent with the normal practice of modern law enforcement. And, as is generally acknowledged, forensic evidence is more conclusive than eyewitness testimony or documentary evidence.

Forensic Science and Auschwitz

The 1946 Krakow Auschwitz Trial. In 1945, the Krakow Institute for Forensic Research (*Instytut Ekspertyz Sadowych*) prepared a report on a forensic investiga-

tion of Auschwitz that was submitted in evidence in the 1946 Auschwitz trial in Krakow, Poland.¹ This expert report should be treated with caution, because forensic examinations and judicial procedures under the Communists have been anything but trustworthy, and Poland was in 1945 a Stalinist satellite. One need only point to the example of Katyn, the Soviet account of which was fully endorsed by Poland's Communist regime.²

The Krakow forensic investigators took hair, presumably cut from inmates, and hair clasps from bags found by the Soviets in Auschwitz. Tested for cyanide residues, both hair and clasps showed positive results. Additionally, a zinc-plated metal cover was tested for cyanide and found to have a positive result as well. The Krakow Institute claims that this metal cover once shielded the exhaust duct of a supposed homicidal "gas chamber" at Birkenau.

The tests conducted by the institute were qualitative, not quantitative, analyses. In other words, they could only determine whether or not cyanide was present, not how much of it was there.

As to whether or not homicidal gassing with hydrogen cyanide took place in Auschwitz, these analyses are worthless, for three reasons:

1. There is no way of determining the origin and history of the hair and hair clasps obtained from bags in Auschwitz. Assuming that the analytic results are correct, from a chemical point of view the following can be noted: A positive test for cyanide in human hair proves only that the hair has been exposed to HCN (hydrogen cyanide). But that result does not suffice to establish that the persons from whom the hair came were killed by cyanide. It is a good deal more likely that the hair had already been cut when it was exposed to the gas: in German as well as Allied camps, it was standard to cut off prisoners' hair for hygienic reasons. When hair over a certain length was later recycled,³ it had to be deloused beforehand (often with Zyklon B, the active ingredient of which is hydrogen cyanide). Hence, positive cyanide results from loose hair do not prove human gassings.
2. We face a similar problem with the zinc-plated covers allegedly used to cover the ventilation ducts of the supposed "gas chambers": their exact origin and history is unknown. It would have been much preferable for the Krakow Institute to have analyzed samples from the walls of the alleged "gas chambers" instead of obtaining samples from pieces of metal:

a. Whereas the origin and history of these metal covers was uncertain, the origin and (at least partly) the history of the walls of the morgues allegedly used as "gas chambers" was known.

b. In contrast to cement and concrete, zinc-plated metal covers prevent the formation of stable iron cyanide compounds.⁴ The developing zinc cyanide compounds are relatively unstable and must be expected to vanish in a short period of time.⁵

c. The tendency of porous wall material in moist underground rooms to accumulate and to bind hydrogen cyanide, physically as well as chemically, is hundreds of times higher than that of sheet metal.

d. As a matter of fact, the letter accompanying the samples sent to the Krakow Institute actually mentions that a mortar sample allegedly taken from a so-called "gas chamber" is enclosed as well and should also be tested for cyanide. However, for unknown reasons, the Krakow Institute did not mention this mortar sample in its report, perhaps because it did not show any positive result.

3. There is no evidence that either analysis has been successfully reproduced.

The 1964-1966 Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial. Several expert reports were prepared during the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, the best known being those of the Munich Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History).⁶ However, none of these reports was forensic in nature. They addressed legal, historical, or psychological topics. Throughout this mammoth trial, neither the court, nor the prosecution,⁷ nor the defense⁸ ever suggested that material traces of the alleged crime be secured and investigated. The prosecution had at its disposal numerous statements by eyewitnesses and confessions by perpetrators, and it considered this material entirely sufficient to establish beyond doubt the existence of a program to exterminate Jews in Auschwitz and elsewhere during the Third Reich.⁹ The abundance of such evidence has since been used to argue that the lack of documentary and material evidence was irrelevant.¹⁰ That no material evidence was presented during the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial was freely conceded by the court in its ruling:

The court lacked almost all possibilities of dis-

covery available in a normal murder trial to create a true picture of the actual event at the time of the murder. It lacked the bodies of the victims, autopsy records, expert reports on the cause of death and the time of death; it lacked any trace of the murderers, murder weapons, etc. An examination of the eyewitness testimony was only possible in rare cases. Where the slightest doubt existed or the possibility of confusion could not be excluded with certainty, the court did not evaluate the testimony of witnesses[.]

The 1972 Vienna Auschwitz Trial. Between January 18 and March 10, 1972, two architects responsible for the design and construction of the crematoria in Auschwitz-Birkenau, Walter Dejaco and Fritz Ertl, were put on trial in Vienna, Austria.¹¹ During the trial, an expert report on the possible interpretation of the blueprints of the alleged gas chambers of the Auschwitz and Birkenau crematoria was presented to the court. The report concluded that the rooms in question could not have been gas chambers, nor could they have been converted into gas chambers.¹² Thanks to this first methodologically sound expert report on Auschwitz, the defendants were acquitted.

In Search of Mass Graves. In 1966 the Auschwitz State Museum commissioned the Polish company Hydrokop to drill into the soil of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp and to analyze the samples. It is not known whether this research was done in the context of the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial. The results, however, vanished into the museum's archives: they have never been released, which by itself is revealing enough. Years later, however, several pages from this report were photocopied and sent to the German revisionist publisher Udo Walendy, who published them with commentary in an issue of his periodical.¹³ Traces of bones and hair allegedly found at several places might indicate mass graves. The few pages published by Walendy, however, do not reveal whether these findings led to an excavation or a subsequent forensic study of the traces. It is not even evident whether the bone and hair samples collected are human or animal remains.


Faurisson Pulls the Trigger. It took a professor of French literature to inform the world that determining whether mass murder took place at Auschwitz is a matter for forensic evidence. Robert Faurisson, professor of French, and an analyst of documents, texts, and witness

statements at the University of Lyon 2, began to doubt the standard historical version of the Holocaust after much critical study of the eyewitness testimony and intensive scrutiny of documents said to support the claim of mass murder. Faurisson first asserted the thesis that "there was not a single gas chamber under Adolf Hitler" in 1978.¹⁴ Thereafter he buttressed his position with numerous physical, chemical, topographic, architectural, documentary, and historical arguments. He described the existence of the homicidal gas chambers as "radically impossible."¹⁵ At the end of 1978 *Le Monde*, the leading French newspaper, afforded Professor Faurisson the opportunity to present his thesis in an article.¹⁶

It took almost a decade, however, for the first expert to accept Faurisson's challenge and to prepare the first forensic report on the alleged homicidal "gas chambers" in Auschwitz: Fred Leuchter's now famous report of 1988.¹⁷ The background and history of the Leuchter Report are well known to readers of the *Journal of Historical Review* and need not be repeated here.¹⁸ Suffice it to say that the Leuchter Report was a pioneer work that initiated a series of publications, the scope of which broadened more and more into various fields of forensic science¹⁹ and soon encompassed many interdisciplinary studies of material and documentary evidence.²⁰

Reaction of the Jan Sehn Institute. The reaction of the Krakow Institute which had carried out the faulty 1945 investigation — by 1988 named after the Communist judge who presided during the Polish Auschwitz and Rudolf Höss trials — to the Leuchter Report has caused much confusion in revisionist circles. To this day, many believe that in 1990 four investigators from this institute corroborated the Leuchter Report,²¹ but this is quite incorrect. Clearing up the misunderstanding requires that the post-Leuchter findings of the Krakow Institute be treated in some detail.

A Short Chemical Introduction. To expose the errors of the Krakow investigators requires presenting a little basic chemistry — so basic that equations have been omitted. First of all, until 1979, Zyklon B was the German trademark for a pesticide based on hydrogen cyanide (HCN). As every student of chemistry knows, hydrogen cyanide forms salts, often simply referred to as cyanides. Like hydrogen cyanide itself, these salts are usually highly poisonous. There is one group of cyanides, however, which are not poisonous at all. The best known representatives of this group are the iron cya-



Remnants of Zyklon B, a hydrogen cyanide-based pesticide, are clearly visible even in this black and white photo of a former delousing chamber at the former German concentration camp of Majdanek, in Poland (note dark patches to the right of the door). The staining was caused by the interaction of the cyanide, used to disinfect personal effects, and iron salts present in the walls, to form the compound Prussian blue. This chamber, unlike similar delousing facilities in Auschwitz, is advertised to Majdanek visitors in five languages as a place where humans as well as insects were killed. Yet none of the existing sites at Auschwitz, in which hundreds of thousands are said to have been gassed with cyanide, shows similar staining, or has evinced more than minute traces of cyanide. (Photo of chamber 3, bathing and disinfection facility I, at the Majdanek State Museum, copyright Carlo Mattogno)

nides, especially so-called Prussian blue, a pigment discovered in Prussia a few centuries ago. Every college student of chemistry knows Prussian blue, for one of the more important things a chemist must learn is how to dispose of poisonous cyanide salts without endangering life (including one's own). One simply makes Prussian blue out of it by adding certain iron compounds. Then it can be poured down the sink in good conscience, for Prussian blue is extremely stable and releases no cyanide into the environment.

Understanding the controversy surrounding the Leuchter Report is much easier if one keeps in mind that when hydrogen cyanide and certain iron compounds come together, they form Prussian blue. That is exactly the phenomenon that one can observe when entering the Zyklon B delousing facilities that were used across Europe during the Third Reich. A few of them, for example in the Auschwitz, Birkenau, Majdanek, and Stutthof concentration camps, are still intact today. All these facilities have one thing in common: their walls are permeated with Prussian blue. Not just the inner surfaces, but the mortar between the bricks, and even the outside walls of these delousing chambers abound

in iron cyanides, exhibiting a patchy blue coloration. Nothing of the sort can be observed in the alleged homicidal "gas chambers" of Auschwitz and Birkenau.²²


The iron compounds needed to form Prussian blue are an integral part of all building materials: bricks, sand, and cement always contain a certain amount of rust (iron oxide, usually between 1 and 4 percent). That is what gives bricks their red, or other, color and what makes most sands other, too.

Now, let's examine the way in which the investigators from the Jan Sehn Institute approached the prob-

lem of analyzing and interpreting samples from Auschwitz.

A Lack of Understanding. The team from the forensic institute, Jan Markiewicz, Wojciech Gubala, and Jerzy Labedz, claims not to have understood how it was possible for Prussian blue to have formed in walls as a result of their being exposed to hydrogen cyanide gas: "It is difficult to imagine the chemical reactions and physicochemical processes that could have led to the formation of Prussian blue in that place."²³

There is no shame in not understanding. Actually, this is the beginning of every science: the cognition of not understanding. In pre-scientific ages, humans tended to find mystical or religious answers to unsolved questions; modern scientists approach problems they don't understand, and sometimes can scarcely imagine, as challenges to investigate, in order to understand. This quest for knowledge is the chief driving force of modern humanity. Should we not expect, then, that the Krakow researchers would next have attempted to learn whether Prussian blue can be formed in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide and, if so, how?



The outer wall of a delousing chamber at the former German concentration camp at Stutthof (today Sztutowo, Poland). As with the inside walls of the delousing chamber at Majdanek, the dark patches evident are the result of Prussian blue. The stability of this compound, still present after more than half a century of exposure to the elements, disproves the exterminationist claim that the absence of similar traces of cyanide in the alleged homicidal gas chambers is due to weathering. The fact that the cyanide compound has worked its way through inches of brickwork also gives the lie to the assurance of chemist James Roth, featured in the anti-revisionist movie *Mr. Death*, that hydrogen cyanide can penetrate walls no deeper than ten microns, or roughly one tenth the width of a human hair. (Photo copyright Carlo Mattogno)

More Lack of Understanding. In 1991 Dr. Markiewicz wrote, via a mutual acquaintance, that he was unable to understand how Prussian blue could possibly form in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide. He thought that quite unlikely, and suggested that its presence might stem from a different source, for example from Prussian blue wall paint used to give the interior walls of the delousing chambers a fanciful, patchy blue coloration. (What for?, one is tempted to ask.²⁴) I suggested that he look at the outer surfaces of the walls, which are exposed to environmental influences, and which were partly patchy blue as well. Their color cannot be explained by paint, but only by cyanide compounds spreading to the outside walls over the years, and being converted to Prussian blue. He replied that these blue patches were hard to explain, and first it had to be established that they were indeed Prussian blue.²⁵ So there were even more questions to be answered before these scientists could conduct their analysis.

Disregard of Key Questions. At length, the Polish investigators published an article on their findings, in 1994.²³ Surprisingly, perusing their article reveals that they did nothing to establish whether or not Prussian blue can form in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide. Nothing indicates that they did basic research on the

behavior of cyanide compounds under conditions similar to those in brickwork. Nor did they do anything to establish whether or not the blue patches on the external walls of the delousing chambers were caused by Prussian blue. Should you wonder why, just be patient: it gets even worse.

Ignoring Peer Opinions. Had the researchers found a scientific source which stated in a reliable way that Prussian blue cannot develop in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide, that would have made things easy for them, by rendering any new research obsolete. On the other hand, if they had discovered literature claiming in a scientific way that the formation of Prussian blue in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide was possible, the scientific method would have compelled them to do either of two things: to abandon their position that Prussian blue cannot form thus, or to refute the opposing position by proving

that it cannot form. That is what the scientific process is all about: verification or refutation of theses postulated by peers. Ignoring peer opinions is a strong indicator of unscientific behavior.

In fact, the Krakow researchers quoted one book that deals intensively with the question of Prussian blue formation.²⁶ On consulting it, however, one quickly realizes that it proves the exact opposite of Markiewicz's thesis. The work demonstrates in detail how, and under which circumstances, walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide can indeed form Prussian blue, and that this was not only possible but very likely, at least in the Auschwitz delousing chambers.

Do the Krakow researchers claim that this book shows the opposite? Not at all. In fact, they cite it not to refer the reader to its chemical arguments, but, instead, merely as an example of scientific studies these authors from the Jan Sehn Institute intend to combat with their report. All arguments advanced in the book are simply ignored, while the work is stigmatized as an example of "undesirable science." Let it be recalled that Dr. Markiewicz is a professor, meaning: he professes to adhere to the ideals of science and the scientific method!

Excluding the Unwanted. The authors of the Krakow study ignored all arguments proving them wrong,

although they were certainly aware of them, as they quoted them. They made no attempt to prove or to disprove their own claims. They did nothing to understand what they claimed not to have understood.

Was there a reason for their strange conduct?

The answer is very simple: The researchers wanted to exclude Prussian blue and similar iron cyanide compounds from their analyses. Excluding these compounds can only be justified on the assumption that Prussian blue in the walls of the delousing chambers must have a different origin, e.g. from paint. As the Krakow investigators wrote in their 1994 article:

We decided therefore to determine the cyanide ions using a method that does not induce the breakdown of the composed ferrum cyanide complex (this is the blue under discussion) [.]

What does this mean?

In fact, the exclusion of Prussian blue from analytical detection must result in much lower cyanide traces for the delousing chambers, as non-iron cyanide compounds are not very stable and would therefore hardly be present after fifty years. The same is true for every room ever exposed to hydrogen cyanide. In fact, values close to the detection level must be expected. These are generally so unreliable that a proper interpretation is close to impossible. It can therefore be expected that the analysis of samples tested with such a method would deliver similar results for nearly every sampling of material that is many years old. Such an analysis would make it practically impossible to distinguish between rooms massively exposed to hydrogen cyanide and those which were not: all would have a cyanide residue of close to zero.

Comparison of the order of magnitude of analyses results of different samples

Author:	Markiewicz et al. ²³	Leuchter ¹⁷	Rudolf ²⁷
Detection of:	cyanide without iron cyanides	total cyanide	total cyanide
Delousing chambers:	0-0.8 mg/kg	1,025 mg/kg	1,000-13,000 mg/kg
Alleged gas chamber:	0-0.6 mg/kg	0-8 mg/kg	0-7 mg/kg

I believe that is exactly what the researchers from the Jan Sehn Institute wanted to achieve: values for both the delousing chambers and the alleged homicidal “gas chambers” with similar levels of cyanide residues. This would allow them to state: “The same amount of cyanides, hence the same amount of gassing activity: thus, humans were gassed in the crematoria cellars. Thus, Leuchter is refuted.”

The analyses results of the Krakow report showed just that, and its authors drew the requisite conclusions.

If we examine the analyses results of samples taken by different people, and obtained with different methods of analysis, it is evident that Markiewicz and his co-workers fudged their results by adjusting their method to deliver what they wanted.

If that doesn’t smell like scientific fraud, well ... we aren’t through with the Krakow report yet.

Suppressing Unwanted Results. In 1991, a document leaked out of the Jan Sehn Institute in Krakow into the hands of the revisionists, and was eventually published in their periodicals.²¹ It showed that Dr. Markiewicz and his co-workers had prepared a first report as early as 1990. This report was never published. Its results were discomfiting: although the researchers were already employing their deceptive analytical method, only one of the five samples taken from alleged homicidal gas chambers resulted in an extremely small amount of cyanide (0.024 mg/kg); the rest had no detectable cyanide. On the other hand, samples taken from a delousing chamber showed values up to 20 times higher (0.036-0.588 mg/kg). These results seemed to confirm Leuchter’s findings. Hence, in their 1994 paper, the Krakow investigators suppressed any information about their initial results. Normally, researchers guilty of such unethical conduct are expelled from the scientific community.

Today, most revisionists are aware of the findings revealed in 1991, but not of the later ones published in 1994 that seem to refute Leuchter.

Krakow Guidelines: Not Scientific Truth, but a Political Agenda. In a subsequent correspondence with the Krakow researchers, I asked for a scientific explanation of their method of analysis. I gave them irrefutable proof that Prussian blue can be formed in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide gas, citing a recent case documented in expert literature.²⁸ The authors of the Krakow report were unable to give a scientific reason for their deliberate failure to test for Prussian blue and refused to admit that they had made a mistake.²⁹



The author taking a sample from the door jamb of a delousing chamber in building 5A at Auschwitz-Birkenau. In this case, cyanide residues from repeated use of Zyklon B combined with iron from a corroding hinge to form a particularly bright shade of Prussian blue in the wooden door frame. Under analysis, the wood proved to contain 7,150 mg/kg of cyanide.

Finally, in their article as well as in a letter to me, the Krakow researchers stated that the purpose of their paper was to refute the “Holocaust deniers” and to prevent the whitewashing of Hitler and National Socialism. In other words, their purpose was not the search for truth, but to serve a political end.

Conclusions. To summarize the extremely unscientific and politically biased approach of Markiewicz and his co-workers:

- a. The most important task of a scientist is to try to understand what hasn't been understood. The investigators from the Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research in Krakow did just the opposite: they chose to ignore and to exclude what they didn't understand (the formation of Prussian blue in walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide).
- b. The next important task of a scientist is to discuss other scientists' attempts to understand something. The Krakow team did just the opposite: they chose to ignore and to exclude from discussion all that might let them (and others) understand how Prussian blue can be formed.
- c. These choices allowed them to employ methods that would produce the results desired.
- d. They suppressed whichever results didn't fit their purposes.

- e. Finally, they admitted that the purpose of their research was not to seek truth, but to contribute to the continued disrepute of the long defunct Adolf Hitler.

Therefore, I publicly called, and continue to call, these researchers scientific frauds. There is only one place for their research findings: the garbage. Neither Markiewicz nor his co-workers have ever responded to my accusations. Dr. Markiewicz, who was an expert in technical testing, not a chemist, died in 1997; the remaining two authors have continued to remain silent.

A German Corroboration of Leuchter. In early 1990, a few months after beginning work on my Ph.D. at the Max Planck Institute for Solid State Research in Stuttgart, Germany, I started investigations to verify the chemical claims made in the Leuchter Report: namely, that long-term stable cyanide compounds were still to be expected in the alleged homicidal gas chambers, if the mass gassings with Zyklon B took place in them as claimed by witnesses. Initially I was interested only in finding out whether the resulting compound — iron blue or Prussian blue — is stable enough to survive forty-five years of exposure to harsh environmental conditions. After this was confirmed, I mailed the results to some twenty people I thought might be interested in these results. Subsequently I got in contact with several engineers and lawyers, the former willing to help me in doing forensic research, and the latter primarily interested in using the results for their clients. I made two trips to Auschwitz and did eighteen months of further research until, in January 1992, the first, 72-page long version of the so-called Rudolf Report was distributed to opinion leaders in Germany. Briefly summarized, it corroborates Leuchter's claim that, for several technical and chemical reasons, the mass gassing attested to by witnesses could not have occurred. My report was subsequently updated and enhanced, and finally published in July 1993 as a 120-page paperback booklet.³⁰ Dutch and French versions appeared in 1995 and 1996, but an English version has never been printed. (A short 16-page summary published in summer 1993 is often mistakenly assumed to be a full version of my report.) An updated and enhanced version is currently in preparation; publication is planned for later this year.³¹

Because I can't be the judge of my own work, I will not discuss my own research here. Scientific discussion of my report began with a German book, consisting mainly of unfounded attacks, in 1995.³² The first serious critique to date, unfortunately riddled with ad hominem attacks, has appeared only on the Internet.³³ Its author, Richard Green, is, like me, a chemist with a Ph.D. thesis in physical chemistry. He has made some far-reaching concessions in his critique:

a. In order to kill humans as quickly as attested to by the witnesses, hydrogen cyanide in concentrations similar to those used for delousing procedures is required. Leuchter was frequently attacked by his opponents on the basis that much less poison would have been required to kill humans than to kill lice. Although this is generally true, it does not apply to a scenario in which many hundreds of humans are supposed to have died from this poison within a few minutes.

b. Iron blue (Prussian blue) can indeed be the result of exposing walls to hydrogen cyanide, and, when found in the delousing facilities in Auschwitz and elsewhere, HCN is most likely the cause.

The latter concession obviously destroys the reputation of the Krakow researchers (and their supporters), who summarily declared that the vast amount of iron blue in the walls of delousing facilities must have a different origin, which in turn "allowed" them to exclude it from analysis. Green, however, is undisturbed by this, and still claims that their results ought to be taken as standard by everybody. To my question of why the Krakow investigators had not responded to my inquiries as to their obviously unscientific behavior, Green responded as follows:

Rudolf complains that Markiewicz et al. have not responded to his queries. Why should they do so? What credibility does Rudolf have, that demands they answer his every objection no matter how ill-founded?

Other Forensic Approaches. Chemistry is obviously not the only science to be consulted when it comes to solving the mysteries of Auschwitz. Engineers, architects, physicians, geologists, and other experts can contribute to this, too. Nor does their work stop with trying to decipher the hidden messages of material traces on site. Original wartime documents on the facilities and

events in Auschwitz require the expertise of engineers, architects, physicians, and geologists as well. When it comes to reconstructing the infrastructure of the camp, down to the function and purpose of every building and every room, the technical modes of operation and capacities of its installations, the extent and modernity of the treatment in its hospitals, the effect of the water table of the swamps, most of which can be determined by analyzing the tens of thousands of documents that have been found or released during the last decade, the historian alone simply cannot do the job, nor can I as a chemist.

'No Holes? No "Holocau\$t"'! Ditlieb Felderer was the first to deal intensively with the question of whether or not there were holes in the roof of the alleged homicidal "gas chambers," although he seems not to have published anything about it. Leuchter touched on this topic only superficially in his report. It was this question, rather than whether or not there were still any chemical residues of the poison gas allegedly used, which made me most curious to go to Auschwitz, to search for these holes by myself. On August 16, 1991, while standing on the collapsed roof of the alleged "gas chamber" of crematorium II in Birkenau, I lost my faith in the "Holocaust," because I could find no holes that deserved the name. This I described in detail in my report. In 1994, Robert Faurisson made the famous quip that subtitles this section. Yet it was not until 2000, during David Irving's libel case against Deborah Lipstadt, that the world took notice of the revisionist allegation that no holes can be found in this roof.

Charles Provan has since written an Internet article in which he claims to have refuted this revisionist finding. He did, indeed, find holes in the roof of the morgue of crematorium II.³⁴ But are they the same holes used fifty-five years ago to introduce Zyklon B into the "gas chamber," as claimed by the witnesses? Or are they merely results of the collapsing roof being pierced by the concrete supporting pillars? I am convinced that the latter is the case. My conviction doesn't matter, however. What matters are facts. But how are we to establish facts in such a case?

According to Robert Van Pelt:

In the twenty-five hundred square feet of this one room more people lost their lives than in any other place on this planet. Five hundred thousand people were killed. If you would draw a map of human suffering, if you create a geography of atrocities, this would be the absolute

centre.³⁵

Now, let us consider a somewhat different, but still tragic case. We all know what happens after an airplane crash: hundreds of experts swarm out to retrieve the debris of the accident, in order to assemble it all like a gigantic, three-dimensional jigsaw puzzle. The purpose is to determine the cause of the accident in order to prevent it from happening again. No expense is spared.

Would it not be appropriate to do the same with the morgues of crematoriums II and III in Birkenau? To assemble a staff of hundreds of historians, engineers, architects, and archaeologists to exactly retrieve all the debris of these rooms and to reassemble them, like piecing together a huge puzzle, in order to determine what they really looked like fifty-five years ago? Would it not be logical to attempt to determine what vestiges we have to expect when looking for holes, before ecstatically jumping to conclusions at the mere sight of a crack in the concrete?

During the last few years, I have heard, to my horror, of people walking up to these rooms and breaking off reinforcement bars protruding from cracks or holes,³⁶ or taking shovels and clearing the roof of debris in order to look for holes.³⁷ What would a paleontologist say of someone who wanted to use a shovel to excavate the skeleton of a *Tyrannosaurus rex*? Sometimes one has cause to wonder: Where have all the *homo sapiens* gone? When will people begin to think and act about the Holocaust like wise human beings?

The question of whether or not there were holes in the roof of crematorium II is not a trivial one. If there were none, then it would have been impossible to introduce Zyklon B into the alleged "gas chamber" in the manner claimed by the witnesses — discrediting all those witnesses. Because eyewitness accounts are the sole pillar on which the Holocaust rests, this would sooner or later lead to the collapse of the entire Holocaust story. This, in turn, is no trivial matter. The international order established by the victorious powers after the Second World War rests mainly on the "given" of the Holocaust. The Holocaust is used to control Germany (and hence Europe), to suppress national movements, and to maintain American dominance — to say nothing of the power leftist and internationalist movements derive from it, and the use to which Jewish and Zionist groups put it.

Who, then, wants to know the truth? Wouldn't it be easier to blow up the Auschwitz crematoria and remove the debris once and for all, and be content with the witness accounts?

If revisionist researchers don't do the work of establishing what really took place in Auschwitz, nobody will. Considering our limited means and the legal restrictions placed on us, it might be only realistic to conclude that nobody ever will. Thus all we can do right now is to meticulously map and document the material remains as they are today, from top to bottom, and hope that eventually reason will prevail.

Criminal Traces? The discovery in German wartime documents of ambivalent words for which a sinister meaning can be interpreted is quite common in mainstream historiography on the Holocaust. Jean-Claude Pressac is not the first to have done so, but he is perhaps the most determined, taking it well beyond the bizarre.³⁸ The revisionist responses have been thorough and, for the exterminationists, devastating.³⁹ Revisionist interpretations have been based, on the one hand, on thorough knowledge of the documents dealing with Auschwitz — including Allied air photos — as well as their context, and on expert knowledge in various fields of engineering and architecture on the other.

Exculpatory Traces! That approach, applied to a great number of documents on Auschwitz, has yielded another, even more important result that sheds revealing light on the history of the Auschwitz camp system. Samuel Crowell has unearthed material on air raid shelters built by the SS to protect inmates from Allied air raids. Hans Lamker and Hans Nowak have shown in detail how the SS installed modern (and highly) expensive microwave delousing facilities to protect the lives of inmates.⁴⁰ Together with Michael Gärtner and Werner Rademacher, they are currently working on a comprehensive history of the Auschwitz camp, equipped with all means necessary to ensure the survival of tens of thousands of prisoners: hospitals, dentists, kitchens, laundries, butchers, as well as recreation facilities like sport fields and gardens. Together with the fact that the overall costs of erecting this camp complex were on the order of magnitude of some five hundred million dollars, these facilities clearly contradict an intention by the German authorities to use this camp as an extermination center. There are cheaper ways of killing humans than to spend 500 dollars per capita.⁴¹

The Future of Auschwitz Forensics. Since the dawn of science, scientists have sought the *perpetuum mobile*. They seem never to have noticed that they had found it at the beginning of their search: science itself. So it can be expected that forensic research about Auschwitz will

never cease, especially if one considers the controversial and highly ideological implications of any potential findings. The direction and methods of research, however, are clearly being set by the pioneers in this field, the revisionists, who lack neither the imagination nor the curiosity to discover whether the mass gassing claims of the Holocaust are true, whatever their use for political or financial purposes. The Auschwitz camp system will, as before, be at the very focus of it all.


To name one recent instance, in early 2000 the Australian engineer Richard Krege employed ground penetrating radar in order to locate (or not to locate) mass graves in the vicinity of alleged German extermination camps. A preliminary study was published in my German language revisionist quarterly in early 2000.⁴²

Krege has promised more thorough investigations, together with a proper introduction into this geological method of determining disturbances in the soil beneath our feet. His work is going to break new ground, as Leuchter's work did thirteen years ago. No doubt he will not be the last pioneer to challenge reigning dogmas and taboos.

Conclusions

As they do for all alleged crimes in the historical past, the forensic sciences hold the key to the riddles of Auschwitz. No group with the power to conduct, or else to demand, forensic research on the necessary scale seems willing to do so: on the contrary. Those in power have no stake in changing our view of Auschwitz, and consequently of the Holocaust, and forensic research is liable to do exactly that. Instead, authorities the world over persecute and prosecute those who advocate or attempt such research. This may slow us down, but it will not stop us.

When revisionist researchers achieve a sudden breakthrough through forensic research, they are countered not merely with slander and persecution, but also with academic forgery and professorial deceit, of which the Krakow forensic report is so evident an example. How desperate must they be, the keepers of the flame of the Holocaust legend, to resort to such methods? By



Ground penetration radar (GPR) device used by Australian engineer Richard Krege to search for evidence of mass graves at Treblinka. GPR can detect large-scale disturbances in the soil structure to a normal effective depth of four to five meters or more, and is widely used by geologists, archeologists, and police. Soil examinations carried out over six days at Treblinka in October 1999 by Krege and his team failed to reveal any soil disturbance consistent with mass graves.

guarding the purported graves and “gas chamber” ruins of Auschwitz from scientific inquiry, they risk the burial of their own reputations, and the ruin of the Auschwitz myth. ☹

Notes

1. Published in German by the Dokumentationszentrum des Österreichischen Widerstandes (Documentation Center of the Austrian Resistance) and the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education and Culture, in *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit* (Vienna, 1991), pp. 36-40; the original is in the Auschwitz State Museum.
2. See F. Kadell, *Die Katyn Lüge* (Munich: Herbig, 1991).
3. Letter from the SS Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungshauptamt, Oranienburg, to concentration camp commanders, August 6, 1942, IMT Document 511-USSR, cited in: *Der Prozess gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof* (Nuremberg, 1949), pp. 553f. The letter ordered the recycling of prisoners' hair twenty centimeters or more in length.
4. Zinc prevents the formation of rust, which is required to form long-term stable iron cyanides.
5. Like earth alkaline cyanides, zinc cyanides are slowly decomposed by humidity.
6. H. Buchheim et al., *Anatomie des SS-Staates* (Freiburg: Walter, 1964).
7. Throughout his writings, Adalbert Rückerl, one of the most prominent German prosecutors in “Holocaust

- cases,” dispenses with any mention of material evidence. Instead, he declares documentary evidence the best and most important form of evidence, even in the absence of material evidence for the authenticity and correctness of the documents themselves (in J. Weber, P. Steinbach, eds., *Vergangenheitsbewältigung durch Strafverfahren?* [Munich: Olzog, 1984] p. 77). Rückerl reports that it is practically impossible to find a suspect guilty solely on documentary evidence, so that, especially given the increasing time span separating alleged crimes from trial, it is almost always necessary to fall back on eyewitness testimony, even though its unreliability is clear, particularly in trials of so-called “National Socialist violent crimes” (A. Rückerl, *NS-Verbrechen vor Gericht* [Heidelberg: C. F. Müller, 1984], p. 249; Rückerl, *Nationalsozialistische Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse* [Munich: dtv, 1978], p. 34; Rückerl, *NS-Prozesse* [Karlsruhe: C. F. Müller, 1972], pp. 27, 29, 31.).
8. Such total naiveté, combined with legal incompetence, on behalf of the defense is best exemplified in Hans Laternser, *Die andere Seite im Auschwitzprozess 1963/65* (Stuttgart: Seewald, 1966).
 9. The most prominent advocate of this thesis is Professor Nolte, in his book *Streitpunkte* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1993), pp. 290, 293, 297.
 10. For example, the verdict of the Schwurgericht (jury court) of Frankfurt am Main stated that there was no evidence as to the crime, its victims, the murder weapon, nor even the perpetrators themselves; Ref. 50/4 Ks 2/63; cf. I. Sagel-Grande, H. H. Fuchs, C. F. Rüter, eds., *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen*, vol. 21 (Amsterdam: University Press, 1979), p. 434.
 11. Ref. 20 Vr 6575/72 (Hv56/72); this reference number is different from the one Robert Van Pelt quotes in his report: The Pelt Report, Irving vs. Lipstadt (Queen’s Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, David John Cawdell Irving ./. [1] Penguin Books Limited, [2] Deborah E. Lipstadt, Ref. 1996 I. No. 113; p. 135 n. 59; 20 Vr 3806/64 and 27 C Vr 3806/64).
 12. Personal communication from the expert, who must, for the time being, remain anonymous. See Michael Gärtner, “Vor 25 Jahren: Ein anderer Auschwitzprozess,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (VffG) 1, no. 1 (1997), pp. 24f. (vho.org/VffG/1997/1/Gaertner1.html)
 13. Udo Walendy, *Historische Tatsachen 60* (Vlotho: Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, 1993), pp. 7-10.
 14. Cf. *Mémoire en défense* (Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1980); Serge Thion, ed., *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?* (Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1980) (online: aaargh.vho.org/fran/histo/SF1.html); R. Faurisson, *Écrits révisionnistes*, 4 vols., published by author, Vichy, 1999; see also Faurisson, *Es gab keine Gaskammern* (Witten: Deutscher Arbeitskreis Witten, 1978).
 15. R. Faurisson, “Le camere a gas non sono mai esistite,” *Storia illustrata* 261 (1979), pp. 15-35 (online: aaargh.vho.org/fran/archFaur/RF7908xx2.html); cf. Faurisson, “The Mechanics of Gassing,” *The Journal of Historical Review* (JHR) 1, no. 1 (spring 1980), pp. 23ff. (online: aaargh.vho.org/engl/FaurisArch/RF80spring.html); Faurisson, “The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to Be Physically Inconceivable,” JHR 2, no. 4 (winter 1981), pp. 311ff. (online: vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/2/4/Faurisson312-317.html)
 16. “‘Le problème des chambres à gaz’ ou ‘la rumeur d’Auschwitz,’” *Le Monde*, December 29, 1978, p. 8; see also “The ‘problem of the gas chambers,’” JHR 1, no. 2 (summer 1980), pp. 103-114 (online: ihr.org/jhr/v01/v01p103_Faurisson.html).
 17. F. A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1988 (ihr.org/books/leuchter/leuchter.toc.html).
 18. For Leuchter’s own statement, cf. “Witch Hunt in Boston,” JHR 10, no. 4 (winter 1990), pp. 453-460; “The Leuchter Report: The How and the Why,” JHR 9, no. 2 (summer 1988), pp. 133-139.
 19. To name only a few of the more prominent early publications: J.-C. Pressac, *Jour J*, December 12, 1988, i-x; Pressac in: S. Shapiro, ed., *Truth Prevails: Demolishing Holocaust Denial: The End of the Leuchter Report*, (NY: Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1990); W. Schuster, “Technische Unmöglichkeiten bei Pressac,” *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (DGG) 39, no. 2 (1991), pp. 9-13 (vho.org/D/DGG/Schuster39_2); Paul Grubach, “The Leuchter Report Vindicated: A Response to Jean-Claude Pressac’s Critique,” JHR 12, no. 2 (summer 1992), pp. 248ff. (codoh.com/gcgv/gc426v12.html); Helmut Auerbach, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, letter to Bundesprüfstelle, München, Oct. 10, 1989; Auerbach, November 1989, both published in U. Walendy, *Historische Tatsache 42* (Vlotho: Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, 1990), pp. 32 and 34; see my technical appraisal of Auerbach’s writings in Henri Roques, Günter Anthon, *Der Fall Günter Deckert* (Weinheim: DAGD/Germania Verlag, 1995), pp. 431-435 (vho.org/D/Deckert/C2.html); W. Wegner, “Keine Massenvergasungen in Auschwitz? Zur Kritik des Leuchter-Gutachtens,” in U. Backes, E. Jesse, R. Zitelmann, eds., *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit* (Frankfurt: Propyläen, 1990), pp. 450-476 (vho.org/D/dsdv/Wegner.html, with interpolated critique by the present writer); on this cf. W. Häberle, “Zu Wegners Kritik am Leuchter-Gutachten,” DGG 39, no. 2 (1991), pp. 13-17 (online: vho.org/D/DGG/Haerberle39_2.html); J. Bailer, “Der Leuchter-Bericht aus der Sicht eines Chemikers,” in *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit*, pp. 47-52; cf. E. Gauss (alias G. Rudolf), *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* (Tübingen: Grabert, 1993), pp. 290-293; Gauss, “Che-

- mische Wissenschaft zur Gaskammerfrage,” DGG 41, no. 2 (1993), pp. 16-24 (online: vho.org/D/DGG/Gauss41_2); J. Bailer, in B. Bailer-Galanda, W. Benz, W. Neugebauer, eds., *Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1995), pp. 112-118; cf. my critique “Zur Kritik an ‘Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge,’” in Herbert Verbeke, ed., *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte* (Berchem: Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, 1996), pp. 91-108 (vho.org/D/Kardinal/Wahrheit.html); English: “Critique of ‘Truth and the Auschwitz-Lie’” (online: <http://vho.org/GB/Books/cq/critique.html>); G. Wellers, “Der Leuchter-Bericht über die Gaskammern von Auschwitz,” *Dachauer Hefte* 7, no. 7 (November 1991), pp. 230-241.
20. Most notably the works of the Italian historian Carlo Mattogno, the American historian Samuel Crowell, and a group of South German engineers and architects comprising Michael Gärtner, Hans Lamker, Hans Jürgen Nowak, Werner Rademacher, Gottfried Sänger. For a comprehensive list of their works, enter their names in the search tool of the revisionist online database at www.vho.org/i/a.html.
 21. J. Markiewicz, W. Gubala, J. Labeledz, B. Trzcinska, Prof. Dr. Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research, Department for Forensic Toxicology, Krakow, September 24, 1990; partly published in DGG 39, no. 2 (1991), pp. 18f. (vho.org/D/DGG/IDN39_2.html); English: “An Official Polish Report on the Auschwitz ‘Gas Chambers,’” JHR 11, no. 2 (summer 1991), pp. 207-216 (vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/11/2/IHR207-216.html).
 22. It is a bit different in Majdanek and Stutthof, where rooms that unquestionably served as delousing facilities are claimed to have served as homicidal gas chambers as well. Thus we cannot make the same observation for them as for Auschwitz. However, because the prevailing opinion generally claims that high iron cyanide residues cannot be the results of homicidal gassings — for fallacious reasons unable to be discussed here — it is generally accepted by all sides in this controversy that the blue staining generally originates in the use of these rooms as delousing facilities.
 23. Jan Markiewicz, Wojciech Gubala, Jerzy Labeledz, “A Study of the Cyanide Compounds Content in the Walls of the Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps,” *Z Zagadnien Nauk Sadowych / Problems of Forensic Science* 30 (1994), pp. 17-27 (online: www2.ca.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/orgs/polish/institute-for-forensic-research/post-leuchter.report).
 24. There are no wall paints that contain Prussian blue, because Prussian blue decomposes on fresh plaster (it is unstable in alkaline environments). Thus, nobody could have painted these walls with Prussian blue.
 25. Prof. Dr. Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research, Dept. for Forensic Toxicology, Krakow, letter to W. Wegner, undated (winter 1991/92), signature illegible, but probably Dr. Markiewicz himself, unpublished, partly quoted in: Rüdiger Kammerer, Armin Solms, eds., *Das Rudolf Gutachten: Gutachten über die Bildung und Nachweisbarkeit von Cyanidverbindungen in den “Gaskammern” von Auschwitz* (London: Cromwell Press, 1993) (vho.org/D/rga/krakau.html).
 26. E. Gauss (alias G. Rudolf), *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* (Tübingen: Grabert, 1993); on the chemistry involved here, cf. pp. 163ff., 290-294 (vho.org/D/vuez/v3.html#v3_4 and [~/v5.html#v5_5](http://vho.org/D/vuez/v5.html#v5_5)).
 27. G. Rudolf, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, 2nd ed. (Hastings, Eng.: Castle Hill Publishers, 2001).
 28. A construction damage case occurred in 1976 in Bavaria (Meeder-Wiesenfeld), when a recently plastered church was fumigated with Zyklon B. After several months the plaster was covered with blue patches formed by Prussian blue. See Günter Zimmermann, ed., *Bauschäden Sammlung*, vol. 4 (Stuttgart: Forum-Verlag, 1981), pp. 120f.; reprint in Ernst Gauss (alias G. Rudolf), ed., *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (Tübingen: Grabert, 1994), pp. 401ff.; (codoh.com/inter/intgrgauss.html); English: vho.org/GB/Books/dth/fndwood.html). Furthermore, every one of the delousing facilities of the former concentration camps in eastern Europe that is still standing today has developed enormous amounts of Prussian blue throughout the walls, cf. my report, note 25 above (vho.org/D/rga/prob9_22.html and following pages); Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *KL Majdanek: Eine historische und technische Studie* (Hastings, Eng: Castle Hill Publishers, 1998) (vho.org/D/Majdanek/MR.html); Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *Das Konzentrationslager Stutthof und seine Funktion in der nationalsozialistischen Judenpolitik* (Hastings, Eng: Castle Hill Publishers, 1999) (vho.org/D/Stutthof/index.html).
 29. G. Rudolf, “Leuchter-Gegengutachten: Ein Wissenschaftlicher Betrug?,” DGG 43, no. 1 (1995), pp. 22-26 (vho.org/D/Kardinal/Leuchter.html); Engl.: vho.org/GB/Books/cq/leuchter.html); G. Rudolf and J. Markiewicz, W. Gubala, J. Labeledz, “Briefwechsel,” *Sleipnir* 1, no. 3 (1995), pp. 29-33; reprinted in Verbeke, ed., *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 86-90 (online: as above).
 30. Kammerer, Solms, eds., *Das Rudolf Gutachten* (vho.org/D/rga/). For background, history, and consequences of my report, see W. Schlesiger, *Der Fall Rudolf* (London: Cromwell, 1994) (online: vho.org/D/dfr/Fall.html); English: *The Rudolf Case* (vho.org/GB/Books/trc); and Verbeke, ed., *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte* (vho.org/D/Kardinal/); English: *Cardinal Questions about Contemporary History* (vho.org/GB/Books/cq/); cf. “Hunting Gernar Rudolf,” vho.org/Authors/RudolfCase.html.
 31. This large-format, 350 pp. hardcover book may be ordered for \$30. at www.tadp.org or by writing to Theses & Dissertations Press, PO Box 64, Capshaw, AL 35742.
 32. J. Bailer, in B. Bailer-Galanda, W. Benz, W. Neugebauer, eds., op. cit. (see note 19 above); see my answer to this, “Zur Kritik an ‘Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge’”/“Critique

- of Truth and the Auschwitz-Lie,” in Herbert Verbeke, ed., *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte*. Even less sophisticated: B. Clair, “Revisionistische Gutachten,” VffG 1, no. 2 (1997), pp. 102-104 (vho.org/VffG/1997/2/Clair2.html); my answer: “Zur Kritik am Rudolf Gutachten,” *ibid.*, pp. 104-108 (vho.org/VffG/1997/2/RudGut2.html); further, La Vieille Taupe/Pierre Guillaume, “Rudolf Gutachten: ‘Psychopathologisch und Gefährlich’: Über die Psychopathologie einer Erklärung,” VffG 1, no. 4 (1997), pp. 224f. (vho.org/VffG/1997/4/Guillaume4.html). Robert Van Pelt did not discuss my report, but preferred to repeat and aggravate Pressac’s errors: *op. cit.* (see note 11 above); cf. G. Rudolf, “Gutachter und Urteilsschelte,” VffG 4, no. 1 (2000), pp. 33-50 (vho.org/VffG/2000/1/Rudolf33-50.html); more exhaustively, in English, vho.org/GB/c/GR/RudolfOnVanPelt.html and [.../CritiqueGray.html](http://vho.org/GB/c/GR/RudolfOnVanPelt.html).
33. Richard J. Green, “The Chemistry of Auschwitz,” May 10, 1998, holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/, und “Leuchter, Rudolf and the Iron Blues,” March 25, 1998, holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/blue/, with considerable proselytizing “anti-fascist” bias. A detailed description of the deficiencies of the paper appeared in “Das Rudolf Gutachten in der Kritik, Teil 2,” VffG 3, no. 1 (1999), pp. 77-82 (vho.org/VffG/1999/1/RudDas3.html); English.: “Some Considerations about the ‘Gas Chambers’ of Auschwitz and Birkenau,” vho.org/GB/Contributions/Green.html; for the response see: Richard J. Green, Jamie McCarthy, “Chemistry is Not the Science,” May 2, 1999, holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/not-the-science/. About 50 percent of the article consists of political accusations and vilification. For a response, see G. Rudolf, “Character Assassin,” online: vho.org/GB/Contributions/CharacterAssassins.html.
 34. Charles D. Provan, “No Holes? No Holocaust?: A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller I of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau” (www.revisingrevisionism.com)
 35. Van Pelt’s testimony in Errol Morris’s documentary film *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.*
 36. As did at least one revisionist, in spring 1996, on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II.
 37. As did an engineer named Barford; his colleagues are assisting in the conservation and restoration of the camp for the Auschwitz Museum administration. He informed David Irving of this.
 38. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (NY: Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989); *Les Crématoires d’Auschwitz: la Machinerie du meurtre de masse* (Paris: CNRS, 1993).
 39. For criticisms of Pressac’s first book, see R. Faurisson, JHR 11, no. 1 (spring 1991), p. 25ff.; JHR 11, no. 2 (1991), p. 133ff. (French: www.lebensraum.org/english/04.adobe.faurisson/pressac.pdf); F. A. Leuchter, *The Fourth Leuchter Report* (Toronto: Samisdat, 1991) (www.zundelsite.org/english/leuchter/report4/leuchter4.toc.html); for a criticism of Pressac’s second book see: Herbert Verbeke, ed., *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten* (Berchem: VHO, 1995), pp. 101-162 (online: vho.org/D/anf/; English: *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, vho.org/GB/Books/anf/; for a criticism of the principles underlying Pressac’s methodology, see G. Rudolf, “Gutachten über die Frage der Wissenschaftlichkeit der Bücher *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* und *Les Crématoires d’Auschwitz. la Machinerie du meurtre de masse* von Jean-Claude Pressac,” in Schlesiger, *Der Fall Rudolf* (vho.org/D/dfr/Fall.html#Gutachten); English: see vho.org/GB/Books/trc#expert-report; see also Pierre Guillaume’s criticism, *De la misère intellectuelle en milieu universitaire*, B.p. 9805, 75224 Paris cedex 05, 1995 (aaargh.vho.org/fran/archVT/vt9309xx1.html). See also S. Crowell’s various writings and Matogno’s responses to them, referenced at www.vho.org/i/a.html, as well as the upcoming English version of my report, which will include a summary of this topic.
 40. H. Nowak, “Kurzwellen-Entlausungsanlagen in Auschwitz,” VffG 2, no. 2 (1998), pp. 87-105; English version in Gauss, ed., *Dissecting the Holocaust* (Capehart, AL: Theses & Dissertations Press, 2000), pp. 311-324; H. Lamker, “Die Kurzwellen-Entlausungsanlagen in Auschwitz, Teil 2,” VffG 2, no. 4 (1998), pp. 261-273; see also Mark Weber, “High Frequency Delousing Facilities at Auschwitz,” JHR 18, no. 3 (May-June 1999), pp. 4-12.
 41. W. Rademacher, M. Gärtner, “Berichte zum KL Auschwitz,” VffG 4, no. 3-4 (2000), pp. 330-344.
 42. R. Krege, “Vernichtungslager Treblinka — archäologisch betrachtet,” VffG 4, no. 1 (2000), pp. 62-64.

The Basement Showers of Crematorium III

SAMUEL CROWELL

Well before the Second World War ended, the claim that the Nazis lured their victims into gas chambers under the pretense that they were entering showers was widely reported in the press. This linkage of showers and gassing is probably one reason why Allied soldiers, finding naked bodies in the camps, simply assumed that these were gassing victims, although we now know that typhus victims were stripped after death in order to burn the clothing and destroy the typhus-bearing lice.

Nonetheless the linkage of showers and gas chambers enabled Jean-Claude Pressac to argue, in his 1989 book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, that an inventory sheet in the transfer documents from the building office to the camp administration which listed “14 shower heads” [Brausen] for one of the basement rooms of crematorium III at Birkenau proved that that crematorium had housed a gas chamber. Pressac assumed the shower heads were fake, but, as Robert Faurisson was perhaps the first to note, that was simply presumptuous: the inventory specified “shower heads,” not “fake showers.”

Pressac offered another document regarding showers in crematorium III in *Auschwitz*. This was a telegram dated May 14, 1943, from Karl Bischoff, the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office, to Kurt Prüfer, the head engineer for Topf & Sons, which built the crematorium ovens and sought to provide other products to the camp as well. It reads:

Bring Monday [May 17] rough plan for production of hot water for about 100 showers. Fitting of heating coils or boiler in the waste incinerator at present under construction crem. III or system using the high temperatures of the flue gases. It would be possible to raise the brickwork of the furnace to take a large tank. Herr Prüfer is requested to bring the relevant drawings on Monday 15/5. Sig. Bischoff

The standard explanation of this document has been that the SS planned to install showers after they had completed their program of gassing and burning their enemies. As Carlo Mattogno has argued, however, this does not very well explain why the telegram is marked “Urgent” (dringend).

Pressac’s commentary on this document is worth quoting:

In this telegram, Jährling requested the urgent study of an installation to obtain hot water from the waste incinerator of Krematorium III, then under construction, to supply about one hundred showers (probably to be located in an annex building built on the southern wall of the Krematorium). Prüfer was supposed to bring the relevant drawings with him on the 17th of May. [This plan was never implemented, although such installations were built in other

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

camps, for example in the crematorium of K L Natzweiler (Struthof) where the incinerator was the main source of heat for the showers.] Although this request for a hot water system for a hundred NORMAL showers was in no way criminal, it was recorded in the Krematorium III worksite 30a, file under the heading "SONDERMASSN [AHMEN] / SPECIAL MEASURES" because the building was connected with these measures, the killing and cremation of Jews unfit for work." [emphases in original]

This interpretation is incorrect in all respects. The telegram to Topf & Sons is part of a longer report, in four parts, that is contained in the Auschwitz Central Construction Office files, now archived in Moscow.

The report commences with a cover letter from Bischoff to Kammler which begins:

Auschwitz, am 16.5.1943

Bftgb.[correspondence number] 28 941/43/Eg/
Lm Betr.[re]: Sondermassnahme für die Verbesserung der hygienischen Einrichtungen im KGL-Auschwitz

In English: "Special Measure for the Improvement of Hygiene at the POW Camp Auschwitz," that is, Birkenau.

The text of the letter begins: "Attached hereto is a report on the measures carried out to date for the improvement of the hygienic facilities in the POW camp."

There follows a two-page report that is headed: "Report on measures completed for the implementation of the special program ordered by the SS-Brigadeführer and Major General of the Waffen-SS, Dr. Ing. Kammler"

The report dates the particular special program to May 12, 1943, and lists seven categories of activity, including work on the sewage treatment plant, cutting the King's Ditch (Königsgraben, the main drainage ditch at Birkenau) through to the Vistula, work on the lavatories (Abortbaracken), washing barracks, and so on.

The sixth listing is particularly relevant:

Disinfection Station

For the disinfection of the prisoners' clothing in the several parts of BA [Bauabschnitt: i.e., Birkenau sector — ed.] II an Organization Todt disinfection station is envisioned. In order to achieve a complete bodily delousing for the

prisoners, both of the existing baths for prisoners in BA I will be equipped with hot water heaters and boilers, so that there will be hot water for the existing showers. It is further planned to run heating pipes from the incinerator at crematorium III, to be used for the water in the showers to be set up in one of the basements of crematorium III.

The report is dated May 16, 1943, as is the covering letter. Next, we have a copy of the telegram sent to Prüfer, dated May 14, 1943, supplementing the previous report.

Finally, we have a further three-page report, dated May 13, 1943, which details the job assignments for the "special measures," now referred to as an "emergency program" (Sofortprogramm). Paragraph 9 reads as follows:

Civilian worker Jährling is to carry out the construction of the hot water heaters and boilers in the washing barracks, as well as the showers in the undressing room of crematorium III. SS-Sturmbannführer Bischoff still needs to talk to the camp commandant, SS-Obersturmbannführer Höss, about the showers. For the delousing ovens the SS-WVHA has still to send an Organization Todt drawing.

Note that Bischoff refers to himself in the third person here: because this letter comes three days before the report of May 16, we feel it is safe to conclude that Bischoff had authorization from Höss by that time. Matogno has added a few more points to the question whether or not the showers under discussion were fake or genuine, by referring to two more documents strongly suggesting that they were genuine indeed:

On June 5, 1942, Topf sent Drawing D60446 to the Zentralbauleitung "regarding the installation of the boilers in the rubbish incinerator." This project also involved the installations for crematorium II. In an undated "questionnaire" apparently written in June 1943 regarding the Birkenau crematoriums, in answer to the question "Are the exhaust gases utilized?" the head of the Zentralbauleitung, Bischoff, responded: "Planned but not carried out," and in response to the following question: "If yes, to what purpose?" Bischoff answered, "for bath facilities in crematorium II and III."¹

On the basis of the above report, which is put into

Crematorium I

Bezeichnung	Quantität	Notizen
Kügel-Lampen		
Teller-Lampen		
Hand-Lampen		
Lamp. o. Kug. u. Tel.		
Armaturen		
Leister		
Laternen		
Ofen - eiserne		
Ofen - Kacheln		
Ofen - email.		
Ofen - Metall.		
Ofen - Kessel.		
Taschb. Komp.		
Taschb. o. Gyl.		
Kaschb. eintrag.		
Klosettbecken		
Stocker		
Fliesen		
Kapthöhle		
etc. Tischstühle		
Reiserbehälter		
Brunnen		

Bezeichnung Nr.:
42. 102
Abgangsbuch
aus 1943
1. 1. 1943
2. 1. 1943
3. 1. 1943
4. 1. 1943
5. 1. 1943
6. 1. 1943
7.
8.
9.
10.
 1. reifendhand
 2. Flur
 3. Abort
 4. Aschraum
 5. Eingang

Zusammen: *Matthias*
 für Leister der Zentralbeuleitung
 d. r. Leister des Zentralbeuleitung
 - 3. turbebau. Leiter - *BA*

Der Lagerkommandant: *Matthias*
 Der Verwaltungsführer: *Matthias*
 44 - Standortverwaltung
 Untereinanderverwaltung
 Betriebsb. u. Anst. Helle

This document (BW 30/43, p. 24, in the files of the Auschwitz State Museum) is alleged by researcher Jean-Claude Pressac to have contained "criminal traces" of homicidal gassing at crematorium III in Auschwitz-Birkenau. It is in fact an inventory of plumbing and electrical fixtures in the crematorium as of June 24, 1943, the date the Auschwitz camp administration took over the crematorium from the camp construction office. The inventory includes fourteen shower heads (14 Brausen), but mentions nothing of the "dummy" shower heads that Pressac alleges it evidences. Surely evil has never been so banal.

context thanks to the work of Matogno, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1) The fourteen shower heads mentioned in the June 24, 1943 transfer documents for crematorium III were genuine.

To support the argument that the fourteen shower heads in the transfer documents were fake, it would be necessary to conclude that real showers were planned, but then a month later were replaced with fake ones. Indeed, the traditional narrative holds that morgue I of crematorium II had been used for two months before this report to gas people in a room equipped with fake shower heads. Because crematorium III was supposed to have a comparable function, it would mean that morgue I of crematorium III was originally meant to have fake showers, then real ones, and then fake ones again. This is not believable.

2) "Undressing rooms" are meant in the ordinary mortuary sense, not in any special sense.

Bischoff originally suggested the location of the showers in an undressing room, which means that the

room was understood to be an undressing room before the showers were contemplated. This can only mean that the word "undressing room" is being used in an ordinary mortuary sense, that is, as a space where bodies are cleaned and prepared before burial, or in this case, cremation.

3) The implementation of hygienic measures took precedence over any other alleged purposes for the crematorium cellars.

The traditional narrative holds that the crematoriums were built to destroy the traces of persons who would be murdered in the cellars with poison gas. But the report leaves no doubt that, for the sake of camp hygiene, this undocumented, allegedly intended purpose of the crematoriums was going to be suspended so that the camp population could take hot showers.

4) The crematoriums were going to be used to provide ad hoc hygienic measures, before the completion of the Central Sauna (BW 32, which was opened at the beginning of 1944), and possibly at times of high traffic thereafter.

In this case, at minimum, it was intended to use the basement spaces of crematorium III to provide ad hoc showers for the camp population, and it is known that fourteen showers were installed. We note again that Mattogno has cited documents from June 1943 which indicate that the water for the showers was not heated in the manner Bischoff envisioned in this report, and that the plans for installing showers covered both crematoriums II and III. This suggests that the fourteen showers in morgue 1 were not heated, or were heated by other means. Mattogno's data also suggest that crematorium II may also have been equipped with showers at this time, or even before. The fact that showers were not mentioned on the transfer documents for crematorium II could be explained by the fact that the showers were not originally planned for these structures, but were improvised. In addition, while crematorium III was handed over to the camp authorities in late June, that is, after Bischoff's report, crematorium II was officially transferred to the camp authorities at the end of March 1943, so any inventory document of that time could simply not include items added afterwards.

5) Bischoff's telegram to Prüfer was overly ambitious and probably deliberately so.

The overall thrust of the report is that Bischoff wished to reassure Kammler that, despite the delays in construction, work was proceeding energetically to solve all the issues related to camp hygiene. Our surmise is that showers never could have been installed, but it made an impressive figure to report to Kammler, by way of a copy of the telegram to Prüfer. It also appears that Bischoff seemed to waver on the location: one hundred showers would make most sense in the largest morgue (morgue 2, the "undressing room"). But in the end a smaller number of showers was installed in the smaller morgue. The modest number of showers actually installed could also be explained by the failure to exploit the high volume source of thermal energy that the incinerator would have provided.

6) The dual use of the crematoriums for hygienic purposes may have included the installation of ad hoc disinfestation stations.

The apparent plan to temporarily install Topf hot air delousing facilities in crematorium II fits with the fact that showers were actually installed at the same period of time. Facing tremendous hygienic problems, the camp authorities obviously attempted to convert the basements of the crematoriums into a hygiene center with inmate showers and delousing facilities for their clothes.

In sum, the Bischoff report of May 16, 1943, settles

once and for all the question of whether or not the showers in crematorium III were real. It also strongly supports the idea that the crematoriums were equipped with temporary delousing and disinfection facilities in the spring of 1943, which revisionists have argued for years. The revelations in the Bischoff report also clearly contradict the idea that these same basements were used to gas thousands of prisoners or that the crematoriums were built for the purpose of exterminating the camp population. 

Notes

1. Mattogno's documents concerning the possible use of hot air delousing facilities and showers in the crematoriums are described in "Leichenkeller von Birkenau: Luftschutzräume oder Entwesungskammern," in *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsschreibung* 4, no. 2 (2000), pp. 152-158.

Transfers to the Reich

The Unregistered Inmates of Auschwitz

RICHARD A. WIDMANN

Orthodox historians of the Holocaust have long maintained that most Jews who arrived at Auschwitz, and were not soon registered as inmates there, met a quick end in the gas chambers. Typical of the prevailing view is the opinion of Yisrael Gutman, chairman of Yad Vashem's Academic Committee, that "more than one million Jews were murdered in the gas chambers [of Auschwitz] on arrival and their bodies incinerated in the camp's crematoriums without the victims ever being registered."¹

Revisionist scholars have long disputed the claim that Auschwitz arrivals who were not registered as inmates were sent immediately (or any time thereafter) to the gas chambers. Lately, Swiss researcher Jürgen Graf has addressed the matter in this journal.² Similarly, Germar Rudolf has recently challenged Wolfgang Benz and Serge Klarsfeld on the fate of unregistered detainees of Auschwitz.³

Interestingly, a number of orthodox historians of the Holocaust have also advanced alternative explanations of the fate of unregistered Auschwitz detainees. Shmuel Krakowski, the chief archivist of Yad Vashem, Israel's national memorial to the Holocaust, states:

The Germans did not register the prisoners who were sent to quarantine; nor did they com-

pile statistical data on the number of prisoners sent there. Those who were transferred to other concentration camps were not registered, either. Only those prisoners who were selected for work in the Auschwitz satellite camps were registered and tattooed with Auschwitz concentration camp numbers.⁴


Danuta Czech, former head of the research department of the Auschwitz Museum, explains,

The separate section of Camp B-IIe for unregistered male and female Jews, Camp B-IIc, and Section B-III (Mexico) are referred to in camp documents as the so-called Auschwitz II Transit Camp. The female Jews without numbers are referred to in the camp records as "transit Jews."⁵

Holocaust historian Gerald Reitlinger, author of *The Final Solution*, has also noted that "... very large groups of Jews in 1944 stayed in the camp without registration, awaiting transfer elsewhere, and they stayed long enough to die of epidemics."⁶ The issue is really not *whether* unregistered inmates were transferred elsewhere but rather just *how many* were transferred.

Given the gaps in the available documentary record,

Richard A. Widmann was educated at Rutgers University and Seton Hall University, from which he holds a degree in quantitative analysis. He has published over forty revisionist articles in books, journals, and newsletters around the world. Since 1995 he has been editor of the website of the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust.



The chief concentration camps on the territory of the Greater German Reich. By mid-1944, most of these camps, including Auschwitz, controlled dozens of sub-camps, in which inmates worked in manufacturing, mining, agriculture, and other types of industry.

computing the numbers of unregistered transferees is not a simple operation. Studying the inmate population statistics from the records of the concentration camp system, however, allows a strong inference as to the numbers and origins of transfers to Reich camps in 1944. The numbers of registered inmates for the entire concentration camp system during the years of Auschwitz's existence are known. Analyzing the data for all camps, we find that the system averaged around 100,000 inmates in 1941 and 1942. By August of 1943, the numbers had doubled to 220,000. They continued to rise, reaching 520,000 by August of 1944. In January 1945, when Auschwitz was abandoned, the population of the concentration camp system was recorded as 710,000 inmates.⁷ Among the camp population statistics for Auschwitz alone are: August 1943, 74,000; August 1944, 105,168; January 1945, 67,000.⁸

In the period from 1944 to 1945, when the entire camp system population grew dramatically (five to seven times the 1942 population), large numbers of inmates were being transferred from the east to the west. Initially, these transferees were non-Jewish:

Declaration of the Reich territory as "Judenfrei" precluded the transfer of Jewish Auschwitz prisoners to camps inside Germany. Since the prohibition did not apply to non-Jewish prisoners, many non-Jews, especially Poles, were moved to camps in the German interior.⁹

This situation would change by the spring of 1944, when large numbers of Jews were transferred to concentration camps in the Reich. Dr. Franciszek Piper, head of the Department of Historical Research at the Auschwitz Museum, has acknowledged that "The subsequent lifting of the prohibition [of sending Jews to the Reich] in the spring of 1944 marked the onset of mass transfers of manpower surpluses into the Reich. A new category of prisoners was established. These prisoners were not assigned serial numbers."¹⁰ It is from this time, the spring of 1944, that Auschwitz "became the center for the distribution of Jewish labor for the entire network of concentration camps."¹¹

Arno Mayer noted, in his analysis of the "final solution," that while huge numbers of Jews were being delivered to Auschwitz-Birkenau:

... thousands of others were being shipped out by train to camps in Germany, including Buchenwald, Dachau, Flossenbürg, and Sachsenhausen. These evacuations were part of the frantic effort to remove valuable labor and incriminating evidence from the path of the Red Army. During the second half of 1944 about 400,000 foreigners were forcibly taken to Germany, most of them from the east and a large number of them Jews.¹²

We know as well that at this time Hermann Göring and Albert Speer, desperate to increase the output of fighter planes, proposed a plan to build an impregnable underground factory at Auschwitz. On April 7, 1944, Hitler offered to urge Heinrich Himmler to help procure the necessary manpower by impressing 100,000 Hungarian Jews. On May 11, Himmler notified Oswald Pohl, who was responsible for administering the concentration camp system, that Hitler had ordered 10,000 Waffen-SS troops be detached "to guard the 200,000 Jews ... [about] to be transferred to the Reich's concentration camps for assignment to large construction projects of the Todt Organization or to other essential war work."¹³

A notable indicator of the policy of transfers to the west is the case of famous diarist Anne Frank. Anne Frank and her family were deported to Auschwitz on September 5, 1944. Anne and her sister Margot were transferred from the transit camp in Auschwitz II to Bergen-Belsen on October 28, 1944, along with some 1,300 other female Jews.¹⁴ It is worth considering that during this span of seven weeks that the Frank sisters were transferred from the Netherlands all the way to Auschwitz on the Polish border, only to be sent nearly all the way back, to Bergen-Belsen, two or three hours from the Dutch border.

As stressed in recent articles by Graf and Arthur Butz, the deportations of Hungarian Jews are an extremely important element of the extermination thesis. The transfer of Hungary's Jews represents the largest single group to be deported in 1944. We now know that while some of the Hungarian Jews were retained to work in Auschwitz itself, large numbers were dispersed to over 386 camps, the great majority of these in the concentration camp system within the German Reich.¹⁵ The largest groups were sent to Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, Dachau, Gross Rosen, Gunskirchen, Mauthausen, Neuengamme, Ravensbrück, and Sachsenhausen.¹⁶

In this connection it is perhaps worth reminding

that, by the summer of 1944, the alleged extermination centers in the east (excluding Auschwitz) were no longer in operation (see table 1). Auschwitz had become, in Franciszek Piper's words, "a center for distribution of Jewish labor." It is also clear, as Shmuel Krakowski concedes, that Jews sent to other concentration camps via Auschwitz were not registered as they awaited transfer from Auschwitz. It is thus safe to say that many Jews who were deported to Auschwitz were never registered until their arrival in the western camps.

Table 1. Duration of operation of six alleged "extermination camps"

Camp	Beginning Date	Ending Date
Belzec	December 1941	December 1942
Chelmno	December 1941	March 1943
Treblinka	July 1942	August 1943
Sobibor	May 1942	October 1943
Majdanek	November 1941	July 1944
Auschwitz	June 1940	January 1945

At this time, we shall accept, as a provisional figure for the unregistered inmates of Auschwitz (disregarding his estimation of their fate), the figures offered by Reitlinger. Reitlinger claims "550,000 to 600,000 may have been gassed on arrival."¹⁷ We find that Jean-Claude Pressac corroborates this estimate; Pressac suggests that 630,000 victims were gassed.¹⁸ We shall assume the higher of these estimates and analyze Pressac's figure of 630,000 unaccounted for at Auschwitz.

If we return to the camp system statistics, we find that, by assuming the 630,000 unaccounted-for inmates of Auschwitz arrived evenly throughout the months of April 1944 through January 1945, we arrive at an average number of 70,000 ($630,000 \div 9$) transferees per month. Clearly some portion of these transferees died en route to their destination camps in the west. A precise estimate of the number who died in this fashion is difficult to determine. In some cases, trainloads arrived without any casualties. In other cases, the numbers were significant. If we assume that on average 1 percent of the transferees died en route to their final destination, that leaves 623,700 ($630,000 - 6,300$) transferees from Auschwitz still unaccounted for.

Looking at the camp system population statistics,

we know that 280,000 inmates were registered in April of 1944. We know that in August of 1943 the total system death rate was 2.09 percent.¹⁹ An analysis of the number of prisoners who died at Dachau shows no major increases in the number of casualties until July 1944. The numbers jump again in November of 1944 and remain high throughout 1945.²⁰ Attempting to model this pattern, I have applied a conjectured death rate starting at 2 percent in April of 1944 and increasing to 5 percent by January of 1945. Using these statistics, we arrive at a total camp system population of 707,949 by the end of January 1945 (280,000 + (630,000 - 6300) - 195,751) (see table 2). Recall that the total camp population reached 710,000 in January of 1945.

The statistics bear out that 630,000 transferees can be and in all probability were absorbed into the overall camp statistics. As Jews and others were being trans-

ferred to Auschwitz, many were held as unregistered detainees. By May 1944, large numbers of unregistered inmates were being transferred back into the Reich.

Clearly the extermination thesis is not the only possible solution to the question of the fate of unregistered prisoners at Auschwitz. Indeed, it seems much more likely, based on the statistics of the camp system and the above analysis, that unregistered arrivals at Auschwitz were deported or transferred to other camps. While a large number of these transferees died in those camps, their deaths there were for the most part recorded and have long been accounted for in the official literature. Thanks to the faulty methods of the official historians, there has resulted a double counting of these victims: once as unregistered "victims" at Auschwitz, and once at the camps in the Reich, where many deportees actually perished. ☹

Table 2. Actual Concentration Camp System Population Statistics, in Light of Assumed Transfers of Unregistered Inmates from Auschwitz

Month	Start	Pop. Transfers	Deaths en route	Total Pop.	Death Rate	Total Deaths	End Pop.
Apr	280,000	70,000	700	349,300	.02	6,986	342,314
May	342,314	70,000	700	411,614	.02	8,232	403,382
Jun	403,382	70,000	700	472,682	.02	9,454	463,228
Jul	463,228	70,000	700	532,528	.03	15,976	516,552
Aug	516,552	70,000	700	585,852	.03	17,576	568,277
Sep	568,277	70,000	700	637,577	.03	19,127	618,449
Oct	618,449	70,000	700	687,749	.03	20,632	667,117
Nov	667,117	70,000	700	736,417	.04	29,457	706,960
Dec	706,960	70,000	700	776,260	.04	31,050	745,210
Jan	745,210	745,210	.05	37,260	707,949
Total	...	630,000	6,300	195,751			707,949

Notes

1. Y. Gutman, "Auschwitz — An Overview," in *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (AADC) (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 7.
2. J. Graf, "What Happened to the Jews Who Were Deported to Auschwitz But Were Not Registered There?," *Journal of Historical Review* (JHR) 19, no. 4 (July/August 2000), pp. 4-18.
3. G. Rudolf, "Holocaust Victims: A Statistical Analysis," in E. Gauss, ed., *Dissecting the Holocaust* (Capshaw, AL: Theses & Dissertations Press, 2000), pp. 189-190.
4. S. Krakowski, "The Satellite Camps," in AADC, p.52.
5. D. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945* (NY: Henry Holt, 1997) p. 564.
6. G. Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (London: Jason Aronson, 1987), p. 460.
7. A. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* (NY: Pan-

- theon, 1990), p. 336.
8. F. Piper, "The System of Prisoner Exploitation," in AADC, p. 39.
 9. Ibid., p. 47.
 10. Ibid.
 11. Ibid.
 12. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens ...?*, p. 424.
 13. Ibid., p. 375.
 14. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle ...*, pp. 702, 741. Czech notes that October 28 is "probably" the date of the Franks' transfer to Bergen-Belsen.
 15. R. Braham, "Hungarian Jews," in AADC, p. 466.
 16. Ibid.
 17. Reitlinger, *Final Solution*, pp. 460-61.
 18. J.-C. Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz: la machinerie du meurtre de masse* (Paris: CNRS, 1993), p. 148.
 19. J. Cobden, *Dachau: Reality and Myth* (Newport Beach, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1994), p. 5; P. Berben, *Dachau: 1933-45, The Official History* (London: Norfolk, 1975), pp. 94 -95.
 20. Cobden, p. 4.; Berben, p. 281.

Beyond Auschwitz

New Light on the Fate of the Hungarian Jews

SAMUEL CROWELL

According to the standard anti-revisionist history of the Holocaust, from May to July of 1944 approximately 430,000 Jews from wartime Hungary were deported to Auschwitz, and about ninety percent of them immediately selected out, gassed, and burned. Most of the remainder were held as “transport Jews” (Durchgangsjuden) until their transfer to other camps.¹ The support for this version derives from several contemporaneous sources in Hungary that indicate the deportation of about 430,000 Hungarian Jews in May-July 1944; from evidence that some Hungarian Jews were registered at Auschwitz that summer, and, as usual, a number of rather implausible eyewitness testimonies and postwar confessions.

While the above is the standard story, it is important to note that in recent years even traditional Holocaust scholars have shown that they are not completely comfortable with it.

For example, Jean-Claude Pressac, in an early edition of his second book on the crematoriums at Auschwitz (1993), argued that the number of “transport Jews” was 118,000, that is, 27 percent, rather than 10 percent, of the 430,000 deported, and in a later edition of the book argued that only between 160,000 and 240,000 Hungarian Jews were deported to Auschwitz at all.² Robert Jan Van Pelt, in his expert opinion for the defense in the Irving v. Lipstadt trial, indicated his discomfort with the standard calculations, but pointedly dismissed Pressac’s revisions. Van Pelt further claimed that the current numbers for the disposition of Hungar-

ian Jews at Auschwitz — both arrivals and those allegedly killed — were accurate within a range of about ten percent.³

In our view, the fact that Pressac, as probably the leading anti-revisionist student of Auschwitz, should have so much trouble establishing precise figures for the Hungarian Jews only goes to show how slender is the evidence which upholds the traditional narrative. No less an authority than Istvan Deak, a leading expert on Hungarian history, has recently written: “Let me note here that statistical data on such things as the number of Second Army soldiers and forced laborers, or the casualties they suffered, or the number of Hungarian Jews gassed at Auschwitz, or the total number of Jewish dead, are not much better than guesses. There exists no reliable information on these subjects.”⁴

There have been two revisionist responses to the general claim of a massive Hungarian Jewish extermination. The first, articulated by Professor Arthur R. Butz in his 1976 book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, is that the documentation is so slender that no revisionist is bound to accept it.⁵ In addition, Professor Butz has suggested that there may have been some manipulation of the documentary record.

The other response, recently made by Jürgen Graf, and responded to by Professor Butz,⁶ is that the number of Jews deported is probably correct, but that they were widely distributed in the concentration camps. Graf’s thesis rests largely on his discovery, along with Carlo Mattogno, of records of the passage of some thousands

of Hungarian Jewish women through the concentration camp of Stutthof, near Danzig. The data further indicate that some of them had earlier been in Riga, Latvia and Kovno, Lithuania. All three locations, of course, are far beyond Auschwitz. Graf also appeared emboldened by a comment of Pressac that Hungarian Jews could be found in some 386 camps.⁷

Describing the fate of the Hungarian Jews at Auschwitz is difficult, for reasons which will be discussed below. Nevertheless, in our own research we have been surprised to find a number of approaches, and types of data, which, we believe, suggest a provisional solution. In this article, we simply want to elaborate and expand on what we consider to be the main questions concerning the Hungarian Jewish deportations, to provide some generally unused data, and to point to how the question might be ultimately settled.

The main questions seem to us to be the following: How many Hungarian Jews were deported? How many were deported to Auschwitz? After arriving at Auschwitz, to what other places were they sent? To what purpose? Is there evidence concerning Hungarian Jews that specifically contradicts the extermination claim? How many of these deportees survived the war?

The scope of the deportations

The claim that 430,000 Hungarian Jews were deported derives principally from a series of telegrams to the German Foreign Office prepared by Edmund Veessenmayer, a German bureaucrat who worked with the Hungarian government. The telegrams, issued every few days, list the number of Jews that had been deported as of that date. The telegrams do not, however, indicate specific destinations, other than that they were being sent to “the Reich.” The numbers in Veessenmayer’s telegrams are more or less corroborated by notes by Ferenczy, an official of the Hungarian police, or gendarmerie, as well as by the recently discovered lists of an attorney in Kosice, a Slovakian town on the main rail spur through which the trains would have traveled to Auschwitz.⁸

The support these documents provide for a deportation on the scale alleged is not particularly compelling. First of all, we have reason to believe that Veessenmayer and Ferenczy both received their numbers from the same source: namely, the Hungarian gendarmerie. In essence, then, this evidence consists of two bureaucrats who are simply repeating information obtained from someone else, which means their numbers do not independently corroborate each other. Instead, the

proper focus should be the accuracy of the original gendarmerie data.

Second, none of the evidence moves much beyond giving us numbers of deportees. We lack the kind of layered documentation such a massive movement of people would entail: railway records, memos about delays, shortages of guards or fuel, complaints about the timetable, emergencies and their resolution, and so on. It must also be said that the lists of the Hungarian attorney, which surfaced only in 1988, are not much better on detail than Veessenmayer and Ferenczy, and furthermore offer an unlikely scenario: that the trains stopped in the Slovakian town of Kosice for accurate headcounts before proceeding, that the attorney and his friend carefully recorded the date, place of origin, and numbers for each transport, and then, apparently, forgot about them for over forty years.⁹

Still, if we accept that the deportation lists are generally accurate, an interesting statistic emerges: only about 150,000 of the deportees come from inside the boundaries of Hungary as determined by the Treaty of Trianon in 1919 and, later, after the Second World War. The rest of the deportees, including 150,000 from Transylvania, and 85,000 from Sub-Carpathia, come from areas that, while traditionally part of the Kingdom of Hungary, were under Hungarian control after Trianon only from 1938 to 1945. In other words, if the deportations were on the scale alleged, they still would have affected only about a third of the Jews of interwar or postwar Hungary, that is, about 150,000 out of a total population of 450,000. This might help explain the well-known comment of the Red Cross in its postwar report, which describes 100,000 Hungarian Jews fleeing to Budapest from the provinces in November of 1944.¹⁰

In our judgment, there are certainly good reasons to question the suitability or even the veracity of the evidence offered for the deportations. The Veessenmayer and Ferenczy data represent high-level documents with no underlying support. Meanwhile, the notes of the Hungarian attorney at Kosice present an unlikely scenario, were discovered late, and, given the highly charged and partisan nature of this topic, are bound to be viewed with suspicion.

Still, we are inclined to believe that hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews were deported in the summer of 1944. The reason lies in three data points that we have for the population of the German concentration camp system. The first, developed by Richard Widmann in an interesting statistical study,¹¹ is that the total population of the German concentration camp system in April 1944 was 280,000.

The second data point, a well-known telegram by Wilhelm Burger, indicates that by the beginning of August that population had swelled to 524,286.¹² The third data point, a letter from Himmler dated February 20, 1945, but evidently based on data from the end of January, indicates 700,000 prisoners in the camp system, exclusive of Auschwitz and Monowitz, and including 28,000 prisoners over the age of 50, and 5,000 over the age of 60.¹³

It follows that the growth of the German concentration camp system tracks fairly closely the influx of large numbers of Hungarian Jews, and other Jews, who would have been entering the camp system via Auschwitz at this time. However, we should keep in mind that to the extent that the Veessenmayer-Ferency statistics are inaccurate, any other calculations will be skewed accordingly.

To Auschwitz or Elsewhere?

Assuming that there was a general plan to deport all of the Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz, for whatever reason, we can expect that there would have been exceptions to the rule. In his writings, the father of Holocaust Revisionism, Paul Rassinier, provided an example:¹⁴

Once again, my personal testimony: I refer to a group of Hungarian Jews whose convoy, originally bound for Auschwitz, had arrived at Dora at the end of May 1944. Of the 1,500 or so people of this convoy, a certain number were sent to satellite camps around Dora as soon as they arrived. How many remained with us, I do not know; maybe they filled an entire block ... After a little while, the special surveillance over them became hardly more than a facade: once in a while we could exchange a few words with them, and even have short conversations. Thus it was that we learned about their odyssey. They told us about what they had had to leave behind when they came into the camp, and, since we were old hands in their eyes, they asked if they would get it back, when, how, and so on. They had been transported from Hungary to Dora, 70 to 80 persons in a car, with all of their baggage. They had made a long periplus of six to seven days before arriving. They had been told when leaving that they were being taken to Auschwitz, and when they learned that it was at Dora that they would be unloaded, they were pleased. They told the most appalling things

about Auschwitz. There were neither women nor children among them. The latter had been separated out on departure, and at the moment it did not surprise us since that is what happened to us.

Of course, as eyewitness testimony or hearsay, we cannot give too much weight to Rassinier's observation. But, as with all eyewitness testimony, it can in many cases give us an inkling of what might have occurred, not only in this case, but in others. The one detail that appears most striking is the claim that the women and children were separated out before departure: this reminds us that the Hungarian Jews were incarcerated in ghettos, and that these ghettos could have been the source of all kinds of numbers that would be reported by the Hungarian gendarmerie to Budapest. The second point is that the separating out of the women and children would seem to violate the whole purpose of the deportations, if that purpose was mass murder.

Strangely enough, a personal letter written just after the war was over, and which is posted on an anti-revisionist site, supports Rassinier's account.¹⁵ Recently translated from Hungarian, the eleven-page letter describes in great detail the experiences of a Hungarian woman during the deportations in late June 1944. On the appointed day, the Jews were gathered in a synagogue, the women to age twelve were inspected for pregnancy, and then, over the course of some ten days, they passed through a series of staging areas by truck and train until they ended up in Szeged. There, the Germans demanded a list of those Jews under the age of twelve and over the age of fifty: to the horror of the woman writing the account, her parents, in-laws, and four-year-old daughter were all placed on the list. Again according to her account, the woman managed to place herself on the list with the rest of her family, so as to share their fate. The rest of the letter describes the journey of the woman with her family to Strasshof, outside Vienna, and to Bergen-Belsen toward the end of the war. The only fatality described is the death of the woman's mother-in-law, apparently from typhus, a few days after the war was over.

Naturally, when we consider that the source of this letter is a website very hostile to revisionism, we are inclined to be skeptical of this account, and would prefer to see the letter authenticated. Nevertheless, we consider the account probably true. Moreover, there is independent corroboration: in the last days of June 1944, over 20,000 Hungarian Jews were sent to the Strasshof camp, including 5,200 from Szeged, which

would have been the transport the woman described.¹⁶

To sum up, it is clear that there were significant numbers of Hungarian Jewish deportees who were not sent to Auschwitz. Moreover, the selecting out of those incapable of work appears to have taken place at least in certain areas and at certain times throughout the course of the deportations, and that the deportations themselves involved the confinement and transfer of the Hungarian Jews in several different locations within Hungary. This last circumstance could also have contributed to inaccurate statistics.

After Auschwitz

Those who argue for the massive gassing and burning of the Hungarian Jews at Auschwitz usually claim that there are no significant records of Hungarian Jews sent from Auschwitz to anywhere else, and rest their case on the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, compiled by Danuta Czech, a Polish Communist.

Most of Czech's data consists of various lists of prisoners who were registered in the camp, in various number sequences. It is assumed, of course, that most of those registered were ultimately gassed themselves, and it is furthermore assumed that any quantity of registrations presupposes a much larger quantity gassed without registration. Thus, for example, we might read that on a certain date one hundred Jews were selected from an RSHA transport from Hungary and assigned a range of inmate numbers, and that the rest were taken to the gas chambers. Such an entry might appear authoritative, but in fact usually the only source material at Czech's disposal is a list of the prisoners (in this case, one hundred) who were registered on the day in question. In short, we have no way of knowing how many Hungarian Jews were in fact sent to Auschwitz. Even so, Czech's statistics do indicate that some 26,000 Hungarian Jews were registered in the camp between May and early September 1944 (usually in the "A" series), and that another 25,000 were transferred to other camps, including 20,000 in May, June, and early July alone, usually in packets of 1,000 or more, and usually to Buchenwald and Mauthausen. The combined total, some 50,000, is the general upper bound of Hungarian Jews not exterminated on arrival.¹⁷

Yet Czech's data are glaringly incomplete. The German historian Isabell Sprenger's history of the Gross Rosen concentration camp lists in an appendix a chronology of all known transports to that location.¹⁸ For May 16-17, 1944, that is, at the very beginning of the Hungarian deportations, we find reference to a trans-

port of 1,500 Hungarian Jews arriving at Gross Rosen from Auschwitz. There is no record of this transport in Czech. Another transport, from May 24, lists 3,189 Hungarian Jews arriving in Gross Rosen from Auschwitz. This is not properly recorded by Czech. Still another, on June 8, records the arrival of 4,000 Hungarian Jews from Auschwitz. Again, Czech makes no mention of this transport, and, in fact, mentions no numbers for Gross Rosen at all until the fall, where a transport of 200 Hungarian Jews to Gross Rosen is recorded for September 19.

It is a certainty that the initial transport of May 16-17 was not registered at Auschwitz, indeed, it is likely that the prisoners were not even debarked from their train before being sent on. So this is not a question of double-counting. However, the fact that 1,500 Hungarian Jews would be sent to a non-extermiation camp after passing through a camp supposedly designed for their extermination, and in the very first transports, strongly contradicts the assertion that the Hungarian Jewish deportations ever had mass murder as their aim. Furthermore, in reviewing the incoming transports for only one camp, out of some twenty main concentration camps, and several hundred satellite camps, we have already accounted for almost 10,000 Hungarian Jews, who would normally be assumed to have been gassed and burned at Auschwitz. This points up the serious unreliability of the *Auschwitz Chronicle* as a source for accurate statistics.

Indeed, other sources for other camps provide further missing Hungarian Jews. For example, the records of Mauthausen indicate a shipment of 2,000 Hungarian Jews from Auschwitz on May 28, 1944, which also is not recorded by Czech.¹⁹ Of course, Czech also fails to record the Hungarian Jews in Riga, Kovno, or Stutthof discovered by Graf and Matogno.

The overall approach of attempting to quantify the Hungarian Jews outside of Auschwitz would entail locating all the camps where Hungarian Jews were sent, gathering data, and then analyzing the results. For lack of time and resources, we can only make a few observations in this area. To begin with, the 386 camp figure that Graf cites from Pressac almost certainly derives from a passing comment made by Randolph Braham in his lengthy *Politics of Genocide*, later repeated in an article in *Auschwitz: Anatomy of a Death Camp*.²⁰ The source of Braham's figure, cited in the first book, is an appendix to a study on Hungarian forced labor by the Hungarian historian Szabolcs Szita, which has not been translated from Hungarian. Consulting Szita's book ourselves, we find that it contains not just a list of 386

camps, but rather of over 520 locations where Hungarian Jews were held, including seventeen main concentration camps, hundreds of their satellites, and over a hundred other kinds of camps in which Hungarian Jews were imprisoned.²¹

Some of the satellite camps in Szita's list are well known and have been the subject of special studies in English, for example, the story of the thousand or so Hungarian women sent to the Hessisch Lichtenau sub-camp of Buchenwald in order to work in an explosives factory.²² Of greater interest are those locations listed that are not affiliated with any concentration camp, for example, Unterlüss near Hannover, or Moerfelde-Walldorf near Frankfurt. Van Pelt indicated that large numbers of Hungarian women worked at Unterlüss,²³ which was a subsidiary camp of Rheinmetall, while news reports inform us that 1,700 Hungarian Jewish women labored at Moerfelde-Walldorf building an airstrip for the construction firm Zueblin, after having been transferred from Auschwitz in May.²⁴ Again, neither of these locations appears to be mentioned in the *Auschwitz Chronicle*. The fact that significant numbers of Hungarian Jews eventually were assigned outside the concentration camp system makes the numbers for Hungarian Jews derived from records of the growth of the concentration camp prisoner population seem underestimates of their actual numbers in the Reich.

Turning to the Baltics, we find that Szita has Hungarians listed in several concentration camps and labor camps throughout the region, including Kovno, Klooga, Riga-Kaiserwald, Stutthof, and several sub-camps. According to Andrew Ezergailis, author of *The Holocaust in Latvia*, one of these sub-camps, at Dundaga, employed between two to five thousand Hungarian Jewish women who had been transferred from Auschwitz from May 1944 on.²⁵

Overall, by following up on the data gathered by Szita and other historians of Hungarian forced labor, we find that there was a very wide distribution of Hungarians throughout the German areas of influence very soon after the deportations began. In many cases, the Hungarians at these other camps are described as having been sent from Auschwitz. It may be presumption in some cases to claim that these Hungarian Jews passed through Auschwitz, yet it seems clear that the deportations of Hungarian Jews were very extensive. This is indicated not only by the fact that Hungarian Jews were distributed to so many different locations, but also because it was typical to dispatch concentration camp inmates for labor in packets of 500 to 1,000.²⁶

The Purpose of the Deportations

The idea that the Hungarian Jews were deported simply for the purpose of killing them would seem to be a strategy contrary to the interests of the German Reich, which, by May 1944, was fighting for its life. It seems therefore reasonable to argue, as many have done, that the deportations of the Hungarian Jews are simply not credible given the priorities of the war, transport and otherwise.

Yet, if we consult the documents and the various public declarations of the time, we find unanimity about the desperate need for labor for a variety of war-related programs, and specifically for the kind of labor that the Hungarian Jews would provide. These include the remarks of Himmler, referencing the planned influx of 200,000 Hungarian Jews for labor purposes, the specific authorization of Hitler to allow these intakes, and records of the various conflicts among the various agencies desperate for labor.²⁷ Among these projects were the construction of large concrete bunkers for Speer's Organization Todt, the assembly of V-2 rockets for the V-weapon campaign, the construction of defensive barriers on the eastern frontier of Austria and Czechoslovakia, the construction of fighter planes for the Luftwaffe, and many other war-related projects.²⁸ These needs alone, vital to Germany's war effort, could have allowed for the prioritization of Hungarian Jewish transports of considerable size.

On the other hand, if forced labor was the purpose of the deportations, that does not very well explain the reason why considerable numbers of women, children, and the elderly also appear to have been deported. Part of this appears traceable to conflicts with the Hungarian government. We should keep in mind that many Hungarian Jewish men wore the uniform of the Hungarian Labor Service, and, while discriminated against, tens of thousands of them lost their lives serving their country, which was, after all, Germany's ally in the war against the Soviet Union. It also appears that the Labor Service underwent significant expansion at the time of the deportations, and that thousands more Hungarian men avoided deportation in this manner.²⁹ (This too may have contributed to statistical inconsistencies.) These drafts of Hungarian Jewish men help explain why the Germans were initially surprised to be receiving so many women, and others incapable of work. Still, it is known that Himmler and Oswald Pohl, chief of the concentration camp system, soon found a way to integrate the Hungarian women into the German war economy.³⁰

But what of those Hungarians incapable of work? No doubt interned because of the unjust suspicion that they, as Jews, would foment rebellion before the advancing Red Army, there is plenty of evidence that they were not exterminated as a matter of course. We have seen, for example, Himmler's reference to over 30,000 concentration camp inmates outside of Auschwitz over the age of fifty: it is a certainty that the vast majority would be Jewish prisoners, and probably included many incarcerated at Theresienstadt. At Theresienstadt itself, we find a record of 1,150 Hungarian Jews, apparently transferred from Auschwitz, and by definition non-workers: twelve had died by the end of the war.³¹ We can also find records of Hungarian Jews incapable of work — by definition, including children and the elderly — at Bergen Belsen, where there were at least two camps for Hungarian Jews, and at Buchenwald, which had a block set aside for over a thousand children of various nationalities. Even at Auschwitz itself, as Graf has noted, significant numbers of children and elderly were liberated by the Red Army, including Hungarian Jewish children mentioned by name. This is the proper context for the famous photograph showing a group of smiling Hungarian Jewish women, liberated at Dachau with their newborn babies on their laps.

Calculating the Survivors

The final question one can pose about the Hungarian Jews deported in the summer of 1944 is the most difficult to answer, because, as we have seen, there is some uncertainty about the accuracy of the numbers of the deportations.

The first thing we have to recognize is that the losses of Hungarian Jews are usually calculated globally: that is, the problem is looked at in terms of the overall losses of the Hungarian Jewish community, but not in terms of how many survived the summer 1944 deportations. Indeed, the latter question is never addressed in detail. At the same time, there are several categories of Hungarian Jewish losses related to the war or to the deportations of fall 1944 that have nothing to do with the deportations to Auschwitz, and the combined totals are hard to analyze. There is a canonical number of Hungarian Jewish victims of the Holocaust, but instead of six million it is six hundred thousand, generally rounded up from about 560,000. The ultimate source of this number is calculations of the World Jewish Congress made in 1945 and 1946.³²

The statistics concerning Hungarian Jews have been extensively analyzed over the past decade by the Hun-

garian historian Tamas Stark. There are three main aspects of Stark's analysis. First, he is wary of official statistics, knowing full well their potential political import, and so tries to compare them with any other known sources. Second, Stark tries to address the gaps in the statistical record by itemizing the many reasons for Hungarian Jews not to have returned home, or to have been unable to do so, after the Second World War. Third, Stark is the only expert in this field to stress the fact that after the war large numbers of Hungarians indeed did not return home, but instead emigrated to other countries.

Stark's work has exposed him to some criticism, and perhaps because of this he has revised his calculations. Originally, he estimated the total loss of life for Hungarian Jews at 390,000, but in a recent study he has raised that number to about 500,000.³³ The point, as far as our analysis is concerned, however, is that any increase in the number of Hungarian survivors generally increases the number of Hungarian Jews who survived the summer 1944 deportations.

To put it another way: it is generally conceded that about 500,000 Hungarian Jews were deported in 1944: these include the assumed 430,000 deported May through July, and another 50,000 or more deported to the Austrian border in the fall.³⁴ Of this number, it is universally conceded that about 100,000-120,000 returned from deportation. Assuming a proportional split, this means that about 20 percent of the Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz returned home.³⁵

Yet Stark points out that there were reasons not to return home, and, if returning home, not to declare one's Jewish identity. First, there was the psychological dread of returning home and failing to find one's family.³⁶ Second, there was the fact that the Red Army typically seized Hungarian Jewish men and dragged them off to forced labor in the Soviet Union (Stark estimates that 30,000 Hungarian Jews went from one dictatorial system to the other: they were never heard from again).³⁷ Third, Hungarian Jews were on a path of heavy assimilation even before the war, and there would be little reason for many to return to the community after the war, especially in view of the severe persecution Jews had just endured.³⁸ Yet precisely such a failure to be counted in the Jewish community in the postwar period would have contributed to artificially low numbers of returnees. The World Jewish Congress, after all, was interested in determining the size of Jewish communities, not in counting Jews by racial criteria as was the case under the Nazi, Horthy, or Arrow Cross regimes.

In the absence of reliable statistics, Stark did considerable research in contemporary newspapers and other periodicals, noting especially references to Hungarian Jews who remained in Germany or in other countries and who did not return. His research suggests that a considerable number, perhaps as many as 100,000 or more, remained outside of Hungary and made their homes elsewhere.³⁹ It is by settling on a conservative figure of 50,000 that Stark arrives at his overall figure of approximately 500,000 Jewish deaths among the Hungarian population in the Second World War.

However, Stark's calculation essentially increases the number of those Hungarian Jews who survived the summer 1944 deportations by 50,000 as well, which in turn means that over one third survived. If his higher estimate of 100,000 Hungarian expatriates is used, that percentage rises to over 45 percent. With such numbers, one cannot sustain the contention that the Hungarian Jews were deported in the summer of 1944 with the intention of exterminating them.

Conclusions

The issue of the fate of the Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz has long dominated Holocaust studies, because the deportations took place in the midst of a large-scale media campaign in which the Allies and several Zionist groups protested the deportations even before they began.⁴⁰

Although the current narrative continues to hold that vast numbers of Hungarian Jews were gassed and burned at Auschwitz, the evidence we have consulted contradicts that notion. Specifically, we can now provisionally answer the questions with which we began.

It appears that hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews were deported to Auschwitz. These included Jews of all ages and conditions. However, it seems likely that the figures quoted — 430,000 — could well be inaccurate, if only because these figures might have derived from one of the early stages of the deportation process before the deportations beyond Hungary's borders actually took place. Perhaps some tens of thousands were not deported beyond their staging areas; perhaps, too, some thousands of Hungarian men were drafted into the labor service from these areas. It is further possible that some thousands or tens of thousands managed to escape, at least temporarily, to Romania. It is interesting to quote Adolf Eichmann in this regard:⁴¹

All told, we succeeded in processing about half a million Jews in Hungary. I once knew the

exact number that we shipped to Auschwitz, but today I can only estimate that it was around 350,000 in a period of about four months. But, contrary to legend, the majority of the deportees were not gassed at all but put to work in munitions plants. That is why there are thousands of Jews happily alive today who are included in the statistical totals of the "liquidated." Besides those we sent to Auschwitz, there were thousands and thousands who fled, some secretly, some with our connivance. It was child's play for a Jew to reach relative safety in Rumania if he could muster the few pengő to pay for a railroad ticket or an auto ride to the border. There were also 200,000 Jews left in a huge ghetto when the Russians arrived, and thousands more waiting to emigrate illegally to Palestine or simply hiding out from the Hungarian gendarmerie.

If the number of deportees was appreciably lower than 430,000, and if they managed to remain in the provinces, or in nearby Romania, that would help explain where the 100,000 Jews came from who fled to Budapest in November of 1944. Incidentally, Stark also discusses this flight, which he claims took place from Sub-Carpathia and Transylvania, that is, areas supposedly cleared out by the May-July deportations.⁴² Yet, if the number of deportees was 350,000, as Eichmann claims, or even lower, as Pressac has argued, there still would be ideological reasons to suppress such data. As the controversy over Stark suggests, the Hungarians are as committed to the number of six hundred thousand Hungarian Jewish victims almost as much as Holocaust historians are committed to the *six million* statistic.

Whatever the number, the Hungarian Jews, from the moment they began arriving at Auschwitz, were sent to other camps: Gross Rosen, Buchenwald, Mauthausen, Stutthof, and hundreds of other camps. This influx of Hungarian Jews into the concentration camp system directly tracks the statistical growth of the concentration camp system as a whole. Nor should we forget that by being sub-contracted to private firms, it seems likely that some thousands of Hungarian Jews would never have appeared on the concentration camp rolls at all. At the same time, our analysis indicates that there are yawning gaps in the canonical record of comings and goings at Auschwitz.

The Hungarian Jews deported to these various other camps were involved in labor that was of critical importance to Germany's war effort and moreover

there was considerable competition for their services. It is not believable that any Hungarian Jew capable of work would have been exterminated.

Nor is it believable, on the basis of the data reviewed, to assert that Hungarian Jews incapable of work were automatically killed. While the saving of Hungarian Jewish lives is usually explained by the intercession of this or that saintly diplomat or businessman, there is no easy way to get around the fact that there were significant numbers of Hungarians who did not work in several camps, and who survived the war. This is not to deny the idea that some portion of non-working Hungarian Jews *could* have been killed: it simply means that the known exceptions are varied enough that the thesis of an extermination policy, let alone an extermination plan, is decisively undercut. Nor should we forget the survival rates implied by Stark's analyses, suggesting that 35 percent to 45 percent of the 430,000 deported survived the war.

But what of the missing Hungarian Jews who apparently did not survive? What happened to them, if they were not exterminated? The question brings us back to the statistical measurements of returnees, and émigrés, measured by Stark in the range of 150,000 to 200,000 or more, versus the canonical statistic of 430,000 deportees, or lower estimates of 350,000 by Eichmann and 160,000 to 240,000 by Pressac. Using Stark's low estimate of returns and emigrations, along with Pressac's low estimate of deportations, we could arrive at a death rate among the May-July deportees of about ten thousand, which strikes us as absurdly low.

We have to remind ourselves that there were many ways for people to die in the closing months of the Second World War, and not just in the concentration camps. Disease no doubt played a large role, as we know that tens of thousands of camp prisoners died in the last months of the war and even after from various epidemics, tuberculosis, and above all, typhus. Nor can we ignore the high death rate in the concentration camp system overall, brought on by poor nourishment and overwork in a psychologically debilitating atmosphere, a death rate that was always high but which reached catastrophic levels in 1945. Combined with Allied bombings, Soviet ship sinkings, and random shootings by panicked soldiers or SS, we could easily account for most of the missing Hungarian Jews, even if we set that number at 150,000 or more.

Still, we cannot exclude the possibility that some number were killed at Auschwitz, although, bearing in mind the many other dangers Hungarian Jews would encounter during the war, and the estimated numbers

of returnees and émigrés, that number could not have been more than a few tens of thousands at most. Here we have to keep in mind the iron rule imposed by the limits of the Birkenau crematoriums. Rather than saying that 90 percent of the Hungarian deportees died at Auschwitz, it should be possible to argue the reverse: the evidence suggests that 90 percent of the Hungarian Jews did not die at Auschwitz, regardless of their ultimate fate.

When the Auschwitz death toll was officially revised from four million to about one million in 1989, the traditional figure of 400,000 Hungarian Jews killed at Auschwitz assumed greater importance than ever before. The Hungarian Jews, now 40 percent of the total, became the largest group of Jews said to have been exterminated in that camp. However, the evidence we have reviewed makes it clear that the Hungarian Jews deported in the summer of 1944 were deported for labor in war-important industries, and they were in fact employed in such labor after being transferred from Auschwitz to hundreds of other camps. In addition, we have seen evidence that significant numbers of Hungarian Jews unfit for labor were not in fact exterminated. We have also seen the overall population of the camp system increase, commensurate to the influx of large numbers of Hungarian Jews. Finally, we have seen reasonable statistics that indicate that 45 percent or more of these deportees survived, in spite of the catastrophic death rates that prevailed in the camps at the end of the war.

Determining the fate of the Hungarian Jews at Auschwitz with some finality would entail a detailed analysis of the records of all of the camps and sub-camps of the concentration camp system, as well as all the private and government agencies which had a declared interest in Hungarian Jewish labor in 1944. Probably such materials could be located in the various files pertaining to forced labor during the National Socialist period not only in German archives, but also in those of Washington, Budapest, and above all, the former Soviet Union. It seems likely that such records exist, given the scope of some of the material we have reviewed. We expect these records will continue to be uncovered and used, especially by Hungarian historians, as they try to reconstruct the wartime fate of their countrymen, Jewish and non-Jewish.

It seems to be generally recognized today that the mass exterminations that are supposed to have occurred in "extermination camps" such as Auschwitz have been manipulated for political and ideological purposes.⁴³ This does not make the extermination

claims automatically false, but what such abuse does accomplish is to reduce the people involved to passive statistics, fit only for posthumous martyrdom.

We say this because the reduction of death statistics at extermination camps is frequently said to rob the victims of their dignity in death. But on the contrary, as the studies of Szita and Stark suggest, a more detailed and nuanced study of the experiences of a people does not diminish, but rather enhances, the dignity and the tragedy of their individual lives. And, as such studies tell us what did happen, they also make it rather clear what did not.

It follows from the evidence at our disposal that 430,000 Hungarian Jews were not gassed and burned at Auschwitz, and that the death toll for that camp should again be revised downward by about 40 percent. But it also follows that historians have barely begun to grasp the fate of Hungary's Jews in the Second World War. 

Notes

1. The general estimates of Hungarian Jewish casualties come from Randolph L. Braham, *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary* (Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 792, and László Varga, "The Losses of Hungarian Jewry," in Randolph Braham, ed., *Studies on the Holocaust in Hungary*, East European monographs, no. 301 (Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press, 1990), pp. 256-265. Of an estimated 509,000 deportees, Varga reckons 383,000 died (p. 262), and gives remarkably low estimates for emigrants, and survivors who did not return (5,000 for each of the two categories). These estimates were repeated by Robert Jan Van Pelt in his expert report for the Irving v. Penguin/Lipstadt trial (pp. 46-48). His expert opinion, though unpublished, can be found both on Irving's website (www.fpp.co.uk) and a site maintained on Deborah Lipstadt's behalf (www.holocaustontrial.com).
2. Detailed in Van Pelt's expert opinion, pp. 47-48, the changes occurred between the original French version, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz*, and the Italian and German editions of Pressac's book.
3. Van Pelt, op. cit., p. 48.
4. István Deák, "A Fatal Compromise? The Debate over Collaboration and Resistance in Hungary," in István Deák, Jan T. Gross, and Tony Judt, eds., *The Politics of Retribution in Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 72 n. 22.
5. Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Newport Beach, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1977), pp. 133-159, 170-171.
6. Jürgen Graf, "What Happened to the Jews Who Were Deported to Auschwitz but Were Not Registered There?" and Arthur R. Butz, "On the 1944 Deportation of Hungarian Jews," in the *Journal of Historical Review* (JHR) 19, no. 4 (July-August 2000), pp. 4-29.
7. Graf, *ibid.* The source of the "386 camps" will be discussed below.
8. The various classes of data are discussed extensively in Tamás Stark, *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust and after the Second World War, 1939-1949: A Statistical Review*, translated by Christina Rosznyi, East European Monographs (Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press, 2000), pp. 21ff. This is essentially a translation of his *Zsidóság a vézskorszakban és a felszabadulás után, 1939-1955* [Jewry during the Holocaust and after Liberation, 1939-1955] (Budapest:1995). Szabolcs Szita also discusses the scope of the deportations in *Halálteröd: A munkaszolgálat és a hadimunka történetéhez* [Death Fort: On the History of the Labor Service and Military Labor] (Budapest: 1989), pp. 45ff., and provides the lists of the attorney in Kosice.
9. Stark, op. cit., pp. 24f.
10. Quoted and discussed by Butz, op. cit., pp. 139, 142ff.
11. See Widmann, "Transfers to the Reich: The Unregistered Inmates of Auschwitz," pp. 21, current issue of the JHR.
12. In this August 15, 1944, telegram, Burger also describes 90,000 Jews as part of the Hungarian action. By our interpretation, the 90,000 Hungarian Jews mentioned by Burger refers either to transit Jews not yet assigned to work or to Hungarian Jews who were incapable of work in Auschwitz-Birkenau as of that date. Because, moreover, we know that there were no further Hungarian deportations to Auschwitz later than August 15, 1944, it seems as if the actual population of the concentration camp system would be 90,000 higher, if these 90,000 were included. Braham, op. cit., p. 793, misuses this document, a misuse traceable to Danuta Czech's erroneous claim that the document refers to the population of Auschwitz only, rather than to the concentration camp system as a whole.
13. Robert N. Proctor, *The Nazi War against Cancer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 260, 346 n. 31, and references German researcher. Proctor assumes (p. 260) that the figure is too high for the camps alone, but the magnitude is generally accepted by most scholars, cf. Ulrich Herbert, *Fremdarbeiter* (Bonn: Dietz Verlag, 1999), p. 426.
14. Paul Rassinier, *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*, Costa Mesa, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1978, p. 365
15. www.mazal.org
16. Stark, op. cit., p. 25.
17. Van Pelt, op. cit.
18. Isabell Sprenger, *Gross-Rosen: Ein Konzentrationslager in Schlesien*, Neue Forschungen zur Schlesischen Geschichte, vol. 6 (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1996), pp. 335-359.

19. Szita, op. cit., pp. 217ff.
20. Braham, op. cit., pp. 792f. and “The Hungarian Jews,” in Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998), p. 466.
21. Szita, op. cit., pp. 281-287. To be fair, Szita also mentions some locations in Russia where Hungarian Jews of the Labor Service were employed, for example, Kiev, locations that were clearly not available as destinations by May, 1944.
22. Dieter Vaupel, “The Hessisch Lichtenau Sub-Camp of the Buchenwald Concentration Camp, 1944-45,” in Braham, ed., *Studies*, pp. 194-237.
23. Van Pelt, op. cit., pp. 26ff.
24. *The Detroit News*, Saturday, July 25, 1998 (Internet edition).
25. Andrew Ezergailis, *The Holocaust in Latvia 1941-1944: The Missing Center* (Riga: 1996), p. 367.
26. Vaupel, op. cit., p. 195, for the minimum figure.
27. Himmler quoted in Wilhelm Stäglich, *Auschwitz* (Newport Beach, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1986), pp. 73ff. See also Graf, op. cit., p. 13; also Albert Speer, *Infiltration* (NY: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 289-291, and Herbert, op. cit., pp. 426-431.
28. Speer, op. cit. Szita’s various books describe many aspects of Hungarian forced labor, especially for the lower Danube defense works, and for the Mauthausen complex. There are also testimony and documents about the use of Hungarian forced labor in the records of the Nuremberg Military Tribunal (NMT), especially Case 2 (the Milch case), Case 4 (the Pohl, or Concentration Camp, case) and Case 5 (the Farben case).
29. Stark, op. cit., pp. 28ff.
30. The famous exchange between Pohl and Himmler, culminating in Himmler’s insistence that enough garlic be provided the Hungarian Jewish women, was recorded in documents of Case 4 of the NMT, and is cited in Braham, *Politics*, p. 783.
31. Terezin website, www.scrapbookpages.com/CzechRepublic/Theresienstadt/statistics.html; Stark, op. cit., p. 74, cites five to six thousand Hungarian Jews at Theresienstadt at the end of the war.
32. Braham, *Politics*, p. 1298; Stark, op. cit., p. 127.
33. Stark’s original estimate in “A magyar zsidóság veszteségei” (The Losses of Hungarian Jewry), *Historia* (Budapest), no. 1-2 (1989), pp. 54-56, the later number discussed in Stark, *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust*, pp. 136-138. In his original article, Stark gave rough calculations as follows (p. 56): 490,000 deportations, 360 non-returns (inferring 130,000 returns), a minimum of 50,000 who emigrated, and therefore 310,000 deaths among the deportees, or 63% mortality.
34. Other sources claim 100,000 or more deportees from Budapest in this period. However, most of the sources cited by Stark (op. cit., pp. 32-35) mention 30 to 35 thousand. Stark settles on “50-100 thousand.” It is a key point, because the lower the numbers deported from Budapest, the lower the overall number of deportees, and, because the number of returnees is fixed at about 100 to 120 thousand, the higher the survival rate among the May-July deportees.
35. This is a key issue, because there is a tendency to assume that the returnees would comprise mostly those deported to the Austrian border in the fall of 1944. Szita’s work, however, makes it clear that the death rate on the Austrian border was very high, and that, furthermore, the deportees from the fall were mostly from Budapest, not the provinces targeted during the May-July deportations. Stark *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust*, pp. 79f., meanwhile, lists 83,000 registered returnees, of which only about 20-25% come from Budapest, which means the balance must have come from the May-July deportations.
36. Stark, *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust*, p. 75, quoting a contemporary newspaper.
37. Stark, *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust*, pp. 46-56, esp. 56.
38. Stark, *Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust*, pp. 85-86, 87, 89, esp. 90, 91, 93.
39. Stark (see note 33 above).
40. Compare the discussion in Butz, op. cit., and particularly the large literature concerning of the bombing of Auschwitz.
41. *Life* 49, no. 22, November 28, 1960, p. 109.
42. Stark discusses the influx of Hungarians, presumably including Jews, from the outlying provinces to escape the advancing Red Army, as well as the flight of provincial Jews to the capital to escape deportation.
43. E.g., Norman Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry* (NY: Verso, 2000) and Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (NY: Basic Books, 2001).

Thanks

We’ve stirred up things a lot since the first issue of *The Journal of Historical Review* came out in the spring of 1980 — 21 years ago. Without the staunch support of you, our subscribers, it couldn’t have survived. So please keep sending those clippings, the helpful and critical comments on our work, the informative articles, and the extra boost over and above the subscription price. It’s our life blood. To everyone who has helped keep the *Journal* alive, our sincerest thanks.

Video Tapes from the 13th IHR Conference

A Spectacular Line-Up of Speakers!

Welcome / Keynote Address

Greg Raven & Mark Weber

With wit and warmth, MC Greg Raven welcomes attendees and speakers to the IHR's first full-scale conference since 1994. Then IHR director Mark Weber delivers a passionate, historically informed overview of the rise of the Zionist and Holocaust mythology to unchallengeable historical dogma, and the consequences of that rise for Western society. Revisionism — historical, political, social, and cultural — at its best! 81 min. (#v123) \$19.95

Historical Past vs. Political Present

Arthur R. Butz

In this informative, stimulating lecture, the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* brings the method and outlook of his pathbreaking study to bear on the latest issues in Holocaust revisionism. After discussing the accessibility of Holocaust-era material recently available from the Berlin Document Center, Professor Butz discusses — with illuminating insight and mordant incision — the attempts of such exterminationist pundits as self-advertised skeptic Michael Shermer and faux-architect Robert Jan Van Pelt to belittle his own pioneering work on the few Auschwitz documents then available. Butz finishes with a devastating review of the Benjamin Wilkomirski fraud, stressing how Deborah Lipsadt and other pillars of “Holocaust studies” continued to promote this phony “memoir” well after its exposure as a hoax. 90 min. (#v124) \$19.95

My Political Imprisonment in Germany

Fredrick Toben

The chief of Australia's Adelaide Institute discloses the facts of his 1999 arrest in Mannheim, and discusses his seven-months imprisonment for thought crime there. Dr.

Toben, a philosopher by university training, delivers a moving but clear-eyed account of how his intense thirst for knowledge through free inquiry led him to a German jail, and continues to lead him, undaunted, in the search for truth. 62 min. (#v125) \$19.95

The Fate of Unregistered Auschwitz Inmates

Jürgen Graf

Swiss author and researcher Graf examines long-unavailable Auschwitz camp records, from the Moscow archives and elsewhere, to establish the true fates of thousands of Jews at Auschwitz deemed gassed by exterminationists. Graf cites documents showing treatment and release from the Auschwitz hospital of numerous unregistered Hungarian Jews; the presence in Auschwitz of a sizable number of Jewish children, a good number of whom survived the war; and records of many Hungarian Jews, unregistered at Auschwitz, who were sent on to other German camps. Bristling with facts and insight. 55 min. (#v126) \$19.95

My Struggle in Canada

Ernst Zündel

The man who commissioned the Leuchter Report and inspired David Irving's conversion to gas-chamber skepticism talks movingly of his marathon struggle for freedom of expression in his adopted homeland. Zündel relates how the ludicrously named Canadian Human Rights Tribunal has been citing Zündel materials on an Internet website, though owned and operated by Ingrid Rimland in California, as the latest pretext for muzzling him. As Ernst makes clear, the machinations of Canada's spy and police agencies, its media, and its Jewish organizational mafia have anything but dampened the spirits of this one-man truth wave. 66 min. (#v127) \$19.95

A Skeptical Look at 'Schindler's List'

Theodore J. O'Keefe

IHR editor O'Keefe takes a skeptical look at “Schindler's List,” to show that — as Schindler's Jewish “survivors” agree — the list was actually the work of the venal Jewish ghetto policeman and concentration camp capo, Marcel Goldberg. Looking beyond the misnamed list, O'Keefe establishes that Schindler's life-saving exertions are a postwar invention; that his activities as an industrialist and employer of “slave labor” were fully in line with official German policy; and that the survival of “his” Jews, at a branch of the concentration camp Gross-Rosen in Moravia at war's end was far from unique. 58 min. (#v128) \$19.95

On the Front Lines

Robert Countess, Bradley Smith, & John Bennett

Three revisionist activists in top form! Retired college professor and minister of the Gospel Bob Countess recounts, with gusto, his revisionist adventures as a journalist and prankster in Scandinavia and his promotional and publishing work with such scholars as Germar Rudolf. Bradley Smith tells of his latest successes on US campuses, where his publications have graduated from being banned to being burned. Longtime Australian activist and civil-liberties attorney John Bennett champions a more diverse, better humored revisionism. 105 min. (#v129) \$19.95

Machinations of the Anti-Defamation League

Pete McCloskey

The former US Congressman tells how his long career in law, politics, academic life, and the Marine Corps led him to mistrust governmental official history and to esteem the mission of the IHR. McCloskey relates what he has learned in his role

Quality Recordings of Conference Lectures From the World's Most Controversial Research Center

as lead attorney in an ongoing class action suit that targets ADL's vast spy operation, in concert with corrupt police officials in America and Israeli spy and police agencies, against American citizens. Inside information on how the Zionist lobby targeted his political career (and those of other loyal Americans); on how Jewish pressure prevented Stanford from hiring world-class historian Norman Davies; on how, and why, the Lobby works the way it does. A witty, wise, enlightening presentation from that contemporary rarity: a courageous, thoughtful, and independent man in public life. 70 min. (#v130) \$19.95

My Revisionist Method

Robert Faurisson

The man who made revisionism a household word in his native France goes back to his own revisionist beginnings, and then to the frontiers of revisionism today, in this sparkling lecture. Professor Faurisson recounts how his youthful studies in Greek and Latin, followed by his celebrated deciphering of the meaning of such difficult modern poets as Rimbaud and Lautréaumont, guided him to his revisionist method: simple, "nuts and bolts," free of pedantry, going to the center of things. In an unforgettable performance, Faurisson reveals how his "No holes, no Holocaust!" challenge springs directly from this method, shares amusing details from his conversation with Deborah Lipsadt, and updates his critique of the Anne Frank "diary." 67 min. (#v132) \$19.95

The Unknown Dr. Nyiszli: Auschwitz Witness

Charles Provan

The credibility of Miklos Nyiszli, whose "memoirs" have promoted the Auschwitz myth to millions, bites the dust in this informative lecture. Independent researcher Charles Provan answers questions and dispels myths about the "doctor at Auschwitz" that have gone unchallenged for decades: Nyiszli's German medical schooling; his prewar trip to America; the whoppers on the Auschwitz crematories in Nyiszli's posthumous memoirs; his Doctor at Auschwitz originally classified as fiction; and Nyiszli's postwar membership in Ana Pauker's Romanian Communist Party. 45 min. (#v131) \$19.95

Life and Work as a Political Refugee

Germar Rudolf

This youthful scientist and writer — himself a political refugee — reports knowledgeably on Germany's ever more draconian legal measures against dissident "thought criminals." The author of the most advanced forensic analysis of the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz, renowned as The Rudolf Report, also tells about his recent research and publishing work. Rudolf, now living in forced exile, also takes telling aim at Robert Jan Van Pelt, a key witness in the recent London Irving-Lipstadt trial. Rudolf comments authoritatively on the chemistry of the Auschwitz crematory ruins, as it figured in the Irving trial and in the recent "Mr. Death" movie about Fred Leuchter. 65 min. (#v133) \$19.95

Blacklisting My Book, 'An Eye for An Eye'

John Sack

This prolific author and journalist tells the story of his headline-making book in an address he was prevented from giving at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. Sack dramatically tells how Polish Jews working in the Communist Office of State Security tortured and murdered innocent German civilians, how he discovered some of these Jews years later, and how a few of them repented of their crimes. Following his lecture, Holocaust true-believer Sack answers tough questions from conference attendees. 58 min. (#v134) \$19.95

Changing Views of Race and Society / Closing Remarks

*Gladye Whitney, Greg Raven
& Mark Weber*

A Florida State University psychology professor, and former president of the Behavioral Genetics Association, Whitney relates how his field, psychology, was hijacked from its rightful place among the natural sciences to serve a specious ideology-driven agenda of egalitarianism. Whitney names names — from Franz Boas to Steven Jay Gould — and calls for a return to the methods and values of Charles Darwin and Francis Galton. Then, in a heartfelt closing, IHR director Mark Weber and corporate chief Greg Raven close the Conference with thanks to speakers, attendees, and all IHR supporters. 68 min. (#v135) \$19.95

13th IHR Conference Video Tapes

Order individual tapes, or get the complete set for just \$211.78 (a \$47 savings),
Shipping for any number of tapes is \$2.50 domestic (\$6.50 foreign)

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

An Exercise in Futility

The Bombing of Auschwitz: Should the Allies Have Attempted It? edited by Michael J. Neufeld and Michael Berenbaum. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. Hardcover. 350 pp. Bibliography, index, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY SAMUEL CROWELL

Given the belief that Auschwitz was a unique slaughterhouse in which a million, or several millions, were gassed and burned, the question of whether the Allies could have done something to stop the supposed slaughter there is a natural one. In fact, aerial attacks on the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz were proposed during the war, when several Jewish agencies tried to prod the United States and Britain to intervene militarily during the evacuation of 400,000 Hungarian Jews in 1944.

Following the war, interest in the question of the Allied failure to bomb Auschwitz receded, although it was still common enough for Arthur R. Butz to mention in his *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (1977), along with his correct speculation that the Allies must have taken aerial photographs of the Auschwitz complex. In the following year, David Wyman wrote an article pressing the case for the Allies' dereliction in failing to bomb the "gas chambers and crematoria," an argument he would recapitulate in his 1984 book *The Abandonment of the Jews*. (We should note that "gas chambers and crematoria" are always discussed in tandem by Holocaust historians, evidence for the latter being considered sufficient proof of the former.) In 1979, when Brugioni and Poirier discovered the long-forgotten aerial photos of Auschwitz-Birkenau, they were seized upon, enabling Elie Wiesel to claim, "The world knew and kept silent . . . nothing was done to stop or delay the process. Not one bomb was dropped on the railway tracks to the death camps" (p. x)

The present book, derived from a symposium held at the occasion of the opening of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum 1993, is basically a meditation on Wiesel's accusation of Allied inaction. The book comprises fifteen contributions which take up about two-thirds of its length, detailed notes, an extensive appendix of contemporary telegrams and cables, but only an edited version of the famous Vrba-Wetzler report.

A number of the articles are of an impressionistic nature. Gerhard Weinberg, the American professor who first proclaimed the bogus Hitler Diaries genuine, offers little except his opinion that the Nazis were "nasty people" who fundamentally enjoyed slaughtering Jews and who would have found a way to do so even if the gas chambers and crematoria had been bombed: to argue otherwise is "preposterous" (p. 25). Henry L. Feingold suggests in his piece that the proper route would have been to bomb the German cities in retaliation: after all, the cities were being destroyed anyway, so why not simply justify the practice by referencing Auschwitz? It is difficult to take such casual arguments seriously.

Richard Breitman, who is remarkable among orthodox historians of the Holocaust for his industry in consulting the archives on some occasions, contributes a marginally off-topic article about the ULTRA decodes. While his description of the results of the British effort that broke the German "Enigma" codes fails to address the book's central premise, he does mention that the British were unable to make a connection between the transports being sent to Auschwitz and mass killings. Breitman goes on to say: "More suggestive was a later (November, 1942) message that Auschwitz urgently needed six hundred gas masks to equip its new guards, but that, too, was only one little piece of a picture" (p. 29). Such a large number of gas masks would not have been necessary for any kind of gassing, fumigation or otherwise. On the other hand, the decode fits in nicely with other evidence developed over the past few years that indicates that Auschwitz and sites in occupied Poland were concerned about poison gas attacks at that time, and even before the crematoria were completed.

Several of the rest of the articles are of a highly technical nature. For example, the article by Frederick Kitchens, an Air Force expert, revels in the vocabulary of tactical bombing, describing the crematoria as "relatively soft targets of brick construction" (p. 86). Later Kitchens describes the prospective mission: a "dauntingly complex objective consisting of five widely spaced buildings (four at Birkenau, one over a mile away at Auschwitz I) which had to be identified and attacked in concert with little loiter time and no release error" (p. 90). Evidently, Kitchens was not informed that the base camp crematorium had been decommissioned the previous year, then turned into a bomb shelter. Other contributions go over similar details, and there are several diagrams showing the layout of the camp, the position

of the Birkenau crematoria, and differently shaded circles and boxes to show the extent of damage to be expected around them.

Given the wealth of detail from an air force perspective, one would have expected a corresponding analysis of the passive ground defense at Auschwitz. Yet there is no discussion of the civil defense fixtures, including gastight doors, with which the basements of the crematoria were equipped. Perhaps the authors did not want to contend with the paradox that, of all the structures in Auschwitz, the spaces they designate as “gas chambers” were in fact the best designed to withstand aerial bombardment. Meanwhile, while the authors are meticulous in estimating the collateral damage of a bombing raid in terms of prisoner casualties, none of them seems concerned that bombing the crematoria would also have involved the destruction of the sewage treatment plant as well as the Central Sauna. One is left with the absurd idea of a bombing raid that would destroy all of the hygienic facilities in an over-crowded camp, which would inevitably have engendered terrible epidemics.

The threat of diseases at the camp is, however, treated by Stuart G. Erdheim. It is his claim that had the crematoria been destroyed by bombardment, the Germans would have been unable to burn great numbers of corpses in ditches “due to the problems posed by humidity as well as the threat of disease. It was for these very reasons, in fact, that Himmler had ordered the crematoria built in the first place” (p. 355). Thus Erdheim’s position might seem to be that the Nazis were committed to killing the prisoners in Auschwitz, but were hesitant to burn their bodies in ditches, for fear that this would lead to epidemics which would, no doubt, kill the prisoners at Auschwitz.

In general, the “technical” analyses all share two basic problems. First, there seems to be no clear appreciation of the actual capacities of the “gas chambers” or the crematoria, let alone the capacities as they were envisioned by the Allies in 1944. Most of the authors, quoting testimonies or postwar novels, dogmatically describe how the “gas chambers and crematoria” could destroy a thousand or ten thousand persons per day. But that calculation is irrelevant to the counterfactual scenarios they devise, because it is clear from the primary source material in the back of the book that the figure being tossed around in 1944 was sixty thousand per day.

. That a killing rate of sixty thousand per day was even believed possible in 1944 is important to recon-

structing the mindset of the Jewish groups and of American and British officials, from which one should be able to derive some conclusions about their concern, or lack of concern, for what was transpiring at Auschwitz. Yet so incredible a death rate should also have led the authors to attempt to establish the actual capacities of their assumed “gas chambers.” If they had done so they would have found that the spaces they envisioned bombing had no extraordinary features. In effect, a basic analysis of the gassing claim, if it did not lead the authors to a revisionist perspective, would at least have led them to acknowledge that any closed space with a secure enough door would suffice, which means that bombing the “gas chambers” would have been utterly pointless.

The second basic problem concerns cremation. The underlying assumption appears to be that the Nazis were eager to carry out mass gas exterminations, but only if they could destroy all evidence of the crime. This idea suggests that the crematoria had some kind of magical ability to destroy the evidence of mass murder, and without such machines the mass murder would not have gone forward. This notion ignores the standard claim that several million Holocaust victims were killed with no expensive cremation facilities to dispose of their remains. Furthermore, since most of the authors endorse the idea of cremation pits at Auschwitz capable of destroying the remains of thousands on a daily basis, and must, according to the traditional view, endorse the idea for other locations, it is hard to see why the destruction of cremation facilities would be vital. We may leave aside the fact that bombing the crematoria would have, at the very least, provided the Nazis with a surfeit of bomb craters ready made for cremation. Still, it seems to us that the proper point of departure for any researcher attempting to evaluate the feasibility of a bombing run on the crematoria would have been to investigate the actual capacities of such a structure. If such is done, and realistic cremation rates selected, the point of bombing the crematoria is rendered moot.

Aside from the primary documentation provided in the back, there is on balance little to recommend *The Bombing of Auschwitz*. The technical articles, ranging over all the contingencies involved in the proposed bombing of the “gas chambers and crematoria,” are fatally flawed by the ignorance of the authors about the very objects they envision destroying, which renders the rest of their highly learned commentary of little if any value. The impressionistic pieces, on the other

hand, simply repeat well-known, but by now rather trite, moral judgments. There is, however, one pleasant surprise: Deborah Lipstadt, in an overview revised for this release, declares that the use of the Holocaust for political purposes, including the question of the Allied failure to bomb Auschwitz, is “ahistorical” — which fairly well sums up the nature of this flawed book.

Not Quite the Hitler Diaries

Gestapo Chief: The 1948 Interrogation of Heinrich Müller by Gregory Douglas. San Jose, CA: R. James Bender, 1995. Hardcover. 283 pages. \$35.95. Bibliography, index, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY MARK WEBER

Gestapo Chief, more than seventy thousand copies of which have reportedly been sold, is the product of an inventive mind and much hard work. It purports to present long-suppressed secret documents with startling revelations about Third Reich Germany, Hitler, Roosevelt, Churchill, and the Second World War.

This book, and three others in the *Gestapo Chief* series, are based primarily on what the author claims are detailed revelations from Heinrich Müller, the Bavarian-born policeman who, from 1939 until 1945, was chief of the Gestapo, the Third Reich’s “Secret State Police” (Geheime Staatspolizei), a branch of the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA). He was the immediate boss, for example, of Adolf Eichmann, who headed the RSHA bureau that oversaw Germany’s wartime Jewish deportation program. Müller reported to RSHA chief Reinhard Heydrich (until his assassination in Prague in 1942), and then, until the end of the war, to Ernst Kaltenbrunner.

Just what happened to “Gestapo” Müller has never been satisfactorily established. He was last seen in Berlin in April 1945, vanishing in the chaos and turmoil of the great battle for the German capital shortly before the end of the war in Europe. His corpse has never been found. For decades rumors persisted that he escaped to South America, or that he worked for Soviet or American intelligence.

Half a century after the end of the war, an elusive American who sometimes calls himself “Gregory Douglas” emerged to present in *Gestapo Chief* what he claims is proof that in 1945 Müller escaped to Switzerland, where he was recruited by American intelligence.

From December 1948 until 1952, “Douglas” contends, Müller lived in the Washington, DC, area, where he worked for U.S. military intelligence in the Truman administration, rising to the rank of U.S. Army brigadier general. According to “Douglas,” the former Gestapo commandant participated in high-level White House security conferences, and even met President Truman.

“Douglas” lays out this amazing story, with ever more tantalizing revelations from Müller, in four *Gestapo Chief* volumes issued by R. James Bender, a northern California publisher that specializes in militaria, especially of Third Reich Germany. In addition, the first volume in this series was published in Germany under the title *Geheimakte Gestapo-Müller*. Three of the four volumes are supposedly based on conversations between Müller in 1948 in Switzerland and an American intelligence agent named James Kronthal; the fourth is purportedly based on a private diary he kept while living in the United States.

In addition, this first volume contains extensive excerpts of what are claimed to be German intercepts of secret wartime trans-Atlantic telephone conversations between Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. In a purported conversation on November 26, 1941, President Roosevelt tells Churchill that a Japanese strike force is preparing to attack the U.S. naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on the weekend of December 7-8, 1941. This “smoking gun” document seemingly proves that the American president knew in advance of the impending Japanese attack, and failed to give adequate warning to Pearl Harbor’s defenders.

Perhaps this book’s most sensational “revelation” is that Hitler did not commit suicide on April 30, 1945, as those who were with him in the final days of the war later unanimously testified, but instead escaped to Spain. Müller insists that, with his help, Hitler and his mistress, Eva Braun, left Berlin on April 22, 1945, and flew from Austria on the 26th in a special four-motor aircraft that arrived the next day in Barcelona. “Listen to me,” Müller tells his American interrogator. “Hitler went to Spain. I know for certain his plane landed safely ...”

To confirm this testimony, the author presents what appears to be a facsimile reproduction of an authentic German document dated April 20, 1945. Headed “Special Führer journey to Barcelona,” and signed by Müller, it declares that “the Führer and his entourage will depart from airfield Hörching [near Linz] on April

26, 1945.”

Müller says that, as part of the escape operation, he found a man who looked like Hitler to serve as a “double.” Thus, Müller says, Hitler’s wedding to Eva Braun in the Berlin bunker on April 28 or 29, 1945, was “pure theater.” Afterwards, Müller goes on, the “double” was shot and his body left so that the Russians would find it, to mislead them into believing they had discovered the Führer’s corpse.

My view that the Gestapo Chief series is an elaborate hoax is based not only on an examination of the books themselves, but on lengthy telephone conversations with the author. From these talks, I can attest that “Gregory Douglas” is intelligent, loquacious, knowledgeable, and literate, but also amoral, evasive, and vindictive. Those who have spoken at any length with him are struck by his chronic cynicism — a trait that, interestingly enough, is reflected in the words he attributes to

Müller throughout the Gestapo Chief series.

The man who crafted this series of books is a known fabricator of documents who has used a variety of names over the years, including Peter Stahl, Samuel Prescott Bush, and Freiherr Von Mollendorf. His real name, apparently, is Peter Norton Birch or Peter Norwood Burch.

His son, with whom I have also spoken, sometimes fronts for his father as the author of the Gestapo Chief books. For more than a year the son has been living and working in Rockford, Illinois, under the name Gregory Douglas Alford. He is also a former staff writer for the *Sun-Star* newspaper of Merced, California, and the *Journal-Standard* of Freeport, Illinois. Apparently he has sometimes used the name Gregg Stahl.

David Irving, who is probably more familiar with wartime German documents than any other living historian, dismisses *Gestapo Chief* as “a carefully crafted

...
1. Die Kommandosache
 eintich Müller **Chef-Sache**
 SS-Gruppenführer **Nur durch Offizier**
 Kommandant der Dstg
 Berlin, am 20. April 1945
 3 Ausfertigungen
 Z Ausfertigung.
 Betr.: Führersonderreise nach Barcelona

1. Der Führer und seiner Begleitung verläßt den Flugplatz Hörching am 26.4.1945 um 20.00 Uhr.
2. Hierzu befinden sich in der Begleitung des Führers:

Der Führer
 Reichsanführer Dr. Goebbels
 Frau Goebbels und Kinder (6)
 Reichsleiter Bormann
 SS-Gruppenführer Müller
 SS-Gruppenführer Fegelein
 General der Infanterie Burgdorf
 Botschafter abV Hewel
 SS-Oberstuf. Betz
 SS-Stuf. Dr. Stumpfegger
 SS-Hauptstuf. Gross
 FrL. Braun
 FrL. Manziary

4 Mann Begleitkdo (RSD) +3

Das Gepäck vorstehend genannt Herren ist bis 16.00 Uhr vor der Kommandantur Flugplatz Hörching abzugeben.

SS-Gruppenführer
Antschef IV RSHA

Verteiler:

Oberst Baumbach, Chef der Regierungsstaffel 1. Ausf.
I./K.G. 200 Kdr. 2. Ausf.
Reichsleiter Bormann 3. Ausf.

...
1. Die Kommandosache
 eintich Müller **Chef-Sache**
 SS-Gruppenführer **Nur durch Offizier**
 Kommandant der Dstg
 Berlin, am 20. April 1945
 3 Ausfertigungen
 1 Ausfertigung.
 Betr.: Führersonderreise nach Barcelona

1. Der Führer und seine Begleitung verläßt den Flugplatz Hörching am 26.4.1945 um 20.00 Uhr.
2. Hierzu befinden sich in der Begleitung des Führers:

Der Führer
 Reichsanführer Dr. Goebbels
 Frau Goebbels und Kinder (6)
 Reichsleiter Bormann
 SS-Gruppenführer Müller
 SS-Gruppenführer Fegelein
 General der Infanterie Burgdorf
 Botschafter abV Hewel
 SS-Oberstuf. Betz
 SS-Stuf. Dr. Stumpfegger
 SS-Hauptstuf. Gross
 FrL. Braun
 FrL. Manziary

4 Mann Begleitkdo (RSD) +3

Das Gepäck vorstehend genannt Herren ist bis 16.00 Uhr vor der Kommandantur Flugplatz Hörching abzugeben.

Müller 17h/K

Verteiler:

Oberst Baumbach, Chef der Regierungsstaffel 1. Ausf.
I./K.G. 200 Kdr. 2. Ausf.
Reichsleiter Bormann 3. Ausf.

4-517 1945

Each of these two “documents” has been presented by “Gregory Douglas” as a facsimile reproduction of a secret German document dated April 20, 1945. Headed “Special Führer journey to Barcelona,” it purports to be evidence that Adolf Hitler flew from Germany to Spain during the final weeks of the war in Europe. The version on the left, with “SS” rendered as normal typewriter letters, was published by “Douglas” along with an article by him in the spring 1990 issue of *The Military Advisory*. The “corrected” version on the right, with “SS” rendered in runic letters, appears in the first volume of *Gestapo Chief* (p. 275). Both versions are fabrications, as are most of the “documents” presented in the *Gestapo Chief* series.



Heinrich Müller

historical novel." Some years ago, Irving says, "Peter Stahl" tried to sell him forged documents. Another British historian, John Costello (author of *Ten Days to Destiny* and other works), whom I knew rather well until his death in August 1995, told me that Douglas/Stahl similarly tried to sell him wartime documents of dubious authenticity.

Perhaps the most obviously suspect feature of the *Gestapo Chief* series is that the author will not permit any independent examination of his "original" documents. (To be sure, not all the documents he presents are fraudulent. To add credibility to his book, "Douglas" includes, among his forgeries, a number of indisputably authentic wartime documents.)

During one telephone conversation, "Douglas" told me with some pride that his book would soon be coming out in German, and that the 1948 Müller interrogations were being translated into German. But how, I asked, was that possible, given that (as *Gestapo Chief* readers are told) these interrogations took place in German and the "original" transcripts are already in German. The normally suave and loquacious "Douglas" was at a loss for words.

Characteristic of this entire series is the clearly fraudulent "facsimile document" of April 20, 1945, pre-

sented on page 275 of *Gestapo Chief*. This is actually the author's second, "corrected" version. The first appeared with an article he wrote for the spring 1990 issue of *The Military Advisor*, a magazine issued by the same firm that publishes *Gestapo Chief*. But whereas the "SS" characters are rendered in this earlier "facsimile" as normal typescript letters, they are rendered in *Gestapo Chief* as "lightning bolt" runes.

How did these amazing documents come into the author's possession? In *Gestapo Chief*, the first volume of the series, "Douglas" tells the reader that "In the early 1980s, by means that are not of concern here, all of Müller's personal files came into private hands." Later "Douglas" claimed that Müller personally gave him these extraordinary documents (*Spotlight*, Jan. 6, 1997). In another *Spotlight* interview (Nov. 9, 1998), "Douglas" claimed to have met Müller in 1963, and to have known him well until his death in 1983. Remarkably, no mention of this twenty-year relationship appears in volume one of *Gestapo Chief*.

To credit Douglas' fantastic yarns requires one to accept that Hitler's personal and political testaments of April 29, 1945, are phony, and that all those who were with him in the final days in the Berlin bunker, and who survived the war, conspired for decades in a lie to hide the German leader's escape to Spain. These persons include Hans Baur, Hitler's pilot; Traudl Junge, the secretary who typed Hitler's final testament; the pilot Hanna Reitsch; Otto Günsche, Hitler's personal adjutant, who carried the body of Eva Braun from the bunker up to the courtyard where it was burned; Erich Kempka, the chauffeur who helped burn the bodies of Hitler and his wife; Heinz Linge, Hitler's valet; and Artur Axmann, the Hitler Youth leader (Linge and Axmann later testified to having seen Hitler's corpse). Some of these witnesses were questioned by British historians Hugh Trevor-Roper and David Irving; others, during Soviet captivity, by the Russians. Their stories tally.

Finally, it is utterly implausible to believe that Hitler would have vanished without trace after arriving in Spain, and that not a single one of the many persons who would have noticed his arrival there has ever spoken of it.

How has "Douglas" gotten away with his fraud? One important factor has been the unwavering support he's received for years from Willis Carto. In spite of repeated warnings that "Douglas" is a liar and that his *Gestapo Chief* books are frauds, Carto has steadfastly promoted

“Douglas” and his books in two periodicals he controls: *The Spotlight*, the weekly Liberty Lobby tabloid, and *The Barnes Review*, a bi-monthly history magazine.

For years Carto has promoted and offered for sale the Gestapo Chief series through the *Barnes Review* book club. He has arranged for publication of numerous articles by and interviews with “Gregory Douglas.” Typical is a *Spotlight* interview (Jan. 5-12, 1998) headlined “Establishment Can’t Keep Lid on Blockbuster Gestapo Books.” Another uncritical interview with “Douglas” appeared in the April 1997 *Barnes Review*. A few months later, the November 1997 issue of *The Barnes Review* featured a laudatory review of the second Gestapo Chief volume. Written by veteran *Spotlight* staff writer Fred Blahut, it assures readers that “Douglas proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Muller did, indeed, survive [the war] and was, in fact, interrogated by the CIA. Following these extensive sessions, he was employed and moved to Washington ... He was a key player in the Cold War ... Douglas presents the facts and lets the chips fall where they may.”

Gestapo Chief is a fraud nearly as audacious as the notorious “Hitler Diaries” hoax of 1983. For those who care about accurate and honest historiography, the case of *Gestapo Chief* is an instructive one.

In the Name of the Holocaust

Between the Alps and a Hard Place: Switzerland in World War II and Moral Blackmail Today by Angelo Codevilla. Washington, DC: Regnery, 2000. Hardcover. \$27. 263pp. Index.

REVIEWED BY DANIEL MICHAELS

In *Between the Alps and a Hard Place*, distinguished U.S. foreign policy adviser (and long-standing supporter of Israel) Angelo Codevilla takes the Clinton administration to task for collaborating with the World Jewish Congress to extract, by means of moral blackmail, billions of dollars from Swiss, Austrian, and German banks and businesses. Codevilla charges further that American politicians, mostly Democrats, received generous political contributions for their support of the WJC’s campaign.

Daniel W. Michaels is a Columbia University graduate (Phi Beta Kappa, 1954), and a former Fulbright exchange student to Germany (1957). He is retired from the US Department of Defense after 40 years of service.

Put bluntly, the WJC operation strongly resembled a shake-down, whereby the Swiss would stand accused of crimes against the Jewish people if they failed to fork over a sum finally set at over a billion dollars. The WJC had already secured, through lavish contributions, the practical, if not official, support of the Clinton administration. The “moral” support of U.S. establishment media was of course to be counted on, as in all such cases involving the “victims of Nazism.”

At the federal level, President Clinton offered the “good offices” at the State Department of his good friend, Stuart Eizenstat, who also acted as U.S. special envoy for property claims in Central and Eastern Europe. Thus Switzerland was lumped, for the first time, in the category of Nazi collaborator and recipient of assets stolen in the Second World War. Eizenstat promptly and dutifully presented a report on the Swiss matter that was pleasing to the WJC. His report stated that “our task is to complete the unfinished business of the twentieth century’s most traumatic and tragic events and of doing things now that couldn’t be done then.” In these words he dismissed decisions on lost assets made under the Truman administration, and provoked ill-feelings against a nation with which we have long had friendly relations. The final irony of the Eizenstat report, as Codevilla notes, is that it contains only sixteen pages on its ostensible main subject — heirless assets in Switzerland — and even those pages contain not a single finding on how many victims of Nazism put how much money where, or what happened to it (p. 168). “Stu” Eizenstat kept pushing the Swiss bank case for the best settlement possible, right up to President Clinton’s last day in office.

Edgar Bronfman, head of the WJC, was the prime mover and main plaintiff in the action against the Swiss banks for allegedly having collaborated with the Nazis and having failed to disclose and return heirless deposits made by Jewish victims before the war. Such deposits would have had to be made surreptitiously, since the National Socialist government had put limitations on the amounts of money that could be exported and had made currency speculation a crime.

At hearings before the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs in April 1996, Bronfman assumed moral authority on behalf of Jews worldwide, living and dead, to reclaim this “patrimony” (p. 6): “I speak to you today on behalf of the Jewish people. With reverence, I also speak to you on behalf of the six million who cannot speak for themselves.”

To introduce the issue and himself before the Committee, Bronfman first employed the services of its chairman, Republican Senator from New York Alfonse D'Amato, who opened the hearings by proclaiming (p. 5): "We have in our possession recently declassified documents that shed new light on Switzerland's role in World War II."

It mattered not, Codevilla notes, that Senator D'Amato was unable to produce any credible new evidence, nor that President Harry Truman had settled the issue of "heirless assets" in 1949, when he signed Senate Bill 603, setting upper limits on such claims. It did not even matter that Mr. Bronfman in no way represented the Jewish people as a whole. When Codevilla queried his contacts in the Israeli Foreign Ministry to ascertain whether the Israeli government backed Bronfman's action, the Israelis denied it, and told him that Switzerland was one of Israel's best supporters (p. 165, 174).

As is standard in legal actions involving numerous plaintiffs, the WJC filed a class action suit against the Swiss. By doing so, they could rely on maximum favorable publicity, and hope for a settlement before going to trial to prove the truth of their accusations. It is well known that most of the proceeds won in such cases are swallowed up by lawyers and the organizations hiring them. The many individuals on whose behalf the suit is presumably filed normally receive very little compensation.

The most important concern in class-action suits, as Codevilla explains, is the need to select a sympathetic venue and an equally well-disposed judge. New York City, specifically the Borough of Brooklyn, with its heavily Jewish population, was seen by the plaintiffs as the perfect venue. After some consideration Judge Edward Korman, a Democrat who had been appointed to the federal bench through the political patronage of Senator Patrick Moynihan, was selected to preside.

New York City Comptroller Alan Hevesi, chief financial official in America's financial capital, was able to exert additional pressure on the Swiss. In his office as Comptroller, Hevesi and his committee had the authority to grant or reject licenses for major business transactions in New York. At the time of the suit, the Union Bank of Switzerland was requesting a license to merge with the Swiss Bank Corporation, which would create UBS, Europe's largest bank. Since these banks do a business of about \$4 billion per year in New York, the Swiss could ill afford to displease Hevesi.

After much haggling a settlement was reached in the

case (the Swiss agreed to pay \$1.25 billion), and a "special master," Judah Gribetz, was appointed by Judge Korman to administer the distribution of the award to the plaintiffs and their attorneys. Gribetz had been a member of the Judicial Selection Committee that had advised Senator Moynihan on federal judicial appointments, including that of Judge Korman. Gribetz was also president of the Jewish Community Relations Council and a lifetime advocate of Jewish causes (p. 193).

As Codevilla describes it, an unseemly, even obscene, fight over the distribution of the monies to be awarded ensued almost immediately between lawyers representing individual victims, lawyers representing the various Jewish organizations, and still others representing themselves and fighting for their own fees. Aside from the legal suit filed by the WJC, whose main strategist was Rabbi Israel Singer, the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles had its attorneys, Michael Hausfeld, Melvyn Weiss, and Martin Mendelsohn, open legal proceedings, as did still a third camp headed by Edward D. Fagan, another Holocaust activist. While the lawyers bickered and bad-mouthed each other, the WJC consolidated its central role in the claims.

The internecine squabbling led no less than Abraham Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League to comment: "I don't want an industry to be made on the memory of the victims because there are so few survivors out there who will benefit from it." The columnist Charles Krauthammer deplored the rancorous bickering of the contending parties. While agreeing that the suit was justified in order to reveal any wrongdoings on the part of the Swiss or others against Jews, Krauthammer thought that the emphasis on money cheapened the entire proceedings. Krauthammer: "But money? It should be beneath the dignity of the Jewish people to accept it, let alone seek it."

In 1997, the Swiss government and industry established a \$200 million fund for Holocaust victims and designated the WJC to disburse the monies. A year later, only 10 percent of this amount had actually been allotted. The effective beneficiaries, Codevilla states, turned out, as expected, to be the organizations themselves, especially the WJC.

Once the money had been turned over to the WJC for disbursement, the media's vilification campaign against Swiss banks ceased to be news. Codevilla comments cynically that postwar financial settlements follow the principle that "the strong keep what they can while the

weak give up what they must.” By the strong, Codevilla apparently means the United States, acting in concert with Jewish interests. Thus was a million dollar investment in the form of a political contribution parlayed into a billion dollar payoff — all in the name of the victims of the Holocaust.

Codevilla rightly points out the displeasure and even hostility toward the United States that this affair engendered abroad. When a private interest group such as the WJC is able to recruit and involve U.S. government officials in a grievance suit against a foreign country for injustices, real or alleged, that occurred more than half a century ago, it is manifestly unfair to the accused country, and may even violate U.S. law, for our government to lend its prestige and weight to the unproven claims of the plaintiffs. It then appears to all the world that the United States is ever ready to serve as Jewry’s “catspaw” in disputes (social, economic, financial, political) around the globe.

If any country should be the champion of Jewish concerns and grievances the world over, it should be the State of Israel, but of course Israel lacks the clout that the United States can bring to bear. The U.S. government is legally and rightfully the guarantor and protector of the rights of all U.S. citizens — Christians, Jews, or Muslims — here or abroad. What happened, or is alleged to have happened, to individuals abroad — before they emigrated to this country and acquired U.S. citizenship — is not rightly our business. Indeed, most citizens of the United States emigrated to this country precisely because of grievances, injustices, or hardships — real or perceived — suffered abroad.

Codevilla might be criticized for spending too much time in defending Switzerland’s difficult position in the Second World War. Switzerland really needs no defense or explanation for its wartime actions. The author also expends too many words to explain the gold trade during the war. Readers of this type of literature know full well that most countries and governments are Mammon’s children with regard to wartime loot and booty. And, finally, some readers might find this book too partisan, exaggerating the (grantedly predominant) role of Democrats in letting WJC contributions guide their actions.

As to granting Jewish refugees shelter and a haven in their time of need, Switzerland did more in proportion to its size and wealth than did the United States. At the Evian Conference in 1938, Switzerland even offered to be a staging area for an exodus of Jews from Germany,

but no country, including the United States, would take significant numbers of refugees. Still later, at the Bermuda Conference of 1943, Codevilla reminds, the United States and Britain refused to take any practical steps to mitigate the plight of the Jews. Ironically, by far the greatest number of European Jews, about 350,000, found haven in Spain and Portugal, whose Catholic leaders, Franco and Salazar, have often received unfavorable press in this country (p. 104).

Notwithstanding these small faults, Codevilla, with the best interests of the American and Jewish people in mind, rightly condemns the Clinton administration for its officious and sanctimonious involvement in the Swiss bank affair, thereby subordinating U.S. foreign policy interests to those of a minority pressure group. By so doing, Clinton and his helpers distorted and abused the U.S. legal system, and created a foreign policy fiasco. Citizens would be justified in asking why and for how long and at what cost to America’s own international interests is the United States to be the exclusive champion of Jewish claims and accusations.

D for History, A for Entertainment

Enemy at the Gates. (2001) Genre: film (war, drama). Length: 131 minutes. MPAA rating: R. Starring: Jude Law, Joseph Fiennes, Ed Harris, Rachel Weisz, Ron Perlman, Gabriel Marshall-Thomson, Matthias Habich. Director: Jean-Jacques Annaud. Producers: Jean-Jacques Annaud, John D. Schofield. Released by: Paramount. Grade: B+.

REVIEWED BY SCOTT L. SMITH

The success in 1998 of Steven Spielberg’s smarmy *Saving Private Ryan* has inspired a reawakening of interest in epic movies of the Second World War. The latest of these, *Enemy at the Gates*, set in the cataclysmic siege of Stalingrad, is long on drama, short on historical accuracy.

As historical epic to rank with *Lawrence of Arabia*, or even *Doctor Zhivago*, *Enemy at the Gates* fails miserably. Nevertheless, it offers a compelling plot that features a duel between master snipers, and a romantic triangle among the Soviets.

The deadly contest in marksmanship takes place

Scott Smith holds a B.A. in history from Idaho State University. He served in the U.S. Army Signal Corps, and has worked as a radio-television engineer.

between a character based on a real-life Hero of the Soviet Union, Vassily Zaitsev (Jude Law), a sniper credited with hundreds of kills, and a fictitious German sniping expert, Major König (expertly played by Ed Harris). Meanwhile, Zaitsev and his handler, a Jewish commissar and propagandist, Comrade Danilov (Joseph Fiennes), vie for the beautiful Jewish soldier Tanya.

The love-interest does serve to divert the viewer from much of the movie's historical and tactical absurdity. For example, we learn in a cameo that General von Paulus (Matthias Habich), has placed his Sixth Army's entire hopes on Major König's skill in bringing down the Soviet propaganda icon, sharpshooter Zaitsev — and thus winning the pivotal battle of the war with a single well-placed bullet.

Ron Perlman briefly plays the captivating Kulikov, a German-trained sniper who mentors Zaitsev. "Don't have any illusions," the older man tells his study, baring wide the virtues of Soviet dentistry. But the major theme is the relentless duel between the ruthlessly efficient Major König and Comrade Zaitsev: two eyes peering behind two telescopic sights, one of Prussian blue and one of Russian Red.

This would never happen in real life. When a sniper fires he must extricate himself immediately: shock troops are on the way. In this film the protagonists act as amateur detectives in a dead metropolis, stalking each other underneath burlap camouflage. Where are the picket lines? Why is it that every German general likes to take a bath in grenade-range of still-steaming Russian corpses?

The weaponry is accurate, but one would really have expected much more from Berlin's Babelsberg studios, once home to Marlene Dietrich and Fritz Lang.

In a rip-off of *Saving Private Ryan*, the Soviets cross the Volga in barges bombed and strafed by the Luftwaffe — exciting, but not the same as the first few minutes of *Ryan*, where one could almost feel the MG-42 rounds ripping into the landing craft. Despite the cockney casting of the comrades — Bob Hoskins makes a particularly awful scene as Khrushchev, resembling a cross between Noriega and Boris Badenov — deep down we know that these are Russians. The Red Army throws them into the breach without weapons — political commissars standing by to shoot wafflers in the back. It's the legendary Russian way to win a war, where we forget that it was the Germans who were ultimately surrounded, but fought on!

A gripping though impossible drama, the love triangle is awkwardly played out with the required happy ending. Comrade Danilov does the right thing, instead of sending Vassily to the gulag over the affections of Tanya. You may even be able to trick your wife or girlfriend into seeing it with you. Tanya's "I knew you weren't dead." [Why?] "Because we've just met!" is no more mawkish than *Casablanca's* "We'll always have Paris."

Once you forget that the outcome of the war in Europe is supposed to hinge on the plot, you may well enjoy this movie. The Germans have more Panzers and Stukas at first, but the tormented virtuoso with a Mauser rifle, Major König, is no Vassily Zaitsev. König, who stereotypically closes the drapes, unable to bear seeing wounded German soldiers in the train next to him, can certainly make an example of a double-dealing Dickensian street urchin named Sasha (Gabriel Marshall-Thomson), implausibly acting as spy for both snipers. What will become of the young Sasha? What will become of the complex Major König?

The price of admission is worth finding out. Just don't expect a history lesson. But if you've ever wondered how to make love in a cold bunker full of sleepy muzhiks, you will find out from *Enemy at the Gates*.

Remember the Institute in Your Will

If you believe in the Institute for Historical Review and its fight for freedom and truth in history, please remember the IHR in your will or designate the IHR as a beneficiary of your life insurance policy. It can make all the difference.

If you have already mentioned the Institute in your will or life insurance policy, or if you would like further information, please let us know.

Director, IHR
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659
USA

Moving?

Please notify us of your new address at least six weeks in advance. Send address change to:

IHR, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA.

Where are the Missing 'Six Million'? If Hitler Didn't Kill Europe's Jews, What Happened to Them?

In this masterly, unprecedented and, so far, unique demographic study, a qualified specialist shows what happened to Europe's Jews under Hitler and during the Second World War. *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* provides the best accounting available of the actual fate of the "Six Million."

Carefully analyzes the (often fragmentary) census data and the extraordinary population displacements that occurred before, during and after the war, which involved great migrations and deportations of Jewish refugees into Soviet Russia and Ukraine, North and South America, and Palestine.

This study establishes that there never were "six million" Jews under German control at any time. It shows, for example, that the great majority of Jews in the Soviet territories occupied by the Germans, 1941-1944, and who are widely assumed to have perished as "victims of the Holocaust," were actually evacuated or fled — and never came under German rule.

Based on a wide range of sources, including publications of the Institute for Jewish Affairs and such reference works as the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* and the *American Jewish Year Book*, as well as contemporary European periodicals and wartime German documents.

In his foreword, Northwestern University Prof. Arthur R. Butz calls this "the first full

length serious study of World War II-related Jewish population changes ... This book presents the fundamentally correct account of the subject. The perfect antidote to the vulgar idiocies that are today monotonously peddled by the media ..."

The author was born in 1936 into an ethnic German family in a part of eastern Europe that was later incorporated into the Soviet Union. In the mid-1950s he emigrated to the United States, where he met his wife. He graduated with a B.A. (high honors) in international business from a prominent Pacific Northwest university, and did PhD-level graduate work at a major Ivy League university on the East coast.

He taught business, finance and economics at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at a major west coast university. He returned to work in the business world in the early 1970s.

The DISSOLUTION Of Eastern European Jewry

Walter N. Sanning

Foreword by Arthur R. Butz

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry

by Walter N. Sanning

Foreword by Dr. Arthur R. Butz

Quality softcover. 239 pages. Graphs. Charts.

Maps. Bibliography. Index. (#0389)

ISBN 0-939484-11-0

\$8.25 postpaid (CA add \$.48 sales tax)

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

Nothing to It

In the September-October 2000 issue of the *Journal*, Costas Zaverdinos writes:

Regarding Chelmno and the “gas vans,” Irving was more explicit: “I have repeatedly allowed that [Jews] were killed in gas vans” — and he included Yugoslavia among the places where such vans were used. A dramatic moment in the proceedings came when Irving was shown a document describing the gassing of 97,000 Jews in Chelmno “gas vans.” Although he claimed to have first seen this document only five or six months earlier, he accepted it as genuine. It showed “systematic, huge scale, [sic] using gas trucks to murder Jews.”

As [Deborah Lipstadt’s attorney] Rampton put it in his closing speech: “Mr. Irving has been driven, in the face of overwhelming evidence presented by Professor Robert Jan van Pelt, Professor Christopher Browning and Dr. Longrich, to concede that there were indeed mass murders on a huge scale by means of gassing at Chelmno in the Warthegau and at the Reinhardt camps of Belzec, Treblinka, and Sobibor; and even that there were “some gassings” at Auschwitz.

Irving is no Holocaust historian, as he himself admits. Therefore, why did Zaverdinos allow Irving’s statements to go unchallenged? And why did the *JHR* let these statements stand unchallenged?

If there really is substance to Rampton’s assertions, particularly about mass murders using gas vans, I’d to know about it. Everything that I can recall reading about “gas vans” in the *Journal* said that there was really nothing to it.

Phil Eversoul
Los Angeles, CA

The narrative and analytical focus of Dr. Zaverdinos’s article (“The Rudolf Case, Irving’s Libel Suit and the Future of Revisionism,” JHR, 19, no. 5, pp. 26-61) precluded his criticizing Irving’s trial positions at every instance. Nevertheless, his remarks on page 39 take careful issue with Irving on diesel gassings in vans and in the Reinhardt camps. In any case, the evidence for these gassings is even less substantial than that for the alleged Zyklon (cyanide) gassings at Auschwitz and elsewhere. For the most informed and up-to-date analysis of the pitifully scanty evidence, see the articles by Fritz Berg, Ingrid Weckert, and Arnulf Neumaier in Gernot Rudolf’s Dissecting the Holocaust, available from IHR for \$55.00 post-paid (foreign orders please add \$1.50 shipping). — Ed.

One Man’s Opinion

Regarding Donald Tarter’s “Peenemünde and Los Alamos: Two Studies,” in the July-August 2000 issue of the *Journal*, on the one hand we have a group of German scientists — the inventors of the V1 and the V2 and the pioneers of the U.S. space program — desperately trying to ensure their country’s survival under apocalyptic conditions.

On the other hand, we have a

bunch of sheltered and pampered Jewish scientists in a bucolic setting, hellbent on creating the most murderous weapon the world has ever seen. It is clear to me who the criminals and the heroes of that story are. Bottom line, end of story.

P.G.
Brampton, Ontario
Canada

Desires Debate

I would like to thank you for a magazine which increases in quality with each issue and covers varied issues from a revisionist viewpoint. It has been ten years since I discovered the IHR and its journal, and I admire them more than ever. While not every topic is of interest to me, you are definitely on the right track.

I would like to see a detailed history of Holocaust revisionism, past and present findings, and future prospects. I believe further that the *Journal* should be a place for discussion and debate between revisionists and establishment historians. Sometimes I get the feeling that the debate is too narrow-minded, even from your point of view. Is a serious interview with a “believer” too much to hope for?

HL
Sweden

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

The Most Important Dissection of the Holocaust Story in Years!

New!


Packed with stunning revelations, this scholarly, attractive and well-referenced work is the best revisionist critique of the Holocaust story to appear in years.

In this big (8 1/2 x 11 inches), illustrated, 600-page collection, 17 specialists — chemists, engineers, geologists, historians and jurists — subject Holocaust claims to withering scrutiny. They expose bogus testimonies, falsified statistics, doctored photos, distorted documents, farcical trials, and technological absurdities. They provide expert examinations of the alleged Holocaust murder weapons: gas vans and gas chambers.

Among the 22 essays in this anthology are:

- Germar Rudolf (E. Gauss), "The Controversy about the Extermination of the Jews."
- Robert Faurisson, Preface and "Witnesses to the Gas Chambers of Auschwitz"
- John C. Ball, "Air Photo Evidence"
- Mark Weber, "'Extermination' Camp Propaganda Myths"
- Friedrich P. Berg, "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth within a Myth"

- Carlo Mattogno, "The Gas Chambers of Majdanek"



- H. Tiedemann, "Babi Yar: Critical Questions and Comments"
- Udo Walendy, "Do Photographs Prove the NS Extermination of the Jews?"

Writes Dr. Arthur R. Butz: "There is at present no other single volume that so provides a serious reader with a broad understanding of the contemporary state of historical issues that influential people would rather not have examined."

It's no wonder that alarmed authorities banned the original German edition, ordering all remaining copies confiscated and burned.

Dissecting the Holocaust is edited by Germar Rudolf ("Ernst Gauss"), a certified chemist, born in 1964, who wrote "The 'Rudolf Report,'" a detailed on-site forensic examination of the "gas chamber" claims of Auschwitz and Birkenau. After a German court sentenced him to 14 months imprisonment, he fled his homeland and has been living ever since in exile as a political refugee. Since 1997, he has been editor of the German-language historical journal *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*.

DISSECTING THE HOLOCAUST: THE GROWING CRITIQUE OF "TRUTH" AND MEMORY

Edited by "Ernst Gauss" (Germar Rudolf)
Hardcover. Full color dust jacket. Large-size format. 603 pages.
Photographs. Charts. Source references. Index. (#0319)
\$50, plus shipping (Calif. add \$3.88 sales tax)

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

Unmasking Zionism's Most Dangerous Myths

In this headline-making work, a prominent French scholar delivers one powerful blow after another to the pernicious historical myths cited for decades to justify Zionist aggression and repression, including the Israeli legend of a "land without people for a people without land," and the most sacred of Jewish-Zionist icons, the Holocaust extermination story.

For financial gain, as an alibi for indefensible policies, and for other reasons, Jews have used what the author calls "theological myths" to arrogate for themselves a "right of theological divine chosenness." The wartime suffering of Europe's Jews, he contends, has been elevated to the status of a secular religion, and is now treated with sacrosanct historical uniqueness.

This readable, thoroughly documented study examines the brutal dispossession and mass expulsion of Palestine's Arabs, exposes the farce of the Nuremberg victors' show trial, and shows that the notorious German "final solution" term referred to a "territorial" program of resettlement, not extermination. *Founding Myths* details the secret collaboration of prominent Jews with the young Nazi regime, and the 1941 offer by some Zionists, including a future Israeli prime minister, to join Hitler's Germany in a military alliance against Britain. The author presents a frank assessment of the powerful Jewish-Zionist lobby in the United States, showing

Zionist, Soviet, American and German source references, this well-documented study is packed with hundreds of eye-opening quotations, many by prominent Jewish scholars and personalities.


Here, at last, this important work is available in a handsome, professionally edited English-language edition, with a valuable foreword by Theodore J. O'Keefe.

how it effectively controls US policy regarding Israel, and plays a crucial role in shaping American public opinion.

For decades Roger Garaudy was prominent in the French Communist Party, making a name for himself as a Communist deputy in the French National Assembly, and as a leading Marxist intellectual and theoretician. Later he broke with Communism, eventually becoming a Muslim.

When *Founding Myths* first appeared in France, it touched off a storm of controversy among intellectuals and a furious uproar in the media. Soon Garaudy was charged with violating France's notorious Gaysot law, which makes it a crime to "contest" the "crimes against humanity" as defined by the Nuremberg Tribunal of 1945-46. A Paris court found him guilty and fined him \$40,000. His trial and conviction for Holocaust heresy prompted wide international support, above all from across the Arab and Muslim world.

Relying on a vast range of



The Founding Myths of Modern Israel by Roger Garaudy

Quality soft-cover. 230 pages. Source references. Index. (#0246)

\$13.95, plus \$2.50 shipping (\$6.50 foreign; California orders add \$1.05 sales tax)

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