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An Allegory

David had a difficult early childhood. His drug-addicted parents mistreated and neglected him. At the age of two, the local children services intervened. At that point, David was malnourished and emotionally disturbed. David was assigned to a new “home” with foster parents who were more interested in the support money they got from the authorities than in David.

During the first years of his life, David learned not to trust the people around him. In order to survive, he had to learn how to lie, cheat and steal. Because no one was giving him positive, affectionate attention, he developed all kinds of tricks of negative attention seeking: he told wild, invented stories, pretended to suffer, and pushed people’s buttons by being disrespectful, sassy, and by irritating them with provocative pranks.

After parental rights were terminated, David was eventually adopted by parents who wanted to help him overcome his childhood trauma. They even included their own biological children in that project.

First they vowed to do everything to fulfill David’s wishes so that all his needs would be met at last.

Next, there were to be no more punishments. After all, David did not lie because he was a bad person but because he had been traumatized so deeply. One really had to empathize with this.

When David was mean to the other kids, they had to overlook this, too.

From now on, David no longer had to fear any punishment, except for an occasional mild reproof when he told wild but untrue stories, cheated while playing, or bullied other kids. After all, a child who had suffered so heavily in the past could not be made to suffer again.

When his adoptive siblings protested on occasion because they perceived David’s special treatment as unfair, or when they even accused David of lying or bullying, his siblings were rebuked or even punished for being so insensitive. David’s siblings were not allowed to criticize him.

David received this privileged treatment for 14 years in the house of his adoptive parents before he came of age and began his own independent life.

What had David been taught during these 14 years?

David had learned that he is entitled to the people around him lip-reading his wishes and fulfilling them without resistance when possible.

David had learned that not he will be punished for his lies but those who dare criticize him for them.

David had learned that he can torment his fellow human beings to a certain degree without being held responsible for it.

David’s parents had raised a monster.
Introduction

The Dutch cultural historian Dr. Robert van Pelt stated once that the crematoria of Auschwitz-Birkenau, as the killing sites of hundreds of thousands of Jews, are the epicenter of human suffering. But how does he know what transpired in those buildings, of which nowadays only ruins or foundation walls are left?

Anyone questioning their own knowledge – or that of another person – on any subject should start with simple questions such as these:

- How do I know that?
- Why do I think I know that?
- What is the basis of what I consider to be knowledge?

When we talk about historical topics, our knowledge, in a nutshell, is ultimately based on three types of evidence: material remains, documents, and testimonies. The present book on Auschwitz deals primarily with documents and to a lesser extent also with material remains. Testimonies are almost irrelevant. This may surprise many readers, because those familiar with the subject know that there is a veritable deluge of testimonies, especially since several organizations began to systematically record survivor memories in filmed interviews in the 1990s. In addition, the shelves of larger public libraries are chock-full of memoirs and testimonials, not to mention the many statements made during various criminal proceedings. It is no exaggeration to say that what most of us consider to be knowledge of Auschwitz is based precisely on these testimonies. And that’s the problem.

French historian Jacques Baynac expressed it in 1996 as follows:

“For the scientific historian, an assertion by a witness does not really represent history. It is an object of history. And an assertion of one witness does not weigh heavily; assertions by many witnesses do not weigh much more heavily, if they are not shored up with solid documentation. The postulate of scientific historiography, one could say without great exaggeration, reads: no paper(s) [=documents], no proven facts […].”

1 He said this about Crematorium II in Auschwitz-Birkenau, where most victims are said to have perished: some 500,000; Errol Morris, Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr., Fourth Floor Productions, May 12, 1999; VHS: Universal Studios 2001; DVD: Lions Gate Home Entertainment, 2003; first screened on Jan. 27, 1999 during the Sundance Film Festivals at Park City (Utah); youtu.be/YOqhuDGCC04, starting at 25 min. 15 sec.

Witnesses can err, omit important things, say only half the truth, exaggerate and understate, fib, lie and cheat, and all shades in between. Above all, we must always be aware that our brains hate ignorance. When we do not know something, we consciously and subconsciously tend to fill in the gaps in our knowledge or memory with what’s at hand: guesses, clichés, hearsay, rumors, etc. We all do this all the time, every day. Our brain is a master at extrapolating and interpolating.

Whoever wants to write exact, scientific history has to verify the reliability of testimonies. If it turns out that a witness has to some degree stated things that are untrue, then we must be allowed to ascertain this, and then we must draw consequences from it, namely that we reject the statement partly or entirely, or we completely reject a witness as untrustworthy, depending on the severity of the deviation from the truth.

And this is where the circle is completed that I opened with my initial allegory: Anyone who accuses David of not telling the truth or even of lying runs the risk of being persecuted to a greater or lesser degree by social punishment or even criminal prosecution. Under such a Sword of Damocles, historiography cannot conduct dependable, exact research. Fear of social ostracism or even legal consequences lets many researchers completely avoid the topic. If it is nevertheless taken up, then usually either with an ideological zeal that wants to uncritically believe everything David claims, or for safety’s sake in a compliant, uncontroversial way by parroting what the mainstream expects. Hence, the scientific quality of modern Auschwitz research by established, “respected” historians is accordingly pathetic, because anyone merely asking the wrong questions, let alone answering them in an unwelcome way, is no longer “respected”, but ostracized and marginalized.

Either you believe just about everything David says, or you’re a Nazi. Since the Mark of Cain called “Nazi” is equivalent to a social death sentence, even those who harbor doubts feign that they believe. Well, almost all…

The only way out of this dilemma is to make do without David, that is, without testimonies, and to retrace the events of history with what evidence is left: documents and physical traces.

In the 1980s, French hobby historian Jean-Claude Pressac recognized this dilemma and dared to solve the problem by trying to prove only with documents that the many testimonies about mass-extinction events at the Auschwitz Camp are essentially true. He succeeded in gaining the support of many respected individuals and institutions for this project, including the Auschwitz State Museum, the Commission of the European Communities (forerunner of the European Union), the Socialist Group of the European Parliament and the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation. The result was a huge, 564-page book in DIN A3 landscape format (11.7 in × 16.5 in) featuring reproductions of hundreds of original German wartime documents.

---

3 See the list of supporters in Pressac’s 1989 book on page 8.
on Auschwitz which were thoroughly annotated by Pressac. With this trail-blazing book titled *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, whose critical analysis is one of the main focuses of the present book, international Auschwitz research for the first time obtained a solid foundation supported by documents.

Of course, research has not stood still since then. Due to the collapse of the Eastern Bloc in the late 1980s and early 1990s, many archives were made accessible that hitherto had been either completely inaccessible or accessible only to selected researchers.

Take, for instance, the files of the Central Construction Office at Auschwitz. This was the authority that was responsible for all construction projects in the camp, including the crematoria that, according to witness claims, contained homicidal gas chambers. Until the early 1990s, historians believed that the files of this authority had been destroyed in late 1944 or early 1945 shortly before the withdrawal of the Germans from the Auschwitz Region. But that was not the case. After the Red Army had captured the camp in January 1945, the files of this authority were quietly and secretly transferred to Moscow, where they were kept under lock and key until the early 1990s. The files are today in the Russian War Archives (Rossiiskii Gosudarstvenii Vojennii Vojennii Archiv).

Other documents of the Auschwitz camp authorities are today in the Russian Federal Archives in Moscow (Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoi Federatsii), while some files of the Waffen-SS that deal with Auschwitz – the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp was originally planned as a Waffen-SS PoW camp – found their way into the
War Archives of the Waffen-SS, which is today stored in the Czech Military History Archives in Prague (Vojenský Historický Archiv).

In addition, there are archive holdings at the Auschwitz Museum itself as well as various files on criminal proceedings in Poland, which are now in Warsaw.

A small part of the collections made accessible in Moscow was evaluated by Pressac in the early 1990s, which inspired him to write a second book on Auschwitz, which I will address at the very beginning of the main text of this book.

In the following years, other researchers further analyzed these records and, based on Pressac’s *magnum opus*, brought new findings to light. The main text of this book gives an overview of these research results while frequently referring to Pressac’s *magnum opus*. Hence, anyone who wants to examine what is stated here about Pressac’s work needs to have access to his work. Unfortunately, Pressac’s *magnum opus* is no longer available today in its original print version, and only major libraries carry copies of it. Although the book was posted in its entirety on the Internet – [www.historiography-project.com/books/pressac-auschwitz/](http://www.historiography-project.com/books/pressac-auschwitz/) –, the main advantage of the print version of Pressac’s book – that it reproduced many documents in high resolution – does not apply to the low-resolution Internet version. It therefore makes sense to make Pressac’s *magnum opus* accessible again in a reprint. However, as it is partly obsolete by further research, it would be irresponsible to offer Pressac’s statements from 1989 as the final word on the issues at hand. A reprint therefore required a detailed introduction bringing the reader up to speed with the current state of knowledge on document research into Auschwitz. The main text of the present book also fulfills this role, which therewith kills two birds with one stone.
If you cannot afford or don’t want to spend the money for this expensive reprint of Pressac’s *magnum opus*, you can always content yourself with following the many cross-references found in the present book to Pressac’s *magnum opus* by looking them up online or by borrowing a hard copy from a library.

Under no circumstances do I want you to blindly trust me or anyone else who speaks out on this sensitive issue. The potential of political and social abuse with this subject are greater than with any other. After all, Auschwitz cannot only be described as the epicenter of human suffering, but also as the epicenter of the “instrumentalization of our shame for contemporary purposes,” as German writer Martin Walser put it in his notorious 1998 speech. With so much at stake, we all do well to make sure that we are on firm scientific ground.

To ensure this firm ground, many of the documents cited below are printed in facsimile. Many more can be found in the document appendices contained in the primary literature cited, most of which are available online as free PDF downloads. Hence, nothing stops you from finding out what the basis is of what the present book avers as knowledge.

Wimping out is not an option.

Germar Rudolf, Red Lion, Pennsylvania February 22, 2018

PS: As I write these lines, the reprint of Pressac’s *magnum opus*, which will include the contents of this book both in English and in German, is scheduled to appear in winter 2018/19 and will be available from Hanse Buchwerkstatt, Postfach 330404, D-28334 Bremen, Germany – unless the German censorship authorities have other plans…

---

Who Was Jean-Claude Pressac?

Jean-Claude Pressac was a French pharmacist and amateur historian. In his youth-ful years, he was an admirer of Adolf Hitler. As such, he was bothered by the Holocaust, because it sullied Hitler’s reputation. He therefore became interested in arguments suggesting that the orthodox version of the Holocaust narrative was somewhat fishy. He realized quickly, though, that contesting, revising, or denying the Holocaust was very dangerous. Hence, he changed his approach. During the 1980s, he managed to gain the confidence of Serge and Beate Klarsfeld as well as the Auschwitz Museum, and to convince them that one has to defeat the revisionists or rather Holocaust deniers with their own weapons. The revisionists want to see solid evidence for the veracity of the orthodox narrative? Let them have it! Pressac promised to put a stop to the deniers’ games, at least regarding Auschwitz, by means of documents and technical arguments. He gained the support of the Klarsfelds and of the Auschwitz Museum, and got down to business forcefully: in 1989, the Klarsfelds published his first überwork: the present Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers. For the first time in history, this book made generally accessible a wide range of document reproduction concerning the history of the Auschwitz camp. Though of tremendous interest to many researchers in the world, only a very limited number of copies was printed and distributed to selected organizations and individuals. The book was never available for sale to the general public.

Four years later, Pressac upped the ante after having found further documents on Auschwitz in an archive in Moscow. While his first work became known only to connoisseurs of the subject, his second, a much more handy work in paperback format of just some 200 pages, became a bestseller: Les crématoires d’Auschwitz: La machinerie du meurtre de masse1 – in plain English: The Crematories of Auschwitz: The Machinery of Mass Murder. Pressac himself mutated overnight to a darling of the mass media – a knight in shining armor who had slain the revisionist dragon! His book subsequently also appeared in a German,2 Italian,3 Norwegian,4 Portuguese5 and an English edition which, however, was heavily abridged and edited to conform to politically correct expectations.6

---

Pressac died in 2002 at the young age of 59, utterly forgotten by the media who had praised him as a hero merely eight years earlier. It is unclear why they ignored their former hero’s passing, but it may have had to do with Pressac’s increasingly skeptical statements about the orthodox Holocaust narrative.\(^7\) Pressac’s second book, however, is today still hailed as a milestone of Auschwitz research. It is said to refute the deniers’ arguments with technical precision. In fact, due to its persisting relevance, the French publisher of Pressac’s second book issued a new edition in 2007.

This introduction aims at giving the reader a short summary of the research done after Pressac’s magnum opus was published in 1989. That research has greatly profited from the fact that, after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, tens of thousands of documents in Czech, Polish and Russian archives have become accessible, enabling Auschwitz researchers to write a much more precise history of that most infamous of all German wartime camps. This means inevitably that not all of the claims Pressac wrote down in this book were confirmed by later research, while others could be substantiated with many more documents.

Claim and Reality

Already the present book’s title claims that its main focus is on the “Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers” of Auschwitz. Beate and Serge Klarsfeld also highlight this claim by writing in their original preface to this book that the present book is a “scientific rebuttal of those who deny the gas chambers” (my emphasis). With that they refer to the fact that Pressac was a pharmacist by trade, and thus had some training in the exact sciences. Furthermore, just above the table of contents, we read that the reader will find in this book a “systematic study of the delousing and homicidal gas chambers […] of the former KL Auschwitz Birkenau, and an investigation of the remaining traces of criminal activity.”

What has to be expected from a work that scientifically and systematically describes the technique and operation of any device? Works of science and technology have different standards than those of history. While the latter can be narrative and highly conjectural in nature, science and technology have little room for this, if any.

The claims made in a scientific work must by necessity be supported either by source references to other scientific works, by experiments described in a way that they can be repeated by others, or by logical arguments. Particularly in the field of

---

technology, logical arguments are most frequently based on mathematical reason-ings.

Any book on the technique and operation of any device ought to be brimming with references to technical and scientific literature, should have some kind of mathematical reasoning as can be found in the field of engineering, and may even contain descriptions of any kind of experiments conducted.

Pressac’s present book does not contain any of it. His book is completely devoid of any references to anything. It has neither foot- nor endnotes, and not even a bibliography. As a matter of fact, if you carefully read all the text contained in it, you will find not a single reference to any scientific or technical literature in the text itself either. Nothing. Nada. Niente. Rien. Nichts.

So, how can a book that has none of the hallmarks of a book on technology be technological in nature? It simply can’t. At that point, if you are really interested in a thorough study of the technique and operation of the gas chambers, you are well advised to close this book and look elsewhere. And where would that be? Well, I will get to that at the end of this introduction. Let us now turn to Pressac’s first chapter on Zyklon B.

Zyklon B

The primary focus of any treatise on Zyklon B should be to first describe what the product is made of and what features it had. Next, a closer look into this product’s active ingredients would be warranted, which in this case is hydrogen cyanide (HCN). None of this can be found in Pressac’s introduction. It contains only a reference to the guideline for the use of Zyklon B for fumigations as it was published during the war by its distributor, the Degesch Company, and found in the files of the Health Authority of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia in Prague. Not even that bit of information is contained in Pressac’s elaboration, which otherwise contains no reference to any literature on either Zyklon B or HCN.

A large body of scientific literature on Zyklon B and fumigations with HCN was published primarily in Germany between the early 1920s and the end of World War Two. Instead of citing them here, I recommend consulting more-recent monographs on Zyklon B and its use which contain the pertinent references in their bibliographies.8 Unless stated otherwise, the following information is taken from them.

Zyklon B is liquid HCN soaked into some porous carrier material. Initially, diatomaceous earth was used (product name “Diagrieß”), but it compacted during transport, and was subsequently replaced by gypsum pellets (“Erco”). In addition, wood-fiber discs were also used, primarily for the U.S. market. A 1998 analysis of depleted Zyklon B pellets left behind by the Germans in Auschwitz at war’s end using a scanning electron microscope revealed that the carrier consisted of gypsum, see Illustrations 1 and 2.9

A 1942 publication by one of the scientists involved in optimizing Zyklon B gave detailed information about the speed with which HCN evaporates at which temperature from the gypsum pellets, provided the pellets are scattered out, and the ambient air’s relative humidity is low, see Ill. 3.10

On page 18, Pressac gives a long list of features of HCN without indicating where he got this data from, which is typical for him. The chemical and physical properties of HCN are well established,11 and the physiological effects of hydrogen cyanide on insects as well as mammals, humans included, are well-researched. Every toxicological handbook contains an entry, including those that predate World War Two.12 Hence, Pressac’s claim on page 184 that “the lethal dose for humans was not known” to the SS seems far-fetched. However, a 1976 study by McNamara revealed that many, if not all of these toxicological handbooks took their data regarding

---


the susceptibility of humans to gaseous HCN directly or indirectly from a German study of 1919, which reported the effects of gaseous HCN on rabbits. Actual experiments with a human volunteer showed that the concentration listed by toxicological literature and repeated by Pressac as “immediately mortal” – 300 mg/m³ – is not immediately mortal for humans at all. While McNamara had only very limited data to rely on, American researcher Scott Christianson tapped into the precisely recorded data of hundreds of cases where humans were actually killed with HCN: executions of death penalties in the United States using HCN gas chambers. That data showed that it took on average 9.3 minutes to kill humans with a concentration of some 3,000 mg/m³ – ten time the above value! – while the longest execution with that kind of concentration took 18 minutes. Hence, humans are actually quite resilient to gaseous HCN, even more so than Pressac assumed.

Pressac asserts that “By far the greater part (over 95 percent) [of Zyklon B delivered to Auschwitz] was destined for delousing […] while only a very small part (less than 5 percent) had been used for homicidal gassings” (p. 15). He doesn’t back up his data with anything. In fact, since it is not known how many times Zyklon B was used with exactly what amount in the camp’s various fumigation chambers, and because it is also unknown how often the many other buildings of that camp were fumigated for pest control with how much Zyklon B per event, there is no way of pinpointing the percentage of delivered Zyklon B used for innocuous purposes. Auschwitz, with its hundreds of prisoners’ accommodation blocks, had

---


enough volume to perfectly justify the Zyklon B delivery as needed for fumigations.\textsuperscript{15} Hence, the large quantities of Zyklon B delivered to the camp do not prove anything by themselves.

\section*{Disinfestation Devices}

About the 19 Zyklon-B fumigation chambers originally planned for the reception building at the Auschwitz Main Camp, Pressac writes that its present state “makes it impossible to reconstruct the techniques employed” (p. 31). The reason for this is that the plan to install these chambers was abandoned in 1943 and replaced with a microwave disinfestation facility, the first of its kind in history. Siemens started developing the device in 1936. It was originally slated for use on garments of German soldiers. A shift of priorities occurred in early 1943, however. At that point, the typhus epidemic which had broken out at the Auschwitz Camp in spring of 1942 was still not under control, and many tens of thousands of prisoners had succumbed to it already. To preserve this slave-labor resource for the pivotal war industries of the Auschwitz area, the German authorities decided to use the most modern technique at their disposal to stamp out that epidemic for good. Due to air raids on Berlin damaging the local Siemens factories, however, the actual deployment of the device was delayed until spring of 1944. It went into operation on June 30, 1944, and proved to be sensationnally efficient and effective.\textsuperscript{16} Here are a few excerpts of the text of Illustration 4 in translation, a report written by Auschwitz garrison physician Dr. Eduard Wirths on August 10, 1944:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Report about the efficacy of the stationary shortwave delousing device}

The shortwave delousing device Osten 3 was taken into operation at Auschwitz on June 30, 1944. After training the so-far unskilled employees, full operations of the device started on July 5, 1944. Unless interrupted by blackouts, it was operated on a daily basis, but not always at full load. The delousing device’s performance data listed hereafter can be increase at least threefold.

The device’s average daily performance was 1441 sets of clothing and 449 blankets or comforters, which amounts to 46,122 sets of laundry and 14,368 blankets or comforters within 32 business days. In other words: Within 32 business days, until Aug. 6, 1944, all in all 46,122 people and their laundry and bed linens were
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15} For a calculation of this see Carlo Mattogno, \textit{Auschwitz: Le forniture di coke, legname, Zyklon B}, Effepi, Genoa 2015, pp. 77-79 (English in preparation).

Illustration 4: Report by Auschwitz garrison physician Dr. Eduard Wirths to Berlin about the efficacy of the new shortwave disinfection facility.
(Russian War Archives, 502-1-333, pp. 7f.)
The belongings to be deloused which these people have are usually more voluminous than for instance the stuff of a soldier in the field. The delousing device operates very swiftly and reliably, as many test runs have shown [...].

In order to extend the time during which the items are free of lice after the short-wave delousing, they are now impregnated with a Lauseto [DDT] solution on a trial basis [...].

Tests conducted at Auschwitz by the Hygiene Institute of the SS and Police South-east show that a complete sterilization of all tested staphylococci, typhus and diphtheria samples was achieved during an irradiation of 3 minutes per sack, or 45 seconds per individual item. [...]”

Another fact unknown to Pressac was that DDT showed up at Auschwitz for the first time in 1944. It was produced under license from the Swiss chemical company Geigy, with the German name “Lauseto” (for Lausetod, louse death). The Auschwitz Camp received 9 metric tons of it in April 1944, 15 tons in August, and 2 tons in October of that year.

Since Pressac’s book is about the technique and operation of gas chambers, it would have behooved the author to explain to the reader in technical detail the

---


technique and operation of both the U.S. execution gas chambers, mentioned by him only in passing on page 22, and of the professionally designed German disinfection chambers.

The U.S. execution gas chambers are the only type of homicidal gas chambers about which we have a complete documentation from their inception, of their design, construction and operation up to their decommissioning. By researching them, Pressac would have realized that some of his claims, for instance about the speed of executions, are unrealistic. Explaining in detail the Zyklon-B fumigation chambers which the German Auschwitz camp authorities had planned to install in their reception building would have led to numerous epiphanies. First of all, the Auschwitz camp authorities were informed about that circulation technology, as it was called, already on July 1, 1941, through a letter written to them by one of the
The first is that those chambers were by default equipped with sturdy steel doors, see Illustration 7 for the Degesch circulation devices still visible at Dachau. Second, we need to be aware that the claimed swift executions require a fast rise in poison gas concentration everywhere in the chamber. The Degesch circulation device accomplished this in two ways: first by blowing warm air across the Zyklon B pellets, and then by channeling the air for the fan through a pipe from the other end of the chamber, thus circulating the air, hence spreading the fumes evenly throughout the chamber.

---

19 Letter by Heerdt-Lingler to SS-Neubauleitung, July 1, 1941. Russian War Archives, 502-1-332, p. 86.
21 See the blueprint of June 24, 1944, Illustration 61, in the appendix to this introduction.
Third and finally, in order to achieve a relatively short ventilation time of only an hour or so, the ventilation system recommended for these devices had 72 air exchanges per hour.\textsuperscript{22}

I’ll get back to these issues when addressing doors, introduction devices and the ventilation system, all of which are mentioned by Pressac without any technical context.

The article sent to the Auschwitz authorities does show that not only German experts in this field knew how to build efficient gas chambers, but the Auschwitz camp authorities knew this as well. To top it off, in his already mentioned study, Scott Christianson showed that German chemical companies lobbied for the introduction of hydrogen cyanide gas chambers for the execution of death row inmates in the U.S. in the 1920s and 1930s. Hence, the German specialists also knew very well where to find additional information and empirical data, which they could have, should have, would have used to build their very own homicidal gas chambers. There is, however, no trace of any contact between German and U.S. specialist in this regard in the extant documentation.

\textsuperscript{22} Franz Puntigam, Hermann Breymesser, Erich Bernfus, \textit{Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr}, special edition by the \textit{Reichsarbeitsblatt}, Berlin 1943, p. 50.
Gastight Doors, General Remarks

Many gastight doors were built by Auschwitz inmates in the local workshop. Pressac shows a number of them on pages 46, 48-50, 232, 425 and 486. These doors were constructed of wooden boards held together with iron bands. Technically speaking, they could not have been gastight. In fact, no wooden door can ever be truly gastight, in particular if it consists of several individual boards. Nevertheless, the camp authorities referred to these doors as “gastight.”

Some of these doors were equipped with a peephole covered on the inside by a protective metal grid, see Illustration 10. The peephole was required by German law for fumigation rooms without a window. It stipulated that any person entering such a chamber had to be observed by another person from the outside, who needed to wear a gas mask as well and had to have a first-aid kit at hand. This way he could swiftly intervene in case of an emergency, for example, caused by a leaking or improperly donned gas mask.23

A protective grid on the inside of a fumigation room was also needed, because clothes were put into those chambers on metal racks, see those used in the Auschwitz “Zentralsauna” as shown by Pressac himself (pp. 84f.). Similar clothes racks were also used in Zyklon-B fumigation chambers (See Illustration 8).24 When wheeled in and out of the chamber, in particular when the door was being closed behind them, these racks could accidentally knock against any non-protected peephole’s glass, cracking it in the process.

The term “gastight door” is used by Pressac frequently, because it can be found in many documents. Yet it always refers to this wooden type of doors. The vast documentation of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office does not contain any trace of a real gastight door, one made of steel as shown in Illustration 7. As a matter of fact, an estimate for such doors was indeed requested for the initially

---


24 See Illustration 18 in Franz Puntigam et al., op. cit. (note 22), p. 54.
planned 19 circulation fumigation chambers inside the reception building, but since that project was cancelled in 1943, the doors were apparently never delivered, as results from an inquiry by the vendor of these doors in November 1944, asking whether the camp was still interested in the doors’ delivery.

Even the doors used to seal the SS air-raid shelter in Crematorium I were made of wooden frames and had only a sheet-metal cover, see Illustration 9.

Could the wooden doors, made by the inmates in their workshop, have been used to seal homicidal gas chambers? Illustrations 10a&b show a typical Auschwitz gastight door as shown by Pressac on page 49. In Illustration 10b I have shown the range of motion of the three latches that could be used to lock that door. This particular door was used for a disinfection chamber. The cracks between the boards were “sealed” with felt strip to reduce any poison-gas leakage. It goes without saying that such felt strips may slow down a draft, but they can never be “gastight.”

The main challenge would not have been to keep the door from leaking, but to keep hundreds or even a thousand and more victims, who were locked up inside and who most certainly were panicking, from forcing open a door like this. After all, any execution-chamber door had to open to the outside, because many victims would die right in front of the door, blocking it from the inside.

---

26 Ibid., 502-1-333, p. 2; letter by the Berninghaus Company of November 22, 1944.
Wood isn’t the sturdiest material, and the iron bands used for the hinges and latches would bend sooner or later when forced by a massive crowd. For the SS, it would have been reckless, to say the least, to use such doors for homicidal mass-slaughter rooms.

The Blue-Wall Phenomenon

On page 53, Pressac briefly discusses the “blue-wall phenomenon,” which, according to him, “permits the immediate distinction on sight between delousing and homicidal gas chambers.” While Zyklon-B delousing chambers developed a more or less intense blue wall discoloration, caused by Prussian Blue (iron cyanide), the claimed homicidal gas chambers did not. Pressac attributes the difference between both types of facilities mainly to three factors:

– While lice need HCN concentrations of 5 g/m³, a concentration of 0.3 g/m³ is immediately fatal for man. Pressac claims that “the quantity poured into the homicidal gas chambers was forty times the lethal dose (12 g/m³) which killed without fail one thousand people in less than five minutes.” He does not prove
this latter claim.
– While the delousing chamber walls were exposed to the gas for 12 to 18 hours a day (an unproven conjecture), the homicidal gas chamber walls had an exposure time of not more than 10 minutes per day (another unsupported conjecture).
– While the delousing chambers were heated to 30°C, thus assisting chemical reactions in the wall, the homicidal gas chambers were “without additional heat.”
Pressac also states that the formation of the blue discolorations appeared “under the influence of various physico-chemical factors which have not been studied.” In the meantime, a number of studies have been found or conducted in this regard, starting with a case of a Bavarian church which was fumigated with Zyklon B in 1976, after it had just been renovated. It subsequently developed the “blue-wall phenomenon.”27 Two more chemists published investigations about this phenomenon, with a focus on Auschwitz.28 The gist of these studies is as follows:
– The reactions involved require an alkaline medium and a minimum amount of moisture inside the wall.
– While cool walls in unheated underground rooms have a high moisture content (such as the underground morgues of Crematoria II & III at Auschwitz-Birkenau, some of which are said to have served as homicidal gas chambers), heated above-ground rooms, such as the fumigation chambers, have a low moisture content.
– While the walls, floors and ceilings of the morgues of Crematoria II & III at Auschwitz-Birkenau were built using plaster, mortar and concrete with high contents of cement, keeping them alkaline for years, the mortar and plaster used for the Auschwitz fumigation chambers (particularly Buildings 5a and 5b) were poor in cement and rich in lime. Hence, they stayed alkaline for a much shorter period of time.

---

Already in 1929, a German experimental series showed that moist walls absorb up to 8 times more HCN than dry walls, and that alkaline masonry absorbs 25-times more HCN than non-alkaline masonry. Alkaline masonry also releases the gas much slower during ventilation. In addition to alkalinity, this greater tendency to absorb and bind HCN may also be caused by the different chemical and physical features of cement compared to lime mortar. The cement’s huge inner microscopic surface supports chemical reactions of the kind under scrutiny in more than one way. We won’t go into more details here, though. The interested reader may consult the works cited.

It is thus evident that the physical and chemical features of the claimed homicidal underground gas chambers inside the Crematoria II & III would have had a much higher propensity to form the blue pigment in question.

Pressac’s claim of a swift execution in the homicidal gassings at Auschwitz is based on two premises:

– Zyklon B releases its HCN fast.
– Humans are as susceptible to gaseous HCN as claimed in toxicological literature.

As mentioned earlier, both assumptions are wrong. Despite the fact that victims of gas chamber executions in the U.S. are instantly exposed to the full concentration of the poison, which at 3,200 ppm is more than ten times higher than the instantly lethal concentration given in toxicological literature, it still takes up to 18 minutes to kill all victims.

Finally, Pressac’s claim about brief ventilation times is also flawed, which I will discuss later when addressing ventilation systems.

This introduction is not the place to discuss all the issues involved that would allow us to conclude with certainty what all the facts are regarding this blue-wall phenomenon. For this, the interested reader can consult the literature cited and watch the documentary mentioned in Illustration 11. These brief elaborations merely serve to emphasize that Pressac jumped to premature conclusions without backing up any of his claims. As a matter of fact, it looks like he didn’t even try to investigate the matter.

Claiming that the lack of blue stains on their walls is a hallmark of homicidal gas chambers is puerile at best, because if that were so, basically all buildings in the world, lacking blue wall stains, would meet that criterion. The lack of evidence, however, cannot prove a claim; it actually refutes it.

30 For a swift test gassing with rabbits, showing the instant exposure to the gas, see the BBC documentary 14 Days in May, 1987; www.dailymotion.com/video/x20z7qm.
Homicidal Gassings

Pressac’s books are praised for their attempts to prove the homicidal gas chambers without resorting to statements made by individuals who claim to have experienced them. However, the attentive reader will realize that, in the present book, Pressac will repeatedly resort to witness claims when trying to undergird claims about homicidal gassings. He begins this strategy already on page 16, where he mentions what “Camp Commandant Hoess and Dr. [Miklos] Nyiszli” have said in this regard. That pattern persists throughout the book. However, just because a person claims something doesn’t make it true. Even if a thousand people claim that witches can ride on broomsticks through the air, that still doesn’t make it true. Pressac states that

– 5 to 7 kg of Zyklon B were poured into the gas chamber of Crematoria II & III at Birkenau using some contraption,\(^{31}\)
– for an execution of 1,000 to 2,000 individuals;
– this execution, carried out with 40-times the lethal concentration,
– lasted some five minutes,
– which was followed by 15 minutes of ventilation,
– after which the doors were opened.

But how do we know any of this is true? Just because Höss and others have claimed some of this, that doesn’t make it automatically true. All the claims listed above are technical in nature. A true scientist would subject those claims to a thorough critique, asking:

– Could the witnesses know what they claim?
– How reliable are these witnesses?
– Are these claims internally consistent, and do they agree with each other?
– Are they backed up by documentary and/or physical evidence?
– Are they technically possible?
– Did the devices and facilities allegedly used make these claims technically feasible?

Rather than filling Pressac’s gaping chasm of neglected duties, which would fill a book, I will point out only a few issues about the second point: the witnesses’ reliability.

Regarding former camp commander Rudolf Höss, Pressac hides from his readers that the testimony containing some of the above figures had been extracted from him after three days of uninterrupted torture by his British captors.\(^{32}\) In fact,
right after the war the British occupational authorities in Germany maintained veritable torture centers where they systematically mistreated former SS men to extract whatever “confession” they needed. Hence, and unsurprisingly, a lot is wrong about Höss’s various testimonies, but we won’t go there. Pressac repeatedly quotes Höss in his book, for instances, on pages 127f., 132 and 174. However, he never presents Höss’s various statements as a whole or at least in some context, and he never thoroughly analyzes them. The reader is left with some tidbits of “information,” and with Pressac’s unfounded interpretations of them. This unsystematic approach – scattering out an issue all over the book, yet never pursuing it thoroughly and systematically – is another hallmark of Pressac’s style.

Regarding Nyiszli, Pressac hides that even the American prosecutors at the Nuremberg I.G. Farben Trial, who happily accepted Höss’s extorted testimony, thought that Nyiszli’s story was too wild to be taken seriously, hence they rejected him as a witness. Nyiszli’s account, which has been criticized by revisionists for many decades, is characterized by a plethora of exaggerations and inventions, as Pressac correctly observes. That fact led German mainstream historian Prof. Dr. Werner Maser to write that “Nyiszli lied excessively.” Pressac tries to save Nyiszli’s credibility by taking all the numerical exaggerations, calculating an average factor (of four, see his page 475), then declaring that Nyiszli told the truth, he merely multiplied everything by said factor – which is nonsense. Random lies are thus transmogrified into allegedly systematic “embellished truths.” That provoked French revisionist Prof. Dr. Robert Faurisson to remark:

“Supposing a ‘witness’ states that in six months (the duration of Nyiszli’s stay in Auschwitz) he saw four men who were all 7 meters tall and 200 years old. We can assume that anybody would dismiss such a witness. Anybody but Pressac, who,

---

34 See R. Höss, C. Mattogno, Commandant of Auschwitz, op. cit. (note 32), Part II.
applying the rule of the famous divisor of four, would say: this witness is telling the truth: he saw one man who was 1.75 meters tall and 50 years old.”

The whole affair reminds me of Galileo, whose observation that the moon is not a perfectly smooth sphere but has mountains and craters led to the orthodoxy’s thesis that there must be some invisible layer on top of it all turning the moon back into a perfect sphere. To this, Galileo retorted that he then posits in the same vein that this invisible matter was in fact there, but that it piled up on top of the mountains, making them many times higher than what can be observed.38 Pressac’s attempt at smoothing the craters in Nyiszli’s account (and those of many other witnesses) is just as puerile. We cannot ascertain the truth by applying “smoothing” factors to random accounts. Nyiszli was a liar, plain and simple. He cannot be trusted about anything he claimed, unless it can be confirmed independently by documentary or physical evidence.

Topf & Söhne: Cremation Technology

In Chapter 1 of Part Two, Pressac deals with the history of the company Topf & Söhne, and with the cremation furnaces they built. This is no small matter. In fact, it is the second technical leg upon which the orthodox Holocaust narrative stands: the technique and operation of the devices which are said to have been used to obliterate the trace of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of innocent victims murdered by the Third Reich by all kinds of means, poison gas included. Here, too, Pressac fails miserably.

Cremation technology is not a secret science. The expert literature on it fills shelves. Yet Pressac can do without it. He also can do without any thermo-technical calculations. He really seems to have thought that he knew what the capacity and efficiency of those cremation furnaces were. Just look at page 244. There he discusses a document of June 1943 (reproduced on p. 247) that had been found in the files of the Auschwitz camp authorities. It attributes a certain cremation capacity to each of the five Auschwitz crematoria. Pressac claims that those numbers are “purely hypothetical” and “based on no practice of any sort.” Then he revises those figures downward to some figures he doesn’t back up with anything. In the same paragraph, he then talks about “the low coke consumption figures” which he says prove something.

For the point I’m trying to make, it’s not important what Pressac tries to prove. Fact is that he doesn’t back it up with anything, which renders his musings moot, null and void.

The capacity of a cremation device – the number of corpses it can incinerate within a given time span – and its efficiency – the amount of fuel it needs either per cremation or per operational time period – are extremely crucial device properties in our context. They are decisive in determining whether the Auschwitz authorities were merely trying to handle the victims of the epidemics raging inside the camp, or whether they build an excessive cremation capacity explicable only by the intent to mass-murder people.

In order to get those properties right, it’s not good practice to depend on administrative documents, since bureaucrats have never been known to be competent in technical matters. It’s also not good practice to depend on the advertisement material of a vendor of such devices. Hyperbole and exaggerations – also called false advertisement – are rather common in the technical field. At the end of the day, resorting to technical literature, to experiments and to thermo-technical calculations is the only way to be certain of gaining proper knowledge in these matters.

To date, only one study of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces has been written. It is a three-volume work of 1,198 pages chock-full of calculations, references to expert literature, documents and photographs.\textsuperscript{39} The most important insights we gain from it is that the cremation furnaces of Auschwitz were a cheap, stripped-down version of normal civilian cremation furnaces on a number of counts:

– Their muffles were smaller, because they were designed to merely accommodate one corpse at a time, without a coffin. The missing fuel-equivalent of the wooden coffin had to be compensated for with additional furnace fuel.
– The furnaces had no means of recovering the heat from the exhaust gases (a so-called recuperator). The heat loss had to be compensated for with additional furnace fuel. Combustion air fed into the furnace was cold, hence, the entire furnace operated on average at lower temperatures, thus at extended cremation times.
– The furnaces of the Birkenau crematoria had no forced-draft blowers increasing the chimney’s draft. Moreover, their means of regulating the air flow with ports and shutters was very limited. Hence, they could rarely be operated under ideal conditions.
– The 10 triple-muffle furnaces of the Crematoria II & III had a major design flaw: the combustion air of the two lateral muffles flowed into the center muffle, whose combustion air therefore flowed with twice the speed. As a result, the still-burning combustion gases rushed into the flues, overheating them and the chimney ducts. As a consequence, these crematoria suffered frequent breakdowns due to damaged flues and chimneys. In addition, these units had only one blower feeding cold air indiscriminately into both lateral muffles, further

reducing the controllability of cremations. Although almost the entire documentation about the operation of these crematoria seems to have been lost or destroyed, we don’t have to rely on theoretical thermo-technical calculations and extrapolations from similar furnaces in order to figure out how much time it took to cremate a body in those furnaces, and how much coke each cremation required. As a stroke of luck, a furnace of basically the identical design as were installed in Crematoria II & III at Birkenau was also installed at the Gusen Camp in Austria, and for this, some documents have been preserved. From them we can derive that a cremation of one single corpse took on average an hour, and that it required a little less than 30 kg of coke per hour (and corpse), if the furnace was operated continuously. Discontinuous operations increased the coke consumption accordingly.

From the vast documentation of the Central Construction Office of Auschwitz we can glean that the first two crematoria of Birkenau becoming operational were also seriously damaged right at the beginning. Facing a catastrophic typhus epidemic with thousands of corpses remaining uncremated, the Auschwitz camp authorities fired up these crematoria too fast and too unevenly. Crematorium II had its flues collapse and the chimney crack, while Crematorium IV was irreparably damaged and was subsequently taken offline, never to be used again.

The common cliché has it that Auschwitz was a high-efficiency death camp where people were murdered and incinerated in a conveyor-belt fashion with the most-modern German technology available at the time. A close look into the documents reveals, however, that the Auschwitz cremation devices were cheap, badly designed quick-fixes that failed repeatedly. Their efficiency and capacity were sub-par at best.

Initially, only one crematorium was planned for the PoW camp at Birkenau. In the summer of 1942, however, two events forced the camp authorities to radically increase the projected cremation capacity: First, Himmler ordered that the camp be increased to a slave-labor population of some 200,000 inmates, and then the outbreak of the typhus epidemic with hundreds of victims every single day at a time when Auschwitz had only some 10% of the camp population envisioned by Himmler.

Nonetheless, 46 cremation muffles (15 each in Crematoria II & III, and 8 each in Crematoria IV & V) is unparalleled for all German camps, and it seems excessive. However, if we put the number of muffles in relation to the mortality reigning at the camp when those plans were made – August 1942 for Auschwitz – and compare that with the same ratio of other camps for which no mass-extermination claims are made today, we receive the figures listed in the table shown:40

Relation between Inmate Mortality and Planned Cremation Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dachau</th>
<th>Buchenwald</th>
<th>Auschwitz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mortality during the month of furnace planning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of planned new muffles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ration of mortality ÷ no. of muffles</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>187.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It clearly demonstrates that Auschwitz was special, not so much for its planned cremation capacity, but for its horrendous mortality rate. Considering that it was planned to increase the inmate population to ten times the population of camps such as Dachau and Buchenwald, ten times their cremation capacity seems only “reasonable” within the “logic” of the Third Reich camp system.

The Topf Company’s suggestion for the erection of a mass cremation device in early 1943 (Crematorium VI, or “ring incineration furnace,” see page 217) – a project that never came to fruition – must also be seen in the context of the persistently high mortality rate at Auschwitz, which continued well into the year 1943. Had the authorities planned mass exterminations in addition to the horrendous mortality due to diseases, they would not have dabbled in stripped-down versions of civilian cremation furnaces designed to cremate every corpse individually. Continuously operating large-scale offal- and animal-carcass incineration plants would have been the obvious choice for that right from the start.

Crematorium I

On page 123, Pressac turns to the first crematorium put into operation at Auschwitz. He claims that the dearth of extant documentation makes it impossible “to formally establish proof of homicidal gassing in its morgue.” Since he wrote this, a number of additional documents have been found, which allow some more definitive conclusion in this regard. Before presenting some of them, it is crucial to note how Pressac “establishes” his claim of homicidal activities in this building.

“As evidence to establish the reality of homicidal gassing there remain only the testimonies of participants, the best known of whom are:” (ibid.)

On the next page, he quotes one of the witnesses he relies on – Alter Fajnzylberg:

“12 corpses could be put into one [cremation] opening, but no more than 5 were usually put, as they burnt more quickly in that quantity.”

Pressac qualifies the 12-corpse claim as “mathematically possible, but not practically,” stating that the 5-corpse claim “is closer to reality which was on average three (normal adult) bodies at a time.” Again, he does not say how he came to this conclusion.

As stated earlier, the Auschwitz furnaces were slimmed-down versions of civilian devices. Hence, they were designed to accommodate only one adult corpse at a time. This means that the muffle door and the muffle itself were smaller than what is common for civilian devices. Illustrations 13a&b illustrate the problem. They are based on a recent photo of the Topf double-muffle cremation furnace of the Mauthausen Camp, whose design is identical to the furnaces installed in Crematorium I at Auschwitz. The muffle door was just 60 cm wide and high; the muffle itself only 10 cm wider and higher (see p. 126). Its vaulted ceiling started arching already at a height of 35 cm above the muffle floor. The stretcher used to insert the corpse ran on rollers which were some 10 cm above the muffle floor. Hence, if the average adult corpse was some 25 cm high, this allowed only two corpses to be inserted at most.

Even though it would have been possible to place two adult corpses into that muffle at once, this would have resulted in several severe thermo-technical problems:

– The first phase of cremation requires the evaporation of the water contained in the body (some ⅔ of its weight). This consumes lots of energy, which in the absence of a coffin has to be provided by the furnace’s coke hearth. But that was designed in size only to provide the heat required for one corpse. Hence, inserting two corpses, requiring twice the amount of heat, would have drastically reduced the muffle’s temperature at the beginning of the cremation, slowing down

---

Illustrations 13a&b: Crematorium of Mauthausen. Topf coke-fired double-muffle furnace Auschwitz type. The two added horizontal lines in the left photo represent the upper limits of two superimposed normal corpses, with the first lying on the muffle grate. The right-hand photo shows how high the stretcher would have had to be raised in order to introduce another, third corpse on top of the second. © Carlo Mattogno.

---

the entire process considerably.

– Once the corpses' water had evaporated, the burning tissue of two corpses would have produced excessive heat. Furthermore, because the space between the two corpses and the muffle wall was too small, this would have resulted in the combustion gases flowing at a greater speed through the muffle, hence, they would have kept burning inside the flue. Both effects compound and would have severely damaged the crematoria's muffles, flues, and chimneys.

Although it was possible to insert two corpses at once, it is highly doubtful that this would have accelerated the process much, if at all, but it sure would have risked the integrity of the entire facility. It may well be that one of the reasons why Crematoria II and IV broke down shortly after being put into operation was the attempt to cremate two corpses at once in one muffle. If anything was gained by that in the short run, the subsequent breakdown of those facilities more than cancelled any advantage gained.

The first point to be made here is that Pressac's witnesses are again in trouble. As a matter of fact, Pressac's favorite witness, Henryk Tauber, made similar technically impossible claims (see page 489):

“Generally speaking, we burned 4 or 5 corpses at a time in one muffle, but sometimes we charged a greater number of corpses.”
As mentioned before, just because many people claimed that witches can ride on broomsticks through the air, doesn’t make it true. It only proves that those witnesses were all exposed to the same kind of lore and repeated it uncritically.

The second point to be repeated here is that Pressac’s arbitrary method of “adjusting” anecdotes has nothing to do with science or technology.

The only documentary evidence Pressac offers for the existence of a homicidal gas chamber in that building is a photo of the roof taken after the war (p. 149). He claims to have identified three spots where the former holes were located through which Zyklon B is said to have been poured into the room below. A closer analysis reveals, however, that there are in fact four such spots, see Illustration 14. Three of them – #1 through #3 in Illustration 14 – run parallel to the line of the two ventilation brick chimneys, while the fourth is on a line roughly perpendicular to this at the height of Spot 1. Illustration 15 shows both the rough positions of these spots (D1 through 4, grey squares) and the positions of the Zyklon-B insertion shafts as they exist today (Z1 through 4, black squares). As can be seen, there is no relation between them. Neither are there three Zyklon-B insertion shafts in a straight line, nor is there any shaft even remotely close to D1.

The Zyklon-B insertion shafts existing today were allegedly put in exactly where traces of the old, original shafts could be seen. That is at least what officials from the Auschwitz Museum claim. Interestingly, as Pressac observed correctly on p. 133, “photos of the interior showing the state of the premises were not taken at the beginning of 1945.” In a letter of March 31, 2016, the Auschwitz Museum confirmed that they actually have no documentation whatsoever about the state of that building after the retreat of the German forces from the area, and none was prepared

---

42 Fajnzylberg also stated that, inside the cremation furnaces, “The corpses lay on grates under which coke was burning” (p. 124), when in fact the coke was burning in the coke gasifier located behind the muffle in the rear of the furnaces, see its cross section on p. 132. When reconstructed after the war, those gasifiers were not put where they originally were, so Fajnzylberg actually describes the erroneous post-war situation; see C. Mattogno, F. Deana, op. cit. (note 39), Vol. 3, pp. 74f.

Illustration 16: Writing of Dr. Igor Bartosik from the Auschwitz Museum confirming that no documentation has been preserved proving that there were any traces of former Zyklon-B insertion holes in the roof of Crematorium I at Auschwitz prior to its “reconstruction” in 1947.

(or preserved) regarding the post-war reconstruction of that building either, see Illustration 16.\textsuperscript{44} As to “former employees” mentioned in that letter who testified about this, we know only of one, Adam Żlobnicki, a former museum guard who testified about that in 1981. He claimed that the new shafts built by the museum in 1947 were put exactly where traces of former holes could be seen, and that they were made of bricks, when in fact they were – and still are – made of wooden planks.\textsuperscript{45} Why a former museum guard would know what exactly happened during the “reconstruction” of that building in 1947 is beyond me. Any museum official or architect, engineer or even bricklayer involved in that reconstruction would have been a better witness. But maybe none of them were willing to lie on record?

\textsuperscript{44} For the entire letter see Carlo Mattogno, \textit{Curated Lies: The Auschwitz Museum’s Misrepresentations, Distortions and Deceptions}, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{45} Auschwitz Museum Archives B, Statements, Vol. 96, p. 60.
That this is nothing but a lie can be seen from Illustration 17, which shows how the holes are distributed on the ceiling of what is today presented to tourists as “the gas chamber.” Compare this with the distribution of these holes (Z1-4) in Illustration 15, the original morgue. This clearly shows that the holes were made to be evenly distributed on the ceiling of the room as it is today. This room, however, includes an airlock added only in 1944, and it is missing a wall which originally separated the morgue from the adjacent washing room. That’s why there is no documentation and no credible witness account about traces of former original holes. Unless proven otherwise, we must assume that they simply didn’t exist.

Next on our agenda is a brief overview of the morgue’s ventilation system. In his second book, Pressac describes the history of this system in more detail, because he found more documents about it when visiting the Russian War Archives in Moscow.46 A system ventilating the entire building was offered by the Topf company in late 1940,47 and after several design changes, an order for it was finally placed in March of 1941.48 Since delivery was not expected for another six months, a temporary system was installed which simply connected the morgue with the furnace’s flue, hence using the crematorium chimney’s draft to suck out stale air from the morgue.49 That system failed in the summer of 1941, when the second cremation furnaces of that crematorium came into frequent use. That second furnace was

\[\text{Illustration 17: Distribution of holes in the morgue’s roof of Crematorium I (today’s situation). The missing partition wall, here shown with 50% transparency, was erroneously removed by the Auschwitz Museum in 1947.}\]

47 Russian War Archives, 502-1-312, pp. 136f.
close to the morgue. When in operation, the ventilation duct from the morgue had to be closed, because the flue gases of the second furnace would otherwise enter into the morgue.\footnote{Ibid., 502-1-312, p. 111.}

Hence, a second make-shift ventilation system was installed starting in September 1941, since Topf’s proper system had still not been delivered.\footnote{Visible from a number of work orders, see ibid., 502-2-1, pp. 74f.} That second temporary system consisted of an air-intake fan, visible on a 1942 blueprint – see Illustration 18\footnote{Ibid., 502-2-146, p. 21.} – and a duct channeling the morgue’s stale air to the chimney. Topf’s ventilation system arrived at Auschwitz later that year, but a letter by Topf of late October 1942 indicates that their system had still not been installed.\footnote{Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 96.} A month later, the camp authorities requested the immediate installation of this ventilation system, but there is no documentation confirming that it actually was installed.\footnote{Russian War Archives, 502-1-314, p. 17.}

Be that as it may, Topf’s ventilation system, designed in late 1940/early 1941 when no one was thinking of equipping this building with a homicidal gas chamber, was designed for a simple morgue. Yet for an entire year, instead of using that professionally designed system, the camp authorities made do with an inferior makeshift solution that could not possibly have been more effective than the Topf system. This makeshift solution was at best barely capable of ventilating the morgue.
That morgue is said to have been converted into a homicidal gas chamber in late 1941, and is said to have served as such intermittently until the so-called bunkers of Birkenau went into operation – that is to say, until spring or early summer 1942.

Installing a ventilation system drastically more powerful than the makeshift systems put in place in late 1941 would have been absolutely pivotal for a homicidal conversion. Yet the camp authorities did not even bother to install Topf’s standard system. It rusted away in some warehouse. This speaks volumes in and of itself.

Now let’s turn to the door separating the morgue from the furnace room. Today, there is no door at all in the wall opening connecting both rooms, not even a door frame, see Illustration 19. As Pressac describes correctly, the original door had been walled up when the SS converted the building into an air-raid shelter in late 1944. After the war, the Poles knocked a new opening through that wall, although both of the wrong size and at the wrong place – and without any door.

Original wartime blueprints reveal that this opening used to have a swinging door, see Illustrations 20a&b and 21a&b. Such a swinging door was very convenient for crematorium workers whose hands were tied up carrying corpses from the morgue to the furnace room. It would also automatically close behind them, thus preventing too much warm air from getting from the furnace room into the morgue.

A door designed to swing both ways is utterly worthless as a gastight homicidal-gas-chamber door. Such a swinging door could not be properly braced against dozens or even hundreds of panicking gassing victims attempting to bash it down.

55 Ibid., 502-1-312, p. 135.
56 Ibid., 502-2-146, p. 21.
Illustration 20a&b: SS blueprint of Crematorium I drawn on November 30, 1940 clearly showing a swinging door (inside added rectangle) between the morgue (bottom) and the furnace room (top). See section enlargement in the inset.

Illustration 21a&b: SS blueprint of Crematorium I drawn on April 10, 1942, while the morgue was allegedly being used as a homicidal gas chamber, again clearly showing a swinging door between the morgue (bottom, inside added rectangle) and the furnace room (top). See section enlargement in the inset.
Illustration 22a&b: SS blueprint of Crematorium I drawn on September 21, 1944, also clearly showing a swinging door (although with inverted opening direction) between the former morgue (bottom) and the furnace room (top). See section enlargement in the inset.

Illustration 23: Blueprint of Crematorium I, situation as given in 1942. (Source: present book, p. 151, cleaned up by the author.) Dotted lines: two possible ways for intended victims to enter the morgue aka “gas chamber.”
More importantly, a swinging door of this type would by necessity contain a sizeable gap between the door and the door frame to allow such a swinging action to occur in the first place. Such a door would also have gaps above and below the door. These big gaps mean that this swinging door could not have been gastight at all, rendering it unfit for use in a location where large amounts of poison gas are being used.

Even the blueprint for the conversion of this building into an air-raid shelter for the SS shows a swinging door, see Illustrations 22a&b, although the opening direction is inverted.\(^5\) This blueprint is flawed in this regard anyway, because this door was ultimately walled up during that conversion.

Evidence of this swinging door existing unmodified inside Crematorium I before (1940), during (1942), and after homicidal gassings (1944) are said to have occurred there is strong evidence against the orthodox narrative about this building’s misuse for mass homicide with poison gas.

One could posit that what we see here is not a swinging door, but rather are two doors, each opening into the room it is closest to. Although possible, that design would have been fatally flawed for a homicidal gas chamber as well, because the door opening into the morgue could not have been opened in case of mass killings, as corpses lying in front of it would have blocked it.

A detail ignored by Pressac is the way the alleged gassing victims would have entered the morgue. Until the late 1990s, the Auschwitz Museum falsely claimed that the air-raid shelter’s airlock, added only in 1944, was the “victim’s entry.” In fact, until that building’s conversion to an air-raid shelter, there was no direct access to the morgue from the outside. There would have been only two ways for the victims to get to their place of execution: either by walking through the vestibule and then through the furnace room, where their deceased fellow inmates were just being cremated – a rather absurd idea (black dotted line in Illustration 23) – or from the vestibule through the laying-out room and the washing room, where corpses were being prepared for dissections (grey dotted line in Ill. 23). This isn’t quite believable either.

Consider also that the mortality in Auschwitz was always high. Inmates were dying at an alarming rate on any given day, and these corpses were being stored in the morgue. The question is: how can one even consider converting a morgue into a homicidal gas chamber, if that morgue is constantly and desperately needed in order to store corpses of those who died of “natural” causes (old age, diseases, exhaustion, malnutrition, abuse etc.) or were executed in any other way (mostly by shooting)? Where were all these corpses stored when the morgue had to be cleared for a gassing?

Wrapping up my brief treatise of Crematorium I, it is interesting to analyze the work order which describes in detail the changes implemented when this morgue was converted to an air-raid shelter in 1944. It contains a detailed description of the installation of gastight windows and doors as well as new openings to be made in the walls, although that probably referred to the roof:

“installation of gastight doors, shutters, and windows; openings in wall necessary for heaters and various ventilation ducts and hoses.”

According to that, there had not been any gastight doors and windows, or openings in the walls/roof prior to this time, except of course for the air intake of the morgue’s makeshift ventilation system, which was located where the shelter’s air-
lock was put in. It was filled in during that conversion and can be seen to this day in the airlock, see Illustration 24.

If the morgue had four (Zyklon-B) openings in its ceiling already, it must be assumed that the camp authorities would have used them for any stove pipes and ventilation ducts, rather than compromising the roof’s integrity even more by knocking more holes through it. Fact is, however, that five more holes were indeed added during that conversion. But because those holes were in inconvenient places and thus unsuited to be presented as Zyklon-B insertion shafts, the Auschwitz Museum filled three of them in in 1947 during their “reconstruction” of that place, see the grey circles in Illustration 25, and the photos in Illustrations 26a-c. Two more holes ending in two of the air-raid shelter’s brick-built ventilation shafts are located near the morgue’s internal wall and were left by the museum as they were, see the empty rectangles in Illustrations 15 and 25 as well as the 1945 photo in Illustration 14.

The Bunkers of Birkenau

The first rumors about gas chambers at Birkenau were circulated at the end of August 1942, although the term “bunker” wasn’t used yet. In a “Letter written from the Auschwitz camp” on August 29, 1942, we read:

“Most terrible are the mass executions by means of gas in chambers built for that purpose. There are two and they can take in 1200 persons. They are equipped with baths and showers, but instead of water there is gas coming out of them.”

In late summer 1942, the representation of the Polish government in exile working clandestinely in Poland picked up on these rumors and started reporting about them in their reports to London. The first reports were not very specific, but a report of November 1942 has some revealing aspects to it:59

“The others […] went directly to the Degasungskammer. […] an installation of 5 modern chambers was built […]. It comprises 6 [sic] blocks (windowless, with double doors and modern apparatuses for feeding the gas and for ventilation) […].”

None of these features – showers, windowless, double doors, modern device for feeding the gas and a ventilation system – are said to have been part of what current mainstream historiography claims about the bunkers, which are said to have been converted residential houses confiscated from local Polish farmers. In fact, they allegedly had little windows or shutters through which Zyklon B was thrown

in, no device – modern or otherwise – for feeding in the poison, and no ventilation system either.

No person in their right mind could possibly take any claim seriously that a facility not having any ventilation system at all could seriously be considered, let alone used, as a mass execution facility using poison gas. Individuals making or believing such claims ought to be research subjects of psychiatrists.

Returning to the initial reports of the Polish resistance, what we are dealing with here is a mixture of features of the various fumigation gas chambers which were being planned and erected at Auschwitz starting that summer. The 19 Degesch “Begasungskammern” (fumigation chambers, see Illustration 6) planned for the new reception building at the Main Camp, whose name got corrupted to “Degasungskammern,” were indeed “windowless, with double doors [in terms of two opposing doors] and modern apparatuses for feeding the gas and for ventilation.” The reception building also had large shower rooms not far from those fumigation chambers.

At the same time the reception building was projected for the Main Camp, two large hygiene buildings were being built at Birkenau, each with showers for the inmates and, only a short distance away, a separate wing for Zyklon-B fumigations. As is the case for most blueprints created at Auschwitz, this one was drawn by an inmate (prisoner no. 18356). That fumigation room was called “Gaskammer” in the blueprint. Originally, the doors were “double doors”, although that plan was later dropped, and single-leaf doors were installed instead. The rooms had two ventilation fans each, installed in the walls opposite the doors, but they had no device for feeding and dissipating the insecticide. See Illustration 27.

The fact that the fumigation room was called “Gaskammer” cannot be emphasized strongly enough. The term “Gaskammer” – gas chamber – was commonly used in German technical and administrative writings in order to describe a fumigation chamber (next to the term “Begasungskammer”). See for instance the title of the German government publication Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr, and the term “Gaskammern” used by Degesch in their ads, see Illustration 28.

Since no homicidal gas chambers ever existed in Germany – or the whole of Europe, for that matter – prior to what is said to have transpired since 1941 at Auschwitz and elsewhere, no technical term for a homicidal gas chamber existed. Hence, unless proven otherwise, whenever we encounter in German technical or administrative writings of that time the term “Gaskammer,” it ought to be understood as describing a fumigation chamber.

This is important, because when encountering the term “Gaskammer” in wartime documents dealing with Auschwitz, most people, Pressac included, get all
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60 By Hermann Breymesser, Erich Bernfus, Reichsarbeitsblatt, Special Print, Berlin 1943.
61 Der praktische Desinfektor, Issue 2, Erich Deleiter, Berlin 1941, inside cover.
hyped up thinking they found documentary proof for the existence of homicidal gas chambers. As we shall see later, that’s more a case of obsessive paranoia than rational analysis.

The use of the word “gas chamber” on many a German document dealing with the Auschwitz fumigation chambers must have fired up the imagination of the inmates drawing and typing these documents, and it sure was a golden opportunity for the various resistance movements as well as for Allied atrocity propaganda efforts against Germany.

As mentioned earlier, the stories about the “bunkers” as told by so-called witnesses and compiled by mainstream historiography ended up telling an entirely
different, quite unbelievable story than what was initially reported.

When it comes to material evidence for these claims, none exists for “Bunker 1,” and the foundation walls presented as remnants of “Bunker 2” (see Illustration 29; Pres- sac’s drawing of them on p. 174 is inaccurate) show a size and partition walls which are completely incompatible with what witnesses have claimed about this building (see p. 173). Although it is claimed that the internal walls were removed when “Bunker 2” was converted to a chemical slaughterhouse, that is doubtful, because judging by the foundations, these might have been load-bearing walls that could not have been removed without compromising the integrity of the entire building.

When it comes to documentary evidence, not a trace has been found to this day suggesting that anything sinister was ever done with any old residential house taken over by the Auschwitz camp authorities.62 The closest we can get to this is the conversion of an existing house to a shower cum sauna and fumigation facility for the SS guards. It was located in the area which later became Construction Sector III of the Birkenau Camp, and its conversion was completed in November of 1942,63 so it may be safe to assume that planning for this facility started sometime during the summer of 1942. Sector III is exactly the area where, in late 1941/early 1942, an existing building is said to have been converted to a homicidal gas chamber, accompanied by huge mass graves, which was later dubbed “Bunker 1.” Would the SS have built a bath house for their guards right next to a mass murder facility with huge stinking mass graves? It seems more likely that the conversion of this building into a facility equipped with a “gas chamber” – meaning fumigation chamber – was the seed crystal for the rumors about Bunker 1.

Mass graves, by the way, did indeed exist not too far away from what was to become Construction Sector III, as can be seen from air photos, see Illustration 30.

62 A laudable effort to prove a negative – the non-existence of documentary evidence for the bunkers – was undertaken by Carlo Mattogno in his book Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda versus History, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016. It contains lots of additional pertinent material.

63 Russian War Archives, 502-1-024, pp. 32f., 77; 502-1-026, pp. 65-67; 502-1-332, pp. 46&8a; 502-1-267, pp. 15-17.
But they can easily be explained by the huge amount of victims which the escalating typhus epidemic caused since the summer of 1942. As Pressac correctly notes, Crematorium I broke down around the same time, requiring a complete rebuilding of its flues and chimney, which took many weeks, if not months. With hundreds of victims dying during that time period every single day and no cremation facilities available at all, most of the victims must have been buried in mass graves – at least temporarily.

Only two related documents have been found so far which use the term “bunker” in a way that has no innocuous context – because they have no context at all. They date from March 1944 and speak of an electric cable leading to “Bunker I” to be dismantled, because it was no longer needed. There are two problems with these documents:

1. The term bunker shows up in documents of the Auschwitz camp authorities a number of times, but they always refer either to bulk storage facilities (potatoes, coke, munitions, food), to an inmate prison (the underground prison of the Main Camp), or to air-raid shelters, because these are the three possible meanings this term can have in the German language. The two documents referred

Illustration 29: Photo of the foundation walls of a building today presented by the Auschwitz Museum as remnants of “Bunker 2.”
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to here don’t explain what kind of bunker is meant, which is why the Auschwitz Museum parades them as “proof.”

2. The orthodox Auschwitz narrative has it that Bunker 1 was dismantled in late 1942, when a large sewage treatment plant was built in the area, hence, no document later than that should refer to that building anymore. Bunker 2, on the other hand, is said to have been in use at least until late summer of 1944, so its electric supply line could not have been considered expendable. These documents therefore prove only that some existing but decommissioned facility in Birkenau was called Bunker I by the camp authorities in early 1944. It is neither known where it was located nor what its purpose was.

The biggest hole in the “bunker” story concerns the events which are said to have transpired starting in mid-May 1944 until late that summer. The orthodox narrative has it that the vast majority of the 450,000+ Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz during that period of time, plus some 65,000 Jews from the Lodz Ghetto, were murdered on their arrival. Since the capacity of the crematoria is said to have been way too small both for the murder and the cremation of the victims, many thousands of these Jews are said to have been killed in Bunker 2. These victims, together with many murdered in Crematorium V, are said to have been cremated in huge, deep ditches nearby these facilities.

This raises two issues that were completely ignored by Pressac:

1. The Birkenau Camp was located in a swampy area. Although the camp itself was step by step equipped with a system of drainage ditches lowering the groundwater level, the areas where Bunkers 1 and 2 are said to have been located were

Illustration 30: Section of an air photo of Birkenau area taken on May 31, 1944. U.S. National Archives, Record Group no. 373, Mission 60 PRS/462 60 SQ. Can D 1508, Exposure 3055. North is to the right. From left to right we see Construction Sector I through III (BAI to BAIII). The mass graves can be seen west of (above) Sector III, see the magnification in the inset.
not part of that drainage system. How high was the groundwater level? Would it have prevented any cremations in deep ditches?

2. Mass cremations of thousands of corpses on pyres outdoors would have been a massive logistical undertaking leaving massive traces on the ground and, while in operation, also in the air in terms of smoke. On what scale would these activities have been carried out? Furthermore, Allied and German reconnaissance aircraft were repeatedly taking images of the area. Do their photos confirm what has to be expected?

The second point is almost literally a smoking gun. But first things first.

Groundwater Level

Two expert studies, made independently of each other, demonstrated that the groundwater level in and around Birkenau was just a foot or two below the surface between 1941 and 1944.65 It cannot be denied, however, that the Birkenau Camp had a sophisticated system of drainage ditches which lowered groundwater level at least in the area where the system had an effect. In 1944, this system was highly developed, but any trench incinerations during 1942/43 would have been located far away from the developed area. Furthermore, the drainage system was built only since 1942. But even the drainage system which existed in 1944 was unable to lower the groundwater level in the camp to more than three feet below ground level. Hence, witnesses claiming trenches of
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considerably more than three feet deep – for whatever purpose they might have been used – are at least exaggerating.

It is entirely possible that there were open-air incinerations in Birkenau in the fall of 1942. Considering the high groundwater level, the corpses buried in the mass graves mentioned earlier (see Illustration 30) could poison the local drinking water. To prevent yet another health catastrophe, the camp authorities may have decided, after several weeks or months, to exhume those typhus victims again. Since the crematoria of Birkenau were only being built at that time, and because the old crematory in the Main Camp was still out of commission, the camp authorities might have had no choice but to burn the exhumed bodies outdoors. However, this probably did not happen in deep trenches but rather on the surface.

According to the *Kalendarium*, often quoted by mainstream historians as the standard chronology of Auschwitz events, which relies exclusively on witness accounts when it comes to the claimed mass murders, these incinerations of previously buried corpses occurred between September 21 and late November 1942.66

Hence, witnesses describing outdoor incineration cannot be dismissed out of hand completely. However, most of these testimonies relate to burning the corpses of prisoners who are claimed to have been murdered in gas chambers, which is a different matter.

Outdoor Mass Cremations

Every once in a while, some animal disease causes a major epidemic among livestock, killing hundreds or even thousands of cattle, pigs and sheep. Many more of them often need to be culled in order to stop the epidemic from spreading. Faced with a sudden surge of animal cadavers and only limited, insufficient cremation capacities, public health authorities rush to solve the problems caused by these piles of dead animals by resorting to huge outdoor pyres. After several of these episodes, many public health authorities have developed crisis management plans that give instructions to affected farmers and local authorities on how to build and maintain such huge cremation pyres.

I certainly don’t want to be disrespectful to the victims who died during World War Two for a number of reasons, but it cannot be denied that the experiences gathered during those livestock health crises can serve historians to understand what must have transpired at Auschwitz and other places when the camp authorities are said to have resorted to large-scale outdoor cremation pyres in order to cremate thousands of victims per day.

Heinrich Köchel has undertaken the thankless task of analyzing the space, time, and fuel requirements for mass incineration of cattle that had died during a massive hoof-and-mouth epidemic in Great Britain in 2001 (see Ill. 32a-e). Uncounted thousands of animal carcasses had to be incinerated on pyres within a short period of time.67

Köchel applied the data resulting from this event to the claimed mass incinerations in the alleged German extermination camps at Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka, in order to estimate the amount of space and fuel needed as well as the time and labor efforts required. Köchel’s study can be applied analogously to Auschwitz, although the presence of crematoria renders it a little more difficult.

According to this, a pyre of the size required in Auschwitz to incinerate hundreds, if not thousands of corpses a day could only have been cleared of ashes after one week at the earliest. Such large fires burn for one to two days, and the remaining embers keep glowing for many more days.

Consider that, during the first 15 days of the deportation of Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz, 134,400 are said to have been murdered. Even if we assume that the crematoria during those days worked at maximum capacity – which they didn’t,
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Illustration 33: Air photo of the Birkenau Camp taken on May 31, 1944 (see Ill. 30).

Ill. 34: Section enlargement of Ill. 32 showing the area of Crematorium V and a small area close to it from which smoke is rising. This is the only smoke visible on this photo.

Illustration 35: Same air photo as in Ill. 33, yet with smoke photoshopped in coming from one long cremation pyre north of Crematorium V, and from several large cremation pyres around the location of the claimed Bunker 2.
because the documents show that they were being repaired – they couldn’t have handled more than a thousand corpses a day, or only a little more than 10% of those murdered. The rest must have been cremated outdoors. That’s some 120,000 corpses within 15 days, or some 8,000 per day. The surface area required to build as many pyres as would have been needed to accomplish such a task, and to store the necessary fuel, would have been around half a square mile. This is far larger than what any witnesses ever claimed.

Keeping in mind that this huge cremation effort is said to have been carried out on swampy river meadows, the whole area would have been turned into a swampy morass by such intensive activity of hauling corpses and fuel to the pyres, and removing the ashes and cremation remains away from them. All the vegetation would have been destroyed. The whole area would have been one muddy, swampy pit.

On May 31, 1944, an air photo was taken of the Birkenau Camp. Considering the massive size of the ongoing outdoor allegedly cremations carried out at that time, a large part of the photo downwind of the areas where the pyres are claimed to have been, should have been covered in smoke.

The actual photo, see Illustration 33, has only one tiny, barely visible area from which smoke rises. Not from any of the crematorium chimneys, but from a small area north of Crematorium V, see Illustration 34. Hence, we know that the wind at that time came roughly from the south. If we use that information, and the claim that those cremation pyres are said to have been located both north of Crematorium V – between the Crematorium and the camp’s fence – and a larger area of pyres in the vicinity of Bunker 2, then what we would expect to see is what I have photoshopped into Illustration 35, which is a copy of Illustration 33: Most of the area downwind of those cremation-pyre areas should be blanketed with smoke.

But as you see in Illustration 33, you don’t see anything. The same is true for any other air photo ever taken during that spring and summer of 1944. Some of them show small smoke plumes rising from a small area north of Crematorium V, such
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69 For more such photos and their analysis see C. Mattogno, _Auschwitz:…, op. cit. (note 65) as well as Ger- mar Rudolf, _Air Photo Evidence: World War Two Photos of Alleged Mass Murder Sites Analyzed_, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017.
as shown in Illustration 36,70 but that’s as bad as it ever gets. Nothing else that looks suspicious can be found on them. There is not a single trace of large-scale outdoor cremations to be found.

Two images exist which are said to depict outdoor cremation scenes during the extermination of the Hungarian Jews in the summer of 1944, allegedly showing the area north of Crematorium V, seen from inside that building, see in the present book on page 422. Large-scale magnifications and critical analyses of these two scenes cast doubt on the claim that these are photos, making it more likely that they are actually drawings.71 But even if they really are photos of the claimed location and time, the size of the area shown is fully consistent with the area from which smoke is shown rising on some of the air photos (see Ill. 34 & 36). Whatever it is that is smoldering there – corpses or merely their clothes, or other items – the scale is ridiculously small compared to what is claimed to have unfolded there.72 Had thousands of corpses been burning there, the photographer would not have hesitated to capture that huge scene. But he didn’t.

More “photos” exist that are said to have the same origin (p. 423), but they are so blurred that the photographer must have shaken the camera on purpose – or triggered it accidentally will swinging it around. Pressac’s claims about them are mere conjectures.

Criminal Traces

The extant documentation on Birkenau’s Crematoria II & III, and to a lesser degree on Crematoria IV & V, is the most comprehensive and complete of all the Auschwitz structures. Consequently, it includes many documents that contain terms or phrases which Pressac considers to be “criminal traces” allegedly pointing to a homicidal function. He discusses them in his Chapters 5 through 7 on Crematoria II through V, and repeats them again in his separate Chapter 8 dedicated to “criminal traces.” This unsystematic, repetitive pattern is typical for Pressac’s work. In order to put some order into Pressac’s creative chaos, I will dispense with discussing the two different types of crematoria separately, as several of the criminal traces listed by Pressac concern both types.

Since his 1989 book was published, more documents have been found which led Pressac to add a number of additional “criminal traces” to his list. On the other hand, several of his traces aren’t criminal in nature at all, as Pressac himself noticed,
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70 British National Archives; http://ncap.org.uk/frame/1-1-89-1-71, UNI: NCAP-000-000-029-090; sortie: 60PR/0686; frame 3084.
72 For details see Carlo Mattogno, Auschwitz:..., op. cit. (note 65), pp. 41-50.
for example his #33 and #34 (page 456). Furthermore, he counts a number of items twice, for example #13 and #14, which are merely copies of the same document. The list of false and multiple entries is longer than what I want to bother the reader with here. A more thorough analysis of Pressac’s list can be found elsewhere.\(^\text{73}\) After trimming down Pressac’s traces to those that really count, grouping them together into certain topics, adding some he didn’t list, plus updating this with the new traces he mentions in his 1993 book, here is what we obtain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Pressac’s Trace #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vergasungskeller (gassing basement)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gasprüfer (gas tester)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gastür (gas door)</td>
<td>3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 23, 26, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Gasdichte Tür (gastight door)</td>
<td>7, 15, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Auskleideraum (undressing room)</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Auskleidekeller (undressing basement)</td>
<td>5, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drahtnetzeinschiebevorrichtung (wire-mesh push-in device)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Holzblenden (wooden blinds)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brausen (showers)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gasdichte Fenstern (gastight windows)</td>
<td>18, 20, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gas[k]ammer (gas chamber)</td>
<td>19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Warmluftzuführungsanlage (warm-air supply)</td>
<td>30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Change to drainage system</td>
<td>1989, p. 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Entry to Morgue #2</td>
<td>1989, p. 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Change of door’s opening direction of Morgue #1</td>
<td>1989, p. 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Change of door’s size of Morgue #1</td>
<td>1989, pp. 311f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elimination of faucets in Morgue #1</td>
<td>1989, pp. 310, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elimination of Morgue #3</td>
<td>1989, p. 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Elimination of corpse slide</td>
<td>1989, p. 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sonderkeller (special basement)</td>
<td>1993, p. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Durchführung der Sonderbehandlung (implementation of special treatment)</td>
<td>1993, pp. 45f., 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sperrgebiet (off-limits zone)</td>
<td>1993, p. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Holzgebläse (wooden blower)</td>
<td>1993, pp. 70f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Normalgaskammer (standard gas chamber)</td>
<td>1993, p. 89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A thorough analysis of the extant documentation and of contextual literature allows us to put these “criminal traces” into their documentary and historical con-
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text. As we shall see, this results in most of these traces losing their imputed criminal nature, while the rest is at best ambiguous.

Gastight Doors, Specific Cases

First, let’s dispense with all the entries about gas (tight) doors and windows. On page 448, Pressac mentions as his criminal trace #23 a document about items destined for Crematorium IV which includes an entry saying “210 gas door anchors” (his translation is clumsy; see the document on page 451). Such anchors are used to anchor a door frame into the wall. The rooms said to have been used for gassings had altogether four doors (or 5, if we count the corridor; see Illustration 37). That would make 52.5 (or 42) anchors per frame. This is excessive, to say the least, all the more so since expert literature on fumigation chambers points out that eight anchors per gas-chamber door frame was standard. This indicates that those anchors were meant to be used for all the door frames in that building (18, three of which were double doors) and possibly even for the window frames. In other words: the term “gastight door” was used excessively.

On page 451, Pressac reproduces a document where we find the term “4 tight doors,” rather than gastight doors. As mentioned earlier in this Introduction, none of the wooden doors produced by the Auschwitz workshops was gastight or air-tight in a strictly technical sense. They were at best capable of preventing a draft. Yet at Auschwitz, for some reason almost every door that was designed to merely prevent a draft was called “gastight.” We can only speculate about the quality of doors and windows made by the Auschwitz workshop that were not characterized as “tight” in any way. Judging by the miserable lodgings the inmates had to live in, we can imagine what they were like.

We can get a pretty good handle on what was going on at Crematoria IV and V, if we pay close attention to a set of documents reproduced by Pressac on pages 444f. It concerns the frames and shutters designated for the little wall openings in the western annex of these two buildings (see #2 in Illustration 37). According to the blueprint, there were seven of these openings in each crematorium, hence 14 altogether, yet the camp authorities ordered only 12 “gastight doors 30x40 cm” for them. We can only speculate what happened to the seventh opening.

The orthodox Auschwitz narrative has it that Zyklon B was poured through those openings in order to kill the unfortunates trapped inside, and Pressac agrees (page 386). Here is what Pressac’s star witness Henryk Tauber said about this:

“[Crematoria IV and V] had gastight doors, windows with grilles on the inside and were closed from the outside by means of gastight shutters. These little win-
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Illustration 38: Section enlargement of a page from the list of orders by the Auschwitz Central Construction Office to the metalworking shop regarding the camp’s crematoria, compiled by investigating judge Jan Sehn. Source: Höss Trial, Vol. 11, p. 92; underlined by me: “PoW Camp Crematorium 4 & 5 Building 30 […] 12 pieces window grates 50 x 70 cm.”

Illustration 39: A shutter as used for the small wall openings in Crematoria IV & V (see page 428), with iron bars added and a Zyklon-B can to scale.
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dows which a man standing on his feet could reach with his hand raised up were used for pouring the contents of the ‘Cyklon’ cans into the gas chambers full of people.”

These grates are confirmed by two documents produced by Polish investigative judge Jan Sehn, who summarized the contents of work orders fulfilled by the inmate metalworking shop, see an excerpt of one of them, dated April 27, 1943, in Illustration 38. According to this order, it looks like pretty much all the windows in those buildings were equipped with grates.

Although the openings in the wall were only 30 × 40 cm, the grates measured 50 × 70 cm, because they had to be embedded in the wall to be any good. On pages 426-428, Pressac reproduced the photographs of three shutters which originally belonged to Crematoria IV and/or V. These shutters came in two different types. The dimensions of the internal opening were about 20 × 30 cm for the larger type, and about 15 × 25 cm for the smaller type (the one on the left of page 426, and on the top of page 427).

If we add just one set of crossbars 1 cm in diameter into that opening (see Illustration 39), the free width and height shrinks to less than 10 × 15 cm in one case and 7 × 12 cm in the other. However, Zyklon B cans had a diameter of 15.4 cm. They would not have fit through that grate. So how exactly did the SS pour in Zyklon B through those openings?

Pouring Concrete Floor in Gas Chamber

This leaves us with Pressac’s Traces #19 and 21 regarding the pouring of a concrete floor “in the gas chamber” (p. 446). First off, unless proven otherwise, “gas chamber” is the technical term for a delousing facility. Next, a document unmentioned by Pressac refers specifically to the installation of heating stoves in the “water installations,”76 see the stoves #3 in Illustration 37. Other documents refer to the massive work carried out by the camp’s plumber unit to install the “sanitary” water installations in Crematoria IV & V: 816 man hours! (See Illustration 40.77) That work wasn’t just about a sink and a faucet, or a few fake shower heads. These were large-scale inmate showers! The sheer size of the heating stoves suggests that they served not only to heat the rooms, but probably also to heat the water for the showers.

Pressac mentions that there are other documents dealing with pouring concrete floors. However, they don’t refer to “gas chambers,” but only to “both chambers” or the “second chamber.” The omission of the term “gas” does not prove any con-

---

77 Russian War Archives, 502-2-54, pp. 37 (order), 38-38a (work card with man hours).
spreading to hide the truth, however, but simply reflects the fact that the other two 
rooms weren’t gas chambers but rather real inmate shower rooms.

So, who builds a homicidal gas chamber next to large shower rooms? No one.

And who builds a fumigation chamber next to large shower rooms which were 
evidently meant to be used by inmates? Although that was not ideal for safety con-
siderations, it was at least doable.
The layout of Crematoria IV & V did not lend itself to using any of its rooms as a fumigation chamber (let alone a homicidal one). Any leakage could have put the whole building under gas. We may assume that these injudicious plans were the result of the health crisis which was still raging at Auschwitz in spring 1943. The camp authorities made plans to install showers and disinfection devices everywhere they possibly could. At the end of the day, not all of these plans were carried out.

Ventilation of Crematoria IV & V

Pressac posits that the gas chambers of these crematoria were ventilated “naturally” merely by opening some doors and shutters (pp. 386, 416, 447). A ventilation system of unknown design for unknown purposes was ordered on May 19, 1943 for these two crematoria (p. 389), but they were delivered only in early 1944. By that time, the project was considered so unimportant that the devices were stored away. Their installation started only in late May of 1944 (see Pressac’s 1993 book, pp. 88f.), and was terminated in mid-June.\(^\text{78}\) This was probably a reaction to the sudden massive influx of Jews from Hungary.

All this suggests that these crematoria were not really used for much of anything. Since Crematorium IV broke down right after it went into operation and was never reactivated, this is not a surprise. That the ventilation system was left unused for five months in the case of Crematorium V as well proves, however, that even that structure was not being used for anything serious. Alternatively, one would have to posit that the gas chamber(s) inside this structure operated for roughly a year without any ventilation system, although they had one ready to be installed for the last five months of that period. Since this can be ruled out, we can only conclude that initial plans to equip each of these buildings with a fumigation chamber were dropped.

Which rooms the ventilation system installed in May/June 1944 ventilated is a matter of pure speculation, as Pressac himself notes (page 386), since the construction drawing was either lost or destroyed.

Implementation of Special Treatment

In order to fully comprehend the historical context of what transpired at Birkenau in the years 1942/43, we need to take a closer look at the overarching picture, which consists of two main themes.

First, as mentioned earlier, the Birkenau Camp was initially planned as a PoW camp primarily for the huge number of expected Soviet PoWs. However, the German military situation in the east deteriorated quickly as the winter approached in

\(^{78}\) Russian War Archives, 502-1-327, p. 28.
1941, and it turned out to be logistically impossible to transport millions of Soviet PoWs out of Russia. The resulting tragedy unfolding among these Russian PoWs is a matter of record, but is not within the scope of the current study.

Having lost the Russian PoWs as a potential slave labor resource, the German authorities next turned to the Jews. Had the German system of concentration camps so far been primarily a means of disciplining and punishing obstinate violators of the Third Reich’s laws, and opponents of the regime, its role started changing, and slowly shifted toward a system of providing slave labor resources for the German war industries. The Jews played a major role in those plans. Since they were not confined to camps due to political or military opposition or violation of laws, however dictatorial they may have been, but were summarily arrested and deported to camps merely due to their religious beliefs (or racial origin, as the regime saw it), their treatment was “special” right from the start. Many German documents dealing with deportations, incarcerations and deployments of Jews to various labor and construction efforts use terms to that effect: special action, special treatment, etc.

The changed role of the Auschwitz camp can be gleaned from a speech held by Camp Commandant Höss on May 22, 1943, where he stated, among other things:79

“Originally intended as a quarantine camp, this later became a Reich camp and thereby was destined for a new purpose. As the situation grew ever more critical, its position on the border of the Reich and G.G. [General Gouvernement] proved especially favorable, since the filling of the camp with workers was guaranteed. In addition to that, the solution of the Jewish question was added recently, which required creating the means to accommodate 60,000 prisoners at first, which increases to 100,000 within a short time. The inmates of the camp are predominantly intended for the growing large-scale industries in the vicinity. The camp contains within its sphere of interest various armament firms, for which the workers are regularly provided.”

No word of exterminations. The increase in the camp population and the change in the camp’s purpose had been ordered by Himmler during his visit to Auschwitz on July 17/18, 1942.80

One classic example of the use of terms like “special action” for deportation of Jews in general are the entries in the diary of Dr. Johann Paul Kremer, a physician who was deployed for a brief period of time at the Auschwitz camp. He wrote about a “special action from Holland” in his diary entry of September 5, and October 12, 1942.81 So the entire operation of arresting Jews in Holland, deporting them to Auschwitz and admitting them there was called a “special action” or special opera-

79 Ibid., 502-1-26, p. 85.
tion. In this sense, all measures by the Third Reich to ethnically cleanse Europe from the Jews were labeled with such terms.

At Auschwitz, the term “special treatment” occurs for the first time on a document dated March 31, 1942, which is a list of planned and already existing structures at the Auschwitz camp. Five barracks are identified in it as being part of that special treatment. One of them was to serve as an accommodation for Jewish women to be deployed at the Budy satellite camp, the other four were meant to serve as storage huts for the personal property of the first wave of Jews deported to Auschwitz from Slovakia and France for slave labor deployment.

Later, and in accordance with what Höss reported in his speech, the entire construction project of the Birkenau Camp was considered a “special program” and bore the subtitle “Implementation of Special Treatment.” It was called “Special Construction Measures” or “Special Operation” in a number of documents logging the progress made.85

One of these progress reports, dated Oct. 28, 1942, was picked up by Pressac in his 1993 study as yet another “criminal trace” due to the use of the phrase “Implementation of Special Treatment” in the subtitle (his pages 77f.). Had that document been about implementing the extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz, as Pressac and most mainstream historiographers claim, then the crematoria and bunkers should feature prominently in it with the term “special treatment” attached to them. Yet the only building expressly referred to as serving any special treatment is the large inmate shower and delousing facility, later called the “Zentralsauna.”86 The crematoria, listed right before this, have no special term attached, whereas the so-called bunkers are nowhere to be found (see Illustration 41).

This leads us to another pattern of usage of terms such as “special program” and “special measures” at Auschwitz. The background of this is the typhus epidemic which had gotten out of control during that summer. It even affected the SS staff, many of whom contracted typhus in 1942.87 The Auschwitz garrison physician Dr. Siegfried Schwela died of typhus in May of that year, and his successor Dr. Kurt Uhlenbrock contracted it just a few weeks after having deployed to Auschwitz. Although he survived, he recovered from it only in October. In the meantime, yet another garrison physician was deployed to Auschwitz, Dr. Eduard Wirths, who until then had been garrison physician at Dachau.88 Here is how Dr. Wirths described

---

82 Russian War Archives, 502-1-267, pp. 3-13, here p. 8.
83 I. Bartosik et al., op. cit. (note 64), p. 111, Doc. 23.
84 Russian War Archives, 502-1-275, p. 56. The barracks’ function is confirmed in 502-1-275, p. 272.
86 Military History Archive, Prague, Fond OT 31 (2)/8, pp. 9-10.
87 These cases were registered in a “Krankenblatt” (sick sheet) of the reserve military hospital in Kattowitz. See Illustration 62 in the appendix to this introduction.
the situation at Auschwitz on his arrival in early September:\footnote{Ulrich Völklein, Dr. med. Eduard Wirths: Ein Arzt in Auschwitz. Eine Quellenedition, Books on Demand, Norderstedt 2005, pp. 40f.}

"I discovered intolerable conditions for the prisoners. There was no running water, no proper toilets, no means of bathing. The barracks in which the prisoners were quartered were unheated, overcrowded, and beds were missing. Lice literally swarmed on the floors, clothes, bodies of the people. The walls were black with fleas. The people in an inconceivable condition, wasted to their ribs, plagued with vermin, the dead lying between the living and the dying. Every day hundreds of dead were carted off, often after lying for days among the living."

\footnote{Illustration 41: Section of page 5 of the Auschwitz construction progress report of Oct 28, 1942. Entry 13b) concerns the four crematoria, entry 16a) the inmate hygienic building (Zentralsauna), labelled as “für Sonderbehandlung/for special treatment.”}
Illustration 42a: “Special measures for the improvement of hygienic installations at the PoW Camp Auschwitz,” with a request for more than 350 metric tons of iron. (Russian War Archives, 502-1-83, pp. 309-311 (pp. 310 & 311 in Ill. 42b & c).
Bericht

über die getroffenen Maßnahmen für die Durchführung des durch SS-Brigadeführer und Generalmajor der Waffen-SS Dr.-Ing. Kammler angeordneten Sonderprogrammes im KGL. Auschwitz.

Mit den Vorarbeiten für die Durchführung des Sonderprogrammes wurde sofort am Mittwoch, dem 12. Mai 1943, begonnen.

Im besonderen wurden folgende Arbeiten in Angriff genommen:

1. Kläranlagen.

Um die Abwässer für die Zeit der Bauarbeiten am Königsgrabens und beim Durchstich abzuhalten und späterhin gleichzeitig bis zur Fertigstellung der Kläranlagen eine entsprechende Klärung der Abwässer zu schaffen, werden sowohl beim Klärbecken im BA I als auch bei der Kläranlage im BA II provisorische Erdklärbecken errichtet. Für diese Arbeiten werden 2 Bagger zusätzlich eingesetzt.

2. Durchstich des Königsgrabens zur Weichsel.


3. Abortbaracken.


An den Längswänden der Abortbaracken werden hölzerne mit Pappe ausgelegte Pfeiler angeordnet, welche in die Kanalgruben entwässert werden.

Illustration 42b: “Report on measures taken for the realization of special program ordered by SS Brigadeführer and Major General of the Waffen-SS Dr.-Ing. Kammler for PoW camp Auschwitz”: sewage plants, drainage system, toilets, wash rooms, drinking water treatment plant, fumigation facility.
Furthermore, it is planned to install heating coils in the garbage incinerator at Crematorium III in order to provide warm water for the shower installation to be built in the basement of Crematorium III.
Wirths subsequently saw to it that a massive “special program” of “special measures” was implemented at Auschwitz in order to drastically improve the hygienic conditions primarily in the Birkenau camp: latrines, water treatment plants, laundry barracks, sewage works, disinfestation facilities, medical facilities, etc. The program was huge and ambitious, and was finally approved in early May 1943.90 Documents in this context contain expressions like “immediate action program,” “special measure,” “special program,” “special construction measures,” as well as “special operation,” see for instance Illustrations 42a-c.91

For his outstanding efforts to stamp out the typhus epidemic and save the lives of thousands of inmates, he was rewarded with the German War Service Cross Second Class on January 30, 1944.92 The inmates liked him, too, as they saw in him a person who had saved their lives.93 During Christmas 1943, they even wrote him

Illustrations 43a&b: Auschwitz prisoners expressed their gratitude toward Auschwitz garrison physician Dr. E. Wirths. Left: Christmas card (British National Archives, WO 309/107, 110055). Right: cartoon drawn by an inmate as a gift to Dr. Wirths (Wirths family estate; courtesy of Dr. Wirths’s son).

93 See for instance the way Hermann Langbein portrays him in his book Die Stärkeren: Ein Bericht. Stern
a collective thank-you card that reads (see Illustration 43a):

“In the past year you have saved the lives of 93,000 people. We do not have any right to express our wishes to you. – So, we wish to ourselves that you will remain here in the coming year.

One for the prisoners of Auschwitz”

If we follow the orthodox narrative, Dr. Wirths would also have been the guy in charge of supervising the design of the homicidal gas chambers; of supervising the selection of those destined to die in them; of ordering the Zyklon B used for the killings; of assigning SS men to carry out these mass slaughters; and, and, and. Nevertheless, the inmates loved him dearly…

In fact, Wirths went beyond what was asked of him. He not only stamped out the typhus epidemic, he actually initiated a program to turn the Birkenau Camp into a camp for sick and recovering inmates. Those who were healthy were to be sent to satellite camps in order to work in the region’s farms and industries, while those in need of care would return to Birkenau. The entire Construction Section III was designed to become one enormous quarantine and hospital facility. Of course, such a project flies in the face of the orthodox Auschwitz narrative, because, as Pressac puts it on page 512:

“There exists an INCONGRUITY between the provision of a health facility and the existence of four crematoria only a few hundred meters away where, according to the official narrative humans in vast numbers were eliminated.”

Hence, Pressac dismisses this as a mere project that was never carried out. Yet a plethora of construction progress reports throughout 1943 and 1944, ending only in the late summer of 1944, show unambiguously that this project was approved by Berlin and was realized to a considerable extent (see Illustration 44). Eventually, the mass deportation of Hungarian Jews derailed the project, as the half-finished hospital barracks suddenly had to be misappropriated as temporary accommodation barracks for these deportees.94

Showers in Crematorium III

Now that we understand what was going on at Birkenau since Dr. Wirths had taken his post in early September 1942, let’s look into some of the “criminal traces” of Crematoria II & III listed by Pressac (see pp. 438f.). Let’s start with the 14 shower heads that show up in the inventory list of Crematorium III, which Pressac claims were fake in order to mislead the victims.

Already in Illustration 42c, we read that the camp authorities were planning to install inmate showers in the basement of Crematorium III. The first documentary

---

94 For this string of documents see the references in Carlo Mattogno, Healthcare in Auschwitz: Medical Care and Special Treatment of Registered Inmates, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016, esp. pp. 61-72.
trace known to us is a report dated May 13, 1943, with which the various tasks of the “special program” are assigned to certain members of the camp staff. Entry no. 9 reads:95

“Civilian employee Jährling has to carry out […] the showers in the undressing room of Crematorium III.”

Two days later, the Auschwitz Construction Office sent a telegram to the Topf company:96

“Bring along Monday project estimate for hot water supply to 100 showers. Provide for installation of heating coils or boilers in waste incinerator under construction at Crem. III, or flue-gas duct for exploitation of high exhaust temperatures.”

This was followed a day later by the report reproduced in Illustrations 42b&c. From a Topf letter of June 5, we learn from the reference “Crematorium II and III waste incineration furnace” as well as the following text that Crematorium II was now slated to receive showers as well:97

“Enclosed, please find drawing D 60446 concerning the incorporation of boilers into garbage incineration furnaces.”

Another document from that time also states that the use of the exhaust gases to heat water for bath installations in both Crematorium II & III were being planned but had not yet been carried out.98

Installing 100 showers each in Crematoria II & III would not have been a minor project. The largest hygienic facility in the camp, the so-called Zentralsauna, had only 54 showers and was meant to serve the entire camp.99

In the end, these plans were apparently either not carried out or drastically downgraded, because other facilities dedicated to inmate hygiene became available around that time:

– The “water installations” of Crematoria IV & V were finished, as mentioned earlier.
– The hygiene buildings 5a and 5b had 50 warm-water showers added that became operational in July.100
– Construction of the Zentralsauna proceeded swiftly; it was scheduled to be finished by early September,101 although it became partially operational only in December 1943, and fully operational in January 1944.102

95 Russian War Archives, 502-1-83, p. 338.
96 Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 40.
97 Russian War Archives, 502-1-336, p. 104.
98 Ibid., 502-1-312, p. 8.
99 Ibid., 502-1-336, p. 107; 50 showers according to the inventory in 532-1-335, p. 3.
100 Ibid., 502-1-83, p. 119.
101 Ibid., 502-1-332, p. 10.
102 Ibid., 502-1-336, p. 84; 502-1-335, p. 1.
Hence, if we find in the inventory of Crematorium III fourteen showers listed for the basement, the thick paper trail just discussed suggests that these were real showers.

Pressac has identified some of the wooden plates included in the ceiling of Morgue #1 of Crematorium II when its reinforced concrete roof was poured, see page 393. Before the invention of plastic wall plugs, the way to create points in poured concrete where items could be screwed in later was by imbedding conical pieces of wood in the concrete. Pressac claims that the wooden bases he found served to screw in the fake shower heads. That argument is fallacious because he cannot prove the existence of 14 false shower heads installed in Crematorium THREE (we find such an entry only in that building’s inventory) by looking for traces in Crematorium TWO. Next, the ceiling of these morgues must have had several wooden bases imbedded in order to hold the lamps that were eventually mounted on that ceiling. A blueprint reproduced by Pressac (page 312) shows that a pair of lamps each was to be located between each concrete column – eight pairs altogether – one to the left, the other to the right of the support beam running the length of the room. This is what Pressac found.

Vergasungskeller, Auskleidekeller, Sonderkeller

The temporarily considered project to install showers in the basements of Crematoria II & III brings up another document suggesting that the SS may have briefly considered installing two hot-air disinfection furnaces in Crematorium II, see Illustration 45. Other documents show, however, that these disinfection furnaces were meant for the Zentralsauna, which at that point in time was only being planned.\(^{103}\) Maybe the disinfection furnaces were ordered under the heading “Crematorium II,” because for bureaucratic reasons they could not yet be ordered for the Zentralsauna. Be that as it may, the document containing the word “Vergasungskeller,” meaning gassing basement, which is paraded around by Pressac (page 432) and almost all mainstream Holocaust historians as prime evidence for the existence of a homicidal gas chamber is not as straight forward as they want to make believe.

First, there is another document which confirms that Morgue #1 of Crematorium II had something to do with gas, see Illustration 46.\(^ {104}\) But was it the temporary, later abandoned, consideration to use these basements as hygienic facilities,

---

\(^{103}\) Ibid., 502-2-27, p. 24; 502-1-316, p. 430.

Illustration 45: Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 47:
“Two Topf disinfection furnaces for Crema II in the PoW Camp Auschwitz.”
including some disinestation device, as Carlo Mattogno posits,\textsuperscript{105} or was that basement room seen as an auxiliary air-raid shelter, as Samuel Crowell has argued?\textsuperscript{106}

Fact is that, ever since the beginning of World War Two, German public buildings by law had to have a sizeable portion of their basement area equipped as gas-proof air-raid shelters. Although the Birkenau Crematoria were not public buildings, they were the only structures at the Birkenau Camp that had basements. In addition, since those basements were set into the groundwater, they were built with very thick floors and roofs to make them heavy, so they would not develop any buoyancy. Hence, they were perfect locations to serve as auxiliary air-raid shelters.

During the war, the architect Dr. Walter Schreiber was the senior engineer of the Huta Corporation’s Kattowitz branch. As such, he supervised the planning and construction of the Auschwitz crematoria, among other things. In an interview with Walter Lüftl in 1999, he had the following to say about this (L=Lüftl, S=Schreiber):\textsuperscript{107}


\textsuperscript{107} Werner Rademacher, “Engineer’s Deathbed Confession: We Built Morgues, not Gas Chambers,” The Revisionist, 2(3) (2004), pp. 296f.
“L.: What did the Huta Corporation build?
S.: Among other things, crematoria II and III with the large morgues.
L.: The prevalent opinion (considered to be self-evident) is that these large morgues were allegedly gas chambers for mass killings.
S.: Nothing of that sort could be deduced from the plans made available to us. The detailed plans and provisional invoices drawn up by us refer to these rooms as ordinary cellars.
L.: Do you know anything about introduction hatches in the reinforced concrete ceilings?
S.: No, not from memory. But since these cellars were also intended to serve as air raid shelters as a secondary purpose, introduction holes would have been counter-productive. I would certainly have objected to such an arrangement.”

But couldn’t it have been a homicidal gas chamber after all? The historical and documentary context proves, however, that this would also have been logistically impossible. The Auschwitz Death Books108 show the following rounded inmate mortality since the peak of the typhus epidemic in August 1942:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 1942:</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1942:</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1942:</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1942:</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1942:</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1943:</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1943:</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers show the tragic background of the frantic planning for cremation capacities on the one hand, and projects to improve the camp’s hygienic conditions on the other, primarily by creating shower and disinfection facilities.

These numbers also show that the crematoria’s morgues were desperately needed for the storage of corpses. Due to rats gnawing on dead inmates not instantly removed from where they had died, Dr. Wirths lobbied for months to have separate solidly-constructed morgues built in every major camp sector, but his request was repeatedly denied, because an order was in place to collect all dead inmates twice a day and to store them in the crematoria’s morgues. If followed, this procedure would not have allowed for any corpses to pile up for extended periods of time anywhere.109 Here is the final decision from Berlin, conveyed to Dr. Wirths in a letter of Aug. 4, 1943 (see Illustration 47):110

“With reference to the above-mentioned letter, please be informed that based on the discussion on Saturday, 31 July 1943, in which SS Standartenführer Dr. Mrugowski, SS Hauptsturmführer Dr. Wirths and the undersigned took part, the construction of dedicated morgues in the individual subsections of the PoW camp, as

---

109 See e.g. Russian War Archives 502-1-170, pp. 259f.
110 Ibid., 502-1-170, p. 262.
Illustration 47: Order from Berlin to the Auschwitz garrison physician Dr. Wirths: No additional morgues will be built; corpses are to be collected and stored in the crematoria’s morgues twice daily.
per the aforementioned request of the SS garrison physician, will not be carried out.

SS Standartenführer Mrugowski has decreed during the discussion that the corpses are to be removed twice daily, in the morning and in the evening, and taken to the morgues of the crematoria; in this way, the separate construction of morgues in the individual subsections can be avoided.”

Hence, every day in 1943, tens of corpses were brought to each of the crematoria’s morgues, and stored there until they could be cremated. This presupposes that these morgues were available at any given time for the storage of these corpses.

In the midst of all this, how could those morgues have been used as undressing rooms for living inmates, and as homicidal gas chambers? This simple fact is probably also the reason why the temporary projects to use these basement rooms as showers or even disinfection facilities were abandoned: It was simply impractical. Hence, after April of 1943, no “criminal traces” can be found anymore in the vast documentation, although the use of these facilities is said to have continued and even intensified later on. Take Crematorium II, which was characterized by Dutch cultural historian Dr. Robert J. van Pelt as the epicenter of human suffering. Not a single document exists with anything remotely “suspicious” that is older than the date this building was officially handed over to the camp administration (March 31, 1943).\footnote{For a list of dates for all criminal traces see C. Mattogno, \textit{The Real Case…, op. cit.} (note 41), p. 42.} This means that this alleged gas chamber would have operated for more than 20 months and caused the death of some 500,000 persons without generating even a scrap of a “criminal trace” during its operation!

On January 21, 1943, while Crematorium II was about to be finished, the garrison physician requested a few minor changes to the use of its rooms that made them more suitable to do autopsies and anatomical preparations. He also requested that an undressing room be provided in the basement.\footnote{Russian War Archives, 502-1-313, p. 57.} In later documents, Morgue #2 is sometimes referred to as an undressing basement (“Auskleidekeller”), for the first time on March 6, 1943 (see pages 432-434). At that time, if we follow the orthodox narrative, the decision to turn these basements into a mass-slaughter location had long since been made. The entire Morgue #2 is said to have been designated for victims to get undressed before walking into Morgue #1 to be gassed. The garrison physician would have been one of those mainly responsible for planning and implementing this chemical mass-slaughter facility. Why then would he ask toward the end of January 1943 for a room to be designated for undressing? This obviously concerned the undressing of corpses of people who had died of “natural” causes and had been brought to the morgues by the hundreds, before they were either first autopsied or directly cremated.
Expert literature on the handling of corpses specifies that the victims of infectious diseases ought to be stored in separate morgues especially equipped for such cases. The main reason for building four crematoria at Birkenau was the massive number of victims of infectious diseases, so they had to have such special morgues. In addition, Morgue #1 had a stronger ventilation system than Morgue #2, so it was even more special among these special basement rooms.

The sky-rocketing death toll at Auschwitz was welcome news for the Allied propaganda machinery. As mentioned earlier, mass extermination claims began a little after the epidemic had gotten out of control. In March 1943, Allied propaganda was very specific in this regard, as German mainstream historian Dr. Werner Maser reported:

"On March 23, 1943, [...] the radio station ‘Sviet’, run by the British Secret Service and broadcasting in the Polish language, published the invented claim [...] according to which the Germans would burn some 3,000 people every day in the crematory of Auschwitz, ‘mainly Jews.'"

In an atmosphere like this, it is not surprising that German officials who were dealing with this human catastrophe at Auschwitz tried to minimize the public relations disaster it produced for Germany. Hence, in many a document we find merely the letter “L” when corpses are referred to, and the word “special” when reference is made to measures taken to get the situation under control.

In his second book, Pressac presents a document as a “criminal trace” because it contains the term “special basements” for the morgues of Crematorium II (1993, p. 60). Another document not known to Pressac also uses that term. After what I just wrote about it, we may justly ask: so what?

Wire-Mesh Devices and Wooden Blinds

As mentioned earlier, the roof and floor of the morgues of Crematoria II & III were made very thick in order to weigh down those basements so they would not float up due to the high groundwater level. Pressac shows cross sections of these morgues on pages 322 through 325, juxtaposing the old version with a thin roof and floor meant for the Main Camp, with the new one for Birkenau where the reinforced concrete roof is some 30 cm thick, and the floor 58 cm.

The orthodox Auschwitz narrative has it that, when the decision was made to use these morgues as mass-slaughter facilities, four holes were knocked through

114 Werner Maser, *op. cit.* (note 36), pp. 342f.
115 Russian War Archives, 502-1-24, p. 86.
the roof of Morgues #1 of both Crematoria. Yet after examining the roof, the already mentioned Dr. van Pelt stated:\textsuperscript{116}

"Today, these four small holes […] cannot be observed in the ruined remains of the concrete slab."

Subsequently, mainstream writers tried unsuccessfully to prove the opposite by declaring some odd cracks in the blown-up roof to be these holes which were allegedly knocked through the concrete after it had already cured.\textsuperscript{117}

Before going into detail, we should be aware that three essential changes to the two Morgues #1 would have had to be made if the SS really planned to use them for mass gassings:

1. The inmates had to be locked into that room securely using massive technically gastight steel doors.
2. A device had to be included that would have allowed the swift evaporation and dissipation of HCN from the Zyklon B carrier material.
3. An upgrade to the ventilation system would have been wise in order to allow for a swift evacuation of the toxic fumes.

None of these changes were implemented. We already covered the doors, and we spoke about the professionally designed standard fumigation gas chambers by the Degesch Company which were planned to be installed in the reception building in the Auschwitz Main Camp. Instead of taking their design principles and applying them somehow to those planned mass-slaughter facilities, witnesses and orthodox scholars want to make us believe that the SS totally forgot about any of these issues when building those crematoria, and when they finally realized belatedly that they needed to find a way of introducing HCN into the morgues, they are said to have ruined the only massively built underground rooms of Birkenau by destroying their roofs with jackhammers.

The engineers involved in building those facilities weren’t imbeciles, while those uncritically spreading those claims are much closer to that description.

Dumping Zyklon B through some holes amidst several hundred or even a thousand and more people is a bad idea. There would have been no way of retrieving the pellets after the deed. It would therefore have kept releasing the toxic fumes for an hour or more, making it difficult to ventilate the room in a timely fashion.

But where there are plenty of witnesses letting their fantasies run wild, there is also a simple solution. Hence, several witnesses have claimed – contradicted by others, but that is usually ignored by the mainstream – that some column-shaped device was built into those holes which allowed the Zyklon B to be removed from


the chamber after the murder. The most prominent among these witnesses, Michał Kula, is quoted by Pressac, and he even drew a sketch of the device as described by Kula, a former inmate employee at the Auschwitz metalworking shop (see page 487). Pressac claims that the existence of this device is supported by the inventory list of Crematorium II (see page 438). It has a handwritten entry reading “4 Drahtnetzeinschiebevorrichtung,” translating to “4 wire-mesh push-in devices.” The “4 Holzblenden” – 4 wooden blinds or screens – listed on the next line, also handwritten, are interpreted as having been wooden lids to cover those devices.

The problems with that interpretation are manifold:
1. There were no holes in the roofs in which any devices could have been installed. That renders the whole discussion moot.
2. These are the only handwritten entries. Anyone could have entered them at any time before the document was first published.
3. Kula made three depositions shortly after the war: one before the show trial against former Auschwitz camp commander Rudolf Höss, one during the trial, and another one during the trial against the Auschwitz camp garrison a few months after the Höss Trial. In his first two depositions he described the claimed Zyklon-B introduction columns with such detail that it must be assumed that he was involved in manufacturing them. The problem is that he described them differently in each case. Before the trial, he claimed that these columns had a square cross-section of 70 cm (Illustration 48), while in his second deposition their size had shrunk to a mere 24 cm (Illustration 49). In his third deposition, he said among other things:

“Then they began to build gigantic crematoria. They were set up so that the victims could not understand where they were being taken. Each crematorium had two gas chambers, one for 1,500 and one for 2,000 people. There was a special concrete ski-jump [no joking] onto which the people were thrown from the truck, [whose load bed] tipped automatically, and in this way the people fell into the gas chambers.”

Kula turned the one claimed gas chamber into two, and although it is true that Crematoria II & III had a corpse chute – more on that later – neither could trucks get access to it, nor did it lead directly into any of the morgues, nor is that how – according to the orthodox narrative – any living inmate is said to have entered that facility. Kula was simply making up a wild story. So much for his credibility.
4. No material or documentary trace of these columns exists. The paperwork left

---

119 Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 498.
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behind in the metalworking shop had no entry for these devices. There are not even cracks in the roof today that have a size of 70 cm square (for the column, 1st edition). The places where those columns would have to have been anchored in the floors and ceilings show no traces of anchoring points.

5. The outer meshwork, drawn in red in Illustrations 48f., was only 3 mm thick, which would have been destroyed by a panicking crowd.

6. The slit into which the Zyklon-B-pellets were allegedly thrown was only 15 mm wide (2nd edition). The gypsum pellets would have gotten stuck while falling down that slit, clogging it, making it impossible to fill it properly.

7. The air in that morgue would have been saturated with moisture. When HCN evaporates, it cools down the gypsum, leading to condensation. Moist gypsum gets gooey, making it practically impossible to clean these columns afterwards.

8. With no heat source and no forced air movement, the release of toxic fumes from this device would have been slow at best, particularly when considering the air’s humidity condensing on the pellets.

9. In the inventory table, the wooden blinds and wire-mesh columns are listed for Morgue #2 (the “undressing basement”), not Morgue #1 (the “gas chamber”).

10. If the Zyklon-B insertion columns were to be entered in the inventory, why were only the inner removable part and the lid listed?

11. The German word “Einschiebevorrichtung” denotes a drawer-like device that is pushed in horizontally. The German word for drawer is “Schublade” – where the noun “Schub” (thrust, push) comes from the verb “schieben” (to push, shove, thrust). A “Blende” on the other hand, is not a lid (for the column) but a blind or screen.
The German word for lid is “Deckel,” closure is “Verschluss,” cover is “Abdeckung.”

12. “Einschiebevorrichtung” is on occasion used in the German language to describe devices used to push items into an oven or furnace (baking oven, cremation furnace). Zimmermann writes, for instance, about baking ovens:121

“For the loading and unloading [of the oven], baking plates are hitched and unhitched from the support chains by a slider for unloading and loading [Aus- und Einschiebevorrichtung], which operates without jolting, and are automatically inserted into and then removed from the oven.”

In a German patent for an automatic pizza oven, this term is mentioned several times.122 In the context of devices for pushing coffins into cremation muffles, the term shows up as well,123 but more often the closely related term “Einschubvorrichtung.”124 On March 7, 2003, the voluntary fire fighters of the German city of Hof had to respond to a call from the local crematorium, because a “deficient [corpse] push-in device/Einschubvorrichtung” had caused a fire in the furnace system.125

13. The proper terms for the claimed devices would have been “(Drahtnetz)Einwurf/Einfüllvorrichtung” or “Einführvorrichtung” and “Holzdeckel” (or “Abdeckung”).

14. The extant documents about the crematoria show indeed two introduction devices that were properly named:
– The door of the garbage chute used to fill the garbage incinerator was called “Einwurfbende” (throw-in screen).126
– The window used to throw coal into the coal storage rooms of Crematoria IV and V was called “Kohleneinwurffenster” (coal throw-in window).127

As I stated earlier, the engineers involved in building those facilities weren’t imbeciles. If they really wanted to turn this into a mass-gassing

123 Christoph Driessen (dpa), “Kaffeefahrt ins Krematorium,” published among others in Main Echo, July 12, 2001 (www.main-echo.de/art4204.1746938); Handelsblatt (June 6, 2011; www.handelsblatt.com/4321318.html); Aachener Zeitung (June 21, 2011; www.aachener-zeitung.de/1.1382786).
125 www.fw-hof.de/index.php/einsaetze?monat=3&submit=OK
126 List of orders submitted to the metalworking shop compiled by Jan Sehn. Höss Trial, Vol. 11, p. 84.
127 Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/4/28, pp. 36f.
facility, they could have come up with a solution of introducing the toxic fumes into that room using its ventilation system – by simply inserting a heating device and a basket for Zyklon B somewhere in the ventilation ducts or chimneys, which were accessible from the building’s attic, for instance.

Gas Testers

I have to backpedal. The story we will unfold now indicates that maybe the engineers constructing the cremation furnaces were imbeciles after all. But first things first.

On page 371, Pressac presents the transcript of a telegram of Feb. 26, 1943, in which the Auschwitz Construction Office asked the furnace manufacturer Topf to instantly ship 10 gas testers to Auschwitz. A handwritten note “Jäh” indicates that the issue was of interest to the civilian employee Rudolf Jährling, who was the camp’s professional heating and furnace technician.

Gas testers could mean a lot of things, but considering that the camp’s furnace technician was involved and that the furnace manufacturer Topf was expected to ship them right away “as discussed” (per the telegram), hence must have had them readily available, it is most likely that these were devices to measure the CO and CO₂ concentrations in flue gases of furnaces in order to make sure that the combustion process was optimal. Crematoria II & III together had 10 flues, so the number of testers ordered is a match.

However, in his 1993 book (pages 71f.), Pressac presented an answer letter to the above telegram sent by the Topf Company, which he had found in Moscow, see Illustration 50. It suggests that the entire issue was about “Indication devices for traces of hydrogen cyanide.” And that’s where things turn imbecilic. Here is the wording in English:

“Re: Crematorium, Gas detectors.
We acknowledge receipt of your telegram specifying:
‘Immediately send ten gas detectors as agreed, price quote to follow.’
We hereby inform you that two weeks ago we inquired, of five different companies, concerning the Indication devices for traces of hydrogen cyanide sought by you. We have received negative responses from three companies and two have not yet answered. When we receive information on this matter, we shall immediately contact you, in order to put you in touch with a company that makes these devices.”

However:
– According to contemporary regulations, testing the air inside fumigated locations using chemical testing kits, which were called “Gasrestnachweisgerät für Zyklon” in German, (residual gas testing device for Zyklon) was obligatory in ev-
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ery disinfection action using hydrogen cyanide in order to verify that the ventilation of a fumigated room had been complete before it could be entered without a gas mask. Since disinfection had been performed on a large scale in Birkenau since 1941, it is categorically impossible that no one should have concerned themselves with the possibility of ordering such devices before early 1943! Hence, the camp authorities knew where to get them.

– Since the creation of the Birkenau Camp in 1941, the local SS garrison physician was responsible, among other things, for the ordering, administration, and use
of Zyklon B and all materials for its handling (disinfestation installations, gas masks, residual gas testing devices, etc.). He therefore had three years’ experience in this business. Why then should the Central Construction Office, which was neither competent in this matter nor authorized, have issued the order for the procurement of residual gas testing devices in 1943?

- Already the ordering telegram involved the expert for furnace systems Jährling, and the response letter by the Topf Company has a handwritten note in the receipt stamp of the Central Construction Office indicating that civilian engineer Jährling was indeed in charge of the matter. Hence, this was definitely a matter concerning furnace systems, not poison-gas facilities.

- In addition to cremation furnaces, the Topf Company also produced hot-air-disinfestation furnaces as well as silo fumigation installations which were, however, not operated with HCN. Why then should the heating technician Jährling, a civilian engineer, order devices, of which he had no expert knowledge, from a firm which evidently did not even know the supplier of the devices, and this at a point in time when the health services of the Auschwitz Camp had already been supplied with these devices by the Tesch & Stabenow corporation for two years and therefore knew the supplier? There was very probably even a supply of them in stock at the camp.

- I refuse to believe that a company involved in the construction of hot-air-disinfestation facilities did not know whom to approach for the delivery of detection kits used for Zyklon-B disinfestations. The Degesch Company had a monopoly on Zyklon B, as was well known to professionals active in the field. They would have known whom to approach for HCN testing kits.

- The Central Construction Office’s ordering telegram clearly states that they expected immediate delivery of the gas testers “as discussed,” implying that the Topf Company had them in stock. In addition, this order was so urgent that the legally prescribed official procedure of getting cost estimates prior to an order was ignored. That does not agree with Topf’s search for weeks for a supplier of unknown items with an inevitably unknown price.

Hence we are left with two options: either this reply from the Topf Company is a forgery, for instance by replacing the letter’s original text (which perhaps contained the subsequently submitted cost estimate) with a new text. Or else one has to assume that the individuals signing this letter (the cremation engineer Kurt Prüfer and Topf’s chief engineer Fritz Sander) completely misunderstood the telegram, in spite of the previous conversation it was evidently base on, and went off on a weeks-long wild-goose chase for something that would neither have been requested of them by anyone nor would have been lacking at Auschwitz. At any rate, that letter’s text as it is today makes no sense at all.\(^\text{129}\)

\(^{129}\) For a more thorough discussion of the issues involved see C. Mattogno, *op. cit.* (note 23).
Warm-Air Supply

On pages 221 and 230, Pressac reproduces documents referring, among other things, to a plan to channel warm air from the overheating forced-draft blowers into Morgue #1. of Crematorium II. On p. 454 Pressac states:

“*Heating a mortuary is nonsensical. The extracts from these two letters are criminal traces of capital importance.*”

On page 375 he writes in more detail (similar on p. 223):

“This document constitutes damning evidence. If […] Morgue #1 remained a ‘morgue,’ it would be mad or stupid to want to ‘preheat’ a place, by definition cool or cold, destined for the temporary storage of corpses. […]”

However, standard works on building crematoria disagree. In his classical treatment on crematoria, Heepke writes:130

“If morgues exist in a crematorium, they must, of course, be equipped with a separate heating system, preferably in the form of a continuously operating stove; but heating of the morgues must always be made possible and is frequently specified by the authorities.”

Neufert writes in a more recent work, a copy of which the Auschwitz Construction Office owned:131

“The temperature level in the mortuary [must be] $\geq 2 - \leq 12^\circ C$, never lower, because frost may cause the corpses to expand and to burst.”

Furthermore, Pressac’s favorite witness Henryk Tauber said in this regard (see on p. 482):

“All [corpses] were frozen and we had to separate them from one another with axes.”

Hence, these crematoria had a design flaw which this suggested modification was to remedy: their basements had no heating. Aware of this, the Topf Company wrote already in a letter of November 4, 1941, that they will install more forced-draft devices because in winter132

“*Frozen corpses will be incinerated, requiring more fuel which causes the exhaust gas volume to increase.*”

Morgue #1 was the target for this heating option, because due to its more-powerful ventilation system, this was the morgue where corpses several days old or even older were to be stored, as Pressac himself states on p. 284, increasing the risk of them freezing in winter. Hence, gently heating a morgue in winter is neither mad nor stupid. In addition, this project never came to fruition, because the overheating

---
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132 Russian War Archives, 502-1-313, p. 83.
forced-draft blowers, whose excess heat was to be the heat source of this system, were removed. So the whole point is moot.

Entry to Morgue #2, Elimination of Morgue #3 and of Corpse Chute

Originally, Crematorium II was meant to be built behind the old crematorium in the Main Camp (see pages 183f.). Since the groundwater level was not that high at the Main Camp, the building’s morgues were planned as full basements. As mentioned earlier, transferring the building to Birkenau with its high water level required a number of changes, among them that the basements were no longer fully underground, but stuck out of the soil by a considerable portion. The way the crematoria were set up at Birkenau made it difficult to reach the only originally planned entrance to the basements, because the camp road was now on the opposite side, with Morgue #2 sticking out of the ground, blocking the access to the basement entry. Hence, new entrances were included to facilitate access to the morgues, see Illustrations 51a&b. One of the blueprints dated Dec. 19, 1942 even expressly states that this was about “Relocation of the basement access to the side nearest the road” (pages 302f.).

One additional basement entry went into what used to be Morgue #3, which was restructured into a vestibule, an office and a room for “gold works” where precious dental fillings were recovered. It is standard for a crematorium to recover metal fillings prior to a cremation, since they would clog the furnaces in the long run. What happened with any recovered precious metal at Auschwitz is, of course, a different story.

Pressac claims that these additional entries, not having any corpse chutes, “could be used only by living people” (page 218), hence would be a criminal trace. In addition, he states that Morgue #3 was eliminated because it allegedly had “no use in the criminal context of Krematorium II” anymore. Finally, Pressac claims on page 213 that the corpse chute of the original basement entry was removed, allegedly because “the plan was for the corpses […] to enter […] on their own two feet, hence STILL ALIVE.” (The longer elaboration in his 1993 book on pages 63f. is similar).

Regarding the corpse chute, Pressac is simply mistaken. The blueprint in question (#2003) focused on adding basement entries. It had neither the corpse chute nor the staircase itself drawn in. They were omitted to simplify that drawing and limit it to the issue at hand. All other later blueprints do feature the corpse chute:

- #2136 of Feb. 24, 1943 for Crematorium III (page 305);
- #2197 of March 19, 1943 for Crematorium II (page 307);
- #109/15 by Huta of Sept. 24, 1943 for Crematoria II and III (page 327);
- #109/16A by Huta of Oct. 9, 1943 for Crematoria II and III (page 329).

In fact, blueprint #2003 seems to have been partly copied from the original blueprint for a new crematorium of the Main Camp dated October 24, 1941, in which
the two underground morgues were accessible via a staircase without a chute! But that building certainly had no criminal background.

Had Morgues #1 and #2 really been used for homicidal purposes, Morgue #3 would have been desperately needed in order to store the victims of the Birkenau Camp’s “natural” mortality, since these could not have been stored in the rooms allegedly used as undressing and execution chambers for the victims. The elimination of Morgue #3 thus proves the exact opposite of what Pressac claims: it was not needed for storing corpses, because the other two morgues were available for this at any given time.

---

133 Reproduced in J.-C. Pressac, Les crématoires..., op. cit. (note 1), his Document 9 on an unnumbered page.
Adding new entrances to the basement of Crematoria II & III has therefore no criminal implication at all. It was an inevitable design change due to the changed situation in Birkenau. It also goes without saying that corpses can be transported into a basement even without a corpses chute. The reason why the new entries did not get chutes as well is succinctly described with one brief term: cost overrun. Constantly changing the design was simply getting too expensive.

Change to Drainage System
Comparing the blueprints #932 (pages 284f., Jan. 23, 1942) with #1300 (page 297, June 18, 1942), it turns out that a change in the layout of the pipework collecting wastewater from the various drains inside Crematorium II occurred. Pressac claims on page 285 that this design change, detaching the drains of Morgue #1 from the rest of the building’s drainage pipes, was meant to prevent any toxic gas from entering the building’s ground floor, hence shows criminal intent.

However, blueprint #1300 dates from June 1942, hence long before any criminal planning is said to have been implemented. Furthermore, water flows downhill, and by default all drains are equipped with U-bend pipes (“traps”) preventing any foul smell and pest to enter the drained rooms. Hence, HCN gas, being highly soluble in water, could not have entered the drainage pipes, and HCN dissolved in water drained from the basements would have flowed away from the higher ground floor.

The older blueprint #932 of January 23, 1942 has all basement rooms detached from the drainage pipes of the ground floor rooms, yet in blueprint #1300, half the basement was attached to the ground floor drainage pipes. Hence, the older plan was “safer” than the newer, although both blueprints predate any alleged criminal plans.

To prove the innocuous nature of the drainage layout, no matter what design it had, we need to look at the drainage layout of the Zyklon-B fumigation wings of Buildings 5a and 5b. Their blueprint #1293 of May 9, 1942 (see page 56) has the two drains of the “gas chamber” connected with the drains of the main building, from where the wastewater flowed into an external sewer. This drainage system was even connected to the drain in the inmates’ shower room. in other words, there was practically no risk that Zyklon-B fumes could spread into the building through the sewer system. So much for the danger of drains in a “gas chamber” for the rest of the building.

Change of Door’s Opening Direction and Door Size of Morgue #1
The ventilation system of Morgue #1 consisted of both an air-intake fan and an extraction fan. Both had the same design and motors, hence the same capacity. However, the registers closing the air-intake openings along the intake channel had
rather small holes (ca. 3 mm diameter, see pages 233 and 487). That increased the pressure loss along the intake channel much more than that along the extraction channel. As a result, the extraction fan sucked out more air from the room than the intake fan blew in, leading to reduced pressure of that room compared with the rest of the building. Hence, air constantly seeped into that room from any other opening, in that case basically the door. That is a desired effect, as it prevents unpleasant odors from leaving this morgue.

The original blueprint provided for a double door opening to the inside (see page 285). Due to the room’s low air pressure, that would have led to this door opening by itself if not properly shut, which is not a good design. That may be the reason why this was changed later on (see blueprint on page 302). However, letting this door open to the outside made one of its wings collide with the right-hand door of the adjacent corpse elevator. Moving the whole door to the center of the wall would have solved the problem. It is not known what the final solution was in this regard. On the inventory drawing of Crematorium II of March 19, 1943, it looks like someone added a little extension to the wall close to the elevator, reducing the width of that door from 200 cm to some 170 cm, see Illustration 52 (from blueprint #2197, page 312). If anything, only careful excavations of the ruins could decide what the actual width of that door was.

Pressac claims that these changes point at a homicidal usage (pages 285f.). It is safe to assume that it would be extremely challenging to secure a double-leaf door against a panicking crowd. But it is not at all certain what kind of door this room had. As a matter of fact, the two drawings by the construction firm Huta from later dates still show a 2-m-wide door (#109/15 of Sept. 24, 1943, page 327; #109/16A of Oct. 9, 1943, page 329).

Off-Limit Zone
When the typhus epidemic got out of control in Birkenau, the camp authorities were ordered by Berlin to put the entire camp on lock-down, or quarantine. As a
result, the camp authorities declared the area where the Auschwitz and Birkenau Camps were being developed as a “Sperrgebiet” (off-limits zone). Repeating an earlier order of 1942, Höss explained this again in another garrison order of Feb. 14, 1943:134

“[…] the following area is defined as an off-limits zone for the total camp lock-down in accordance with indications in the map of KL Auschwitz area of interest: The off-limits zone is represented by the KL Auschwitz area of interest, limited in the north, west and east by the Vistula and/or Sola rivers […].”

This means that the “Sperrgebiet” was the area affected by the “total camp lock-down” due to the typhus epidemic.

In his 1993 book, Pressac presents his Document 21 shown here in Illustration 53, which dates from June 2, 1943 and shows the “Area of Interest of the Auschwitz Concentration Camp.”135 The Birkenau Camp is rendered in white, and an area to the northwest of it, also in white, is marked as “Sperrgebiet” – off-limits zone. On page 52 of his 1993 book, Pressac insinuates in passing that this area is “where Bunkers 1 and 2 were located.” However, if we superimpose that map on a map of Birkenau and its surroundings, see Illustration 54 (turned by -90° to have the common orientation of the camp with west at the top), we see that the area around Bunker 2 (marked with B2) was not included in that zone, while the area of the claimed Bunker 1 (marked with B1) and of the mass graves shown in Illustration 30 (marked with F) are within the camp’s perimeter.

In June of 1943, the typhus epidemic had largely been contained, which may be the reason why the entire “area of interest” was not marked as an off-limits zone, but merely the Birkenau Camp itself and a small area northwest of it. We should avoid overinterpreting the white “Sperrgebiet” area on the map in Illustration 53, however, because it is evidently a hand-drawn sketch meant to merely show a rough outline.

Standard Gas Chamber

In order to improve the reliability and efficiency of Zyklon-B fumigations of effects, the Degesch Company developed a standardized fumigation chamber that could be mass produced to reduce costs, see Illustration 6. It was called standard gas chamber (Normalgaskammer). Degesch even distributed a manual titled Fibel über Normalgaskammern. In contrast to these standardized fumigation chambers were the provisional or improvised fumigation chambers, for instance those built in the disinfection wings of Buildings 5a&b at Birkenau, or the fumigation chamber at Stutthof.

In his 1993 book, Pressac writes (page 89):

---

Illustration 53: Survey map of the Auschwitz region with the “Area of Interest of the Auschwitz Concentration Camp" highlighted.

Illustration 54: A map of the Birkenau Camp (state in mid-1944) superimposed on the map of Illustration 53, turned by -90°.
Illustration 55: Urgent request of June 8, 1944 to install 11 Zyklon-B delousing devices of the Degesch standard design ("Normalgaskammern") in the disinestation wing of the Auschwitz reception building.
“On this occasion, the civilian employee Jährling made a tremendous blunder in a letter to Testa. [Illustration 55] He designated the gas chambers for delousing by the term ‘Normalgaskammer,’ a word underlined and set in quotation marks, as if there were ‘normal’ gas chambers and others that were ‘abnormal.’ Testa took over this designation asserted, first of all, that a switch [from Zyklon B] to Areginal was mandatory only for new installations, and also insisted that the personnel assigned to the normal gas chambers using hydrogen cyanide had to be particularly well trained, insinuating that their use was far more complicated than the mere dumping of Zyklon B into the ‘abnormal’ gas chambers.”

The only one insinuating anything here is Pressac, and it’s all wrong. In fact, any handling of HCN was much more dangerous than any of the other disinfection methods available during the war (steam, hot air, Areginal, DDT, microwaves). Mass-gassing humans would actually have been much more complicated than operating a standardized fumigation chamber, because:
1. Lice cannot struggle against their murderers, as humans do on occasion.
2. Lice don’t absorb large amounts of HCN in their tissue and on their skin, as humans do, rendering the handling of gassed human corpses potentially dangerous.
3. Lice don’t bury the Zyklon-B pellets underneath them, as humans do. Therefore, ventilating and clearing a moist and cool room full of humans murdered with HCN is much more dangerous and complicated than ventilating and clearing a dry and warm room full of clothes.

In fact, the Normalgaskammer was developed to make Zyklon-B fumigations faster, more efficient, easier and safer than improvised Zyklon-B fumigations could ever be. However, even improvised Zyklon-B fumigations were much easier and safer than mass-gassings of humans could ever be.

The letter quoted by Pressac concerns the revival of the old plan to install De-gesch circulation devices in the remaining free cubicles inside the disinfection wing of the reception building at the Auschwitz Main Camp (see Illustration 55). That project is described in more detail in the appendix to this introduction (see Illustration 61). These documents prove once more that sanitation, not mass murder, was the main focus of the camp authorities’ activities.

Elimination of Faucets in Morgue #1

On page 310, Pressac writes that Morgue #1, “the gas chamber, was fitted with three [water] taps, which were subsequently removed” (also on page 286). But as Pressac himself states, these faucets are included in two blueprints of that building, including the inventory blueprint. How does Pressac know they were removed? On page

---

136 Russian War Archives, 502-1-333, p. 35. Testa: Tesch & Stabenow, a distributor for Zyklon B and fumigation equipment.
A Bauleitung inventory drawing indicates that three taps were in fact installed IN the gas chamber. But they were destroyed in the first gassings and it was decided not to replace them.

And how does he know that? Tauber, who might simply have forgotten about those three spigots, didn’t say anything as to why there were none in Morgue #1. It’s all Pressac’s fantasy, pure and simple. Historiography Pressac style: make up a wild story and gain air superiority in the discourse.

But even if it turned out that these spigots and the pipes leading to them were indeed removed, a simpler explanation for that would be that the basement rooms could not be heated, hence any water present in pipes exposed to frost could have burst the pipes and caused the basements to be flooded.

Wooden Fan Casings

Germany has very little naturally occurring iron ore. She has always depended on imports to cover her needs. The situation was worse during both wars, since the Allied blockades deprived Germany of most of her imports. Supplies from Russia dried up when war broke out between the two countries in June 1941. The only major suppliers left were neutral Sweden and occupied Norway. Iron, being the most important raw material for most machinery, weaponry included, was scarce and thus rationed throughout the war in Germany, as were all other types of metals. Wherever possible, other materials or methods were to be used. Any individual, company or organization wanting to purchase iron to manufacture items needed special permits to do so. The Auschwitz Camp was not exempted from that (see the metal allocation listings in Illustrations 42a and 45), and neither were the camp’s suppliers, the furnace manufacturer Topf included.

For instance, a seven-page file memo of Feb. 15, 1943 lists the efforts of the Auschwitz Construction Office to obtain metal allocations. The metal quantities were allocated quarterly, and were passed on to the contractors. For the first quarter of 1943, Auschwitz requested 200 metric tons of steel, but only 150 tons were allocated.\footnote{Russian War Archives, 502-1-319, pp. 53-54.}

Due to constant shortages in iron allocations, Topf repeatedly failed to deliver ordered items in a timely fashion, thus delaying the completion of various construction projects, including the Auschwitz crematoria. For instance, the ventilation system for Crematorium II was to be shipped around the turn of the year of 1942/43. But things didn’t run smoothly. In a telegram of Feb. 10, 1943, the head of the Auschwitz Construction Office complained to the Topf Company that their...
January shipment of the ventilation system for Crematorium II had been incomplete, and that, in a second shipment of items sent on Feb. 6, a blower with motor for Morgue #1 and a motor for Morgue #2 were still missing (see page 360). Topf replied a day later by telegram that it had shipped the blower for Morgue #1 already on Nov. 8, 1942, while the one for Morgue #2, made of a wooden casing, had been shipped on Jan. 25, although without the motor, because they themselves were still waiting for it to be delivered by their supplier (see pages 361, 374).

A Topf memo of Feb. 17, 1943 (see Illustration 46) states that the missing blower and motor concerned the “air-intake blower,” i.e. the blower feeding fresh air into Morgue #1. An Auschwitz file memo dated March 25, 1943 states that the wooden casing of Morgue #1’s extraction fan will be replaced with a wrought-iron one. A letter by the Auschwitz Construction Office to Topf dated March 29, 1943, confirms that the wooden casings of the extractor fans of both morgues will be replaced with wrought-iron ones. Hence, both air-extraction blowers initially had wooden casings, but were eventually replaced.

In his 1993 book, Pressac claims that the use of a wooden casing proves that some aggressive gas was used in Morgue #1 which would corrode iron. According to him, HCN is such a corrosive gas (pages 70f.). This is nonsense on several accounts.

1. First of all, hydrogen cyanide is not an aggressive gas. It turns into a very weak acid only when dissolved in water, and even then it is less corrosive than carbon dioxide (by a factor of 870), which is never considered as corrosive to iron.
2. The reason for the usage of wood for the casings was the scarcity of iron, not any chemical considerations.
3. All components of the professionally designed standardized “standard fumigation gas chambers” by the Degesch company – 19 of which were initially planned to be installed at the Auschwitz reception building – were made of iron, because the pros knew there is no danger of corrosion.
4. Even the air-extraction fan of Morgue #2 initially had a wooden casing, yet it has never been claimed that this morgue was ever planned to be used for HCN executions.
5. The wooden casings were swiftly replaced with wrought-iron ones.

The Ventilation Systems of Crematoria II & III

While Pressac documents with plenty of material how the ventilation systems were installed and which motors the various fans had (see pages 370-374), this yields

---

138 Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 88.
139 Ibid., BW 30/25, p. 8.
140 Ibid., BW 30/34, p. 53; see Pressac’s remark in this regard on p. 227.
little information regarding the capacities of these systems, and how many air exchanges they could achieve for the rooms they ventilated.

He remedied that situation in his second book, where he documented the capacity of the fans used to ventilate each room (1993, p. 30):

– intake fan no. 450 (mm fan diameter) for Morgue #1, 4,800 m³/h at 40 mm water column;
– extraction fan no. 450 for Morgue #1, as above;
– extraction fan no. 550 for Morgue #2, 10,000 m³/h at 55 mm water column;
– extraction fan no. 550 for furnace room, 10,000 m³/h at 32 mm water column;
– extraction fan no. 375 for autopsy room, 3,000 m³/h at 20 mm water column.

Using each room's volume, Pressac even gives the number of air exchanges per hour:

– \((4,800 \text{ m}^3/\text{h} ÷ 483 \text{ m}^3) = 9.94\) exchanges for Morgue #1;
– \((10,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{h} ÷ 966 \text{ m}^3) = 10.35\) exchanges for Morgue #2;
– \((10,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{h} ÷ 1,031 \text{ m}^3) = 9.70\) exchanges for the furnace room;
– \((3,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{h} ÷ 300 \text{ m}^3) = 10\) exchanges for the autopsy room.

The original plan created for a new crematorium at the Main Camp provided for the following fan motors for each room (see Illustration 56a&b):

– 1 HP for fan no. 375, autopsy room.
– 2 HP for both fans no. 450, Morgue #1
– 3.5 HP for fan no. 550, furnace room
– 5.5 HP for fan no. 550, Morgue #2

The difference in motor power between the furnace room (3.5 HP) and Morgue #2 (5.5 HP), although they both have the same fan with the same capacity, results from the higher friction expected in their respective ducts, indicated by the higher pressure difference of Morgue #2 compared to that of the furnace room (55 mm as against 32 mm water column).

In early 1942, the power of all motors was increased, while the fan types remained the same, meaning that the air friction of the respective air ducts had been underestimated. To maintain the planned capacity, stronger motors had to be provided. When discussing the issue of the wooden fan casing, we already encountered the motors planned for the morgues: two 3.5 HP motors for Morgue #1, and a 7.5 HP motor for Morgue #2. From the Topf blueprint D 59366 of March 10, 1942, we can glean these powers, plus the one for the furnace room (4.5 HP), and the autopsy room (1.5 HP). That upgrade in motor power happened at a time when no criminal redesigning of these buildings is said to have happened yet. This

141 These motor powers are also listed in the final invoices, Russian War Archives, 502-1-327, pp. 25 & 25a for Crematorium II (Feb. 22, 1943); pp. 16 & 16a for Crematorium III (May 27, 1943).
142 A. Schüle, op. cit. (note 104), pp. 438f.
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Illustration 56a: Page one of the Topf invoice no. 171 of February 22, 1943 concerning Crematorium II of Birkenau. The arrow added points to the ventilation system for Morgue #1.
Illustration 56b: Page two of the Topf invoice no. 171. The arrow added points to the ventilations system for Morgue #2.
is supported by the fact that all rooms obtained stronger engines, not just the one room where we would expect an upgrade to handle toxic gases: Morgue #1.

Interestingly, when looking at the planned fan capacities, Morgue #1 had a slightly smaller capacity than Morgue #2 (the undressing room) and the autopsy room, even though it is safe to assume that the planning engineers were aiming at installing roughly the same capacities for the entire building. That didn’t change when the motor power upgrades were made.

In his 1993 book, Pressac commits a blunder by calculating a presumed new capacity of the fans by dividing the old capacity by the old motor’s power and multiplying it by the new motor’s power, then rounding the result generously (pages 74 and 118). This is arrant nonsense. These motors had a higher power, but they did not spin faster, and the fans they drove were still the same as before. These stronger motors simply could maintain the same rpms even at higher loads. But since the fans were not changed, their nominal capacity did not change either.143

The ventilation capacities themselves indicate what these rooms were meant to be. According to Heepke’s book on the design of crematoria, morgues should be equipped with a ventilation capacity of at least 5 air exchanges per hour and should reach 10 air exchanges in cases of intensive use,144 which certainly was what the Auschwitz crematoria were facing. Expert literature on fumigation chambers, on the other hand, recommended 72 air exchanges per hour.145 “Responsibly” planned homicidal gas chambers would have had a ventilation capacity at least close to that of professional fumigation chambers.

No upgrade to the ventilation system of Morgue #1 happened in late 1942 or early 1943, when this room is said to have been assigned its new role of chemical mass slaughter. Hence, there is not only no criminal trace here, but quite to the contrary.

When addressing the “blue-wall phenomenon,” I mentioned that Pressac’s claim of brief ventilation times for the hypothesized mass gassings is flawed. This statement is not only based on the fact that the blowers installed were designed for morgues, but also on a number of issues overlooked or ignored by Pressac:146

1. Any ventilation could have been successful only after Zyklon B had released its fumes almost completely, which would have taken an hour and more.
2. Even for an empty room, a complete air exchange does not equate the complete replacement of “old” air by fresh air. If old and fresh air mix thoroughly, only some 63% of old air gets removed with every air exchange.
3. A thousand or more corpses lying on the floor would have created many air

144 W. Heepke, op. cit. (note 130), p. 104.
145 G. Peters, E. Wüstinger, op. cit. (note 20); F. Puntigam et al., op. cit. (note 22), p. 50.
146 For a more-detailed discussion of the issues involved, see G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 8), pp. 275-282.
pockets where almost no air exchange would have occurred, delaying a successful ventilation for hours.

4. The air exhaust openings near the floor would have been partially blocked by dead inmates, reducing the system’s performance.

5. The air intake and exhaust openings on the same wall were only some 2 m apart from another, while the opposite wall was 7 m away. Hence, the system tended to produce an air “short circuit,” where fresh air blown in gets sucked out right where it entered, rather then mixing with the room’s air.

For these reasons, successfully ventilating Morgue #1 would have taken hours.

The Freight Elevators of Crematoria II & III

An issue overlooked but clearly enlightening concerns the freight elevator used in Crematorium II. It is a classic example for a piece of evidence that blows all “criminal trace” out of the water at a single blast. Instead of summarizing the issue, I will use the text which Italian scholar Carlo Mattogno has compiled in this regard, slightly streamlined by me.\(^\text{147}\) It may be a little long, but it's worthwhile reading, also because it clarifies what it means to put documents into their context.

Before turning to Mattogno’s text, however, a few introductory words are due. The logistics of any major operation need to be well planned to make things run smoothly. If plans are made to mass murder people in a conveyor-belt fashion, having a conveyor-belt-like setup is very helpful. In our case, having a path of low resistance from the place of murder – the gas chamber – to the place of incineration – the cremation furnaces – would be good thinking. However, separating the two places by putting them on two different levels of the building, and then connecting these levels with merely a small freight elevator is the dumbest thing an engineer could ever come up with. Yet that was exactly the layout of Crematoria II & III. Let us therefore have a closer look into this marvel of German engineering as reported by Mattogno: the freight elevator of Crematorium II.

According to the initial plans, Crematoria II and III were to be equipped with freight elevators described as follows in the order given to Topf on February 28, 1943, by the Auschwitz Construction Office:\(^\text{148}\)

\[2\text{ compl. electrical elevator machines incl. electric motors for three-phase 220/380 V, 7.5 HP each, special design, with overload protectors, limit switches, braking devices, platforms 2.10×1.35×1.80 m with safety device, otherwise as per above mentioned cost estimate at 9,371 RM [Reichsmark] each} = 18,742 \text{ RM.}
\]

\[1\text{ patented Demag electric lift for 750 kg capacity, single cable, to be raised to 1500 kg capacity by addition of second cable, at 968 RM. This Demag electric lift must}
\]

\(^{147}\) C. Mattogno, The Real Case…, op. cit. (note 41), pp. 49-54.

\(^{148}\) Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 69.
be supplied at once, as it will have to be used pending the arrival of the elevators mentioned in item 1.”

Delivery for the first position was to be about seven months. Pressac shows drawing 5037 which was attached to the cost estimate by the Gustav Linse elevator company of Erfurt written on Jan. 25, 1943. This freight elevator was installed only in Crematorium III, between May 17 and June 6, 1943, by the Topf engineer Heinrich Messing (see the present book, page 371). In Crematorium II, a very crude makeshift elevator was installed which was ordered from the camp’s metalworking shop on Feb. 15, 1943. The order reads as follows:


As can be seen from a Polish photograph of 1945 presented by Pressac, this elevator was very primitive (Photo 20, p. 488). It had to be repaired right away by Messing on April 12, 1943, who needed 11 hours for the job, but it still worked poorly. On July 23, 1943, Topf wrote a letter to the Auschwitz Construction Office stating (see Illustration 57):

“In the recent telephone conversation with your site superintendent, Sturmbannführer Bischoff, the latter stated that the elevator in Crematorium II, as well, has been giving rise to permanent problems. We have, however, not built this elevator; rather, it was assembled and installed by your own people. We are, therefore, at a loss to see how you can make us responsible for a device not built by us.”

Nonetheless, this poorly functioning elevator stayed in place until the end. The order for the two definitive freight elevators underwent a number of changes. On May 25, 1943, Topf thanked the Auschwitz Construction Office for having checked, approved and sent on to Berlin for payment four invoices. One of these was for the “Demag-Elektrozug,” another was “Crematorium II/III. Order no. 43/145/3. [for] 2 electrical elevators. RM 9,391.”

A Topf listing, dated July 2, 1943, referring to the above order, shows a first partial payment of 9,371 RM, half the total amount (18,742 RM), but a handwritten entry by Jährling states that this installment had only amounted to 1,876.43 RM. However, the freight elevators had not yet been supplied, and even ran the risk of never being actually delivered. On August 4, 1943, more than five months after the

150 Höss Trial, Vol. 11, pp. 82f.
151 Russian War Archives, 502-1-306, p. 93a; see the present book, p. 370.
152 Russian War Archives, 502-1-313, p. 29.
153 Ibid., 502-1-327, p. 83.
154 Ibid., 502-1-327, p. 74.

Von der Firma Kübler, Myskowski, hatten wir vor kurzem den Auftrag zur Herstellung der Schornsteinzeichnung und statischen Berechnung gegen Entgelt erhalten. Diesen Auftrag haben wir mit eigenem Gute, um auch Ihnen zu helfen, erledigt.

Schon jetzt möchten wir hierbei erklären, dass wir für die Ausführung des Schornsteinfutters keine Haftung übernehmen, da wir nicht in der Lage sind, die Arbeiten zu überwachen, und auf die Arbeit selbst keinen Einfluss haben.

In Ihrem Schreiben teilen Sie uns weiterhin mit, dass im Rahmen unserer Garantie die sehr schädlichen Heizkanäle auszuBessern sind.


Da das Krematorium seit 6 Wochen außer Betrieb ist, können wir uns nicht erklären, wer den angeblichen Ersatz der Kanäle hergestellt hat. Aufgrund Ihrer Nachricht haben wir unserem Herrn Polier Bölck hierfür Nachlieferung gegeben, der sich an Ort und Stelle überzeugen soll.


Bei dieser Gelegenheit bitten wir Sie nochmals, den schon wiederholt angemahnten Betrag in Höhe von RM 32 732.-- baldigst anzuweisen, desgleichen auch die noch ausstehenden Bauscheine.

Von uns fordern Sie für Ihre Aufträge schmalste Erledigung, auf der anderen Seite lassen Sie uns über Gerüchte, in der Hoffnung, dass unsere Schreiben Ihnen gönigend Auskunft über den Schadensfall gegeben hat, zeichen wir

Heil Hitler!

Anlage: 1 Durchschlag dieses Schreibens

Illustration 57: Topf letter addressing various complaints made by the Auschwitz Construction Office about malfunctioning or damaged equipment of Crematorium II, including its makeshift elevator made by the camp’s employees.
order for these devices, Topf informed the Construction Office that the manufac-
turing permit for them had not yet been granted:155

“We have learned today from our supplier that the Plenipotentiary for machine
construction has not yet granted the construction permit. The application has been
forwarded to the Reich minister for armaments and munitions [Albert Speer]
requesting his decision.”

Topf added that the plenipotentiary for machine construction had voted against
the construction of the devices, and Topf therefore asked the Auschwitz Construc-
tion Office to get in touch with the Berlin authorities in order to have the request
granted, speaking of serious consequences otherwise:

“For your information, please note that our supplier has already assembled the
better part of the elevators. There is the danger, however, that the order has to be
stopped immediately if the Reich minister for armaments and munitions does not
give his approval.”

This incident is in stark disagreement with the thesis that the Birkenau crematoria
were the instruments for the implementation of Himmler’s extermination order:
in such a case, any opposition on the part of the plenipotentiary for machine con-
struction obviously would have been considered sabotage.

155 Auschwitz Museum Archives, BW 30/34, p. 19.
On September 9, 1943, the Auschwitz Construction Office sent to SS Hauptsturmführer Prinzl of Office C V of SS-WVHA a copy of the Topf letter of August 4, with the request to get in touch with the Reich minister for armaments and munitions in order “to obtain [the approval for] the realization of the elevators urgently required.” On May 12, 1944, the Auschwitz Construction Office sent Topf an “urgent telegram” regarding the elevators for Crematoria II & III stating (see Illustration 58):

“installation of the 2 elevators cannot be done now. Installation will be done later, together with installation of air-extraction equipment in 4 and 5.”

We can only speculate about the reason, but it may have to do with the fact that at that time the camp authorities were feverishly preparing to admit more than 400,000 Hungarian Jews to the camp, which must have resulted in an extreme shortage of available manpower.

If, however, the crematoria were meant to become the epicenter of the activities surrounding the deportation of the Hungarian Jews – meaning their gassing and cremation – the camp authorities would have expedited the installation of these devices!

It is not clear whether the two elevators were ever installed at all.

Therefore, the claimed extermination of some 500,000 people in Crematorium II would have been implemented using this primitive and poorly functioning device. As its capacity was 300 kg, or an average of five bodies of 60 kg each, the elevator would have had to do a total of 200,000 runs, 100,000 up and 100,000 down!

If we assume an average duration of five minutes for one complete operation (loading, upward journey, unloading, downward journey), then the transportation of 2,000 bodies from the basement to the furnace hall would have taken \((2,000 \div 5) \times 5 = 2,000\) minutes, or some 33 hours. Such an average duration, which corresponds to one minute for the transit time up and down and four minutes for the loading and unloading of the bodies (hence an average of 24 seconds for loading and another 24 seconds for unloading one corpse), is definitely too short for two reasons:

1. The elevator worked poorly, therefore one has to allow for lost time due to breakdowns, blockages, and delays.
2. According to Pressac’s favorite witness Henry Tauber, in Crematorium II (and III) four detainees were assigned to the elevator, two for loading, and two for unloading, working in 12-hour shifts. Even if we assume an average time of only five minutes per load, hence 12 loads per hour, by mid-shift (after 6 hours),

---

156 Ibid., p. 78.
157 Russian War Archives, 502-1-313, p. 10.
these detainees would have handled a total load of \((6\ \text{hrs} \times 12\ \text{loads/hr} \times 300\ \text{kg/load} =)\ 21,600\ \text{kg}\). The increasing exhaustion would have steadily reduced their working speed.

It is thus clear that the average time for one load was higher, which makes the alleged transport of 500,000 corpses even more grotesque. As the maximum number of days during which Crematorium II was operational was 433,\(^{159}\) the elevator would have had to perform \((500,000\ \text{corpses} \div 5\ \text{corpses/load} \div 433\ \text{days} =)\ 231\ \text{trips per operating day, each of which would have required on average (1,440\ \text{min/day} \div 231\ \text{loads/day} =)\ a\ little\ over\ six\ minutes\ (one\ minute\ for\ each\ round\ trip\ and\ 30\ seconds\ each\ for\ loading\ and\ unloading\ each\ corpse),\ without\ interruption\ for\ 433\ days, 24\ hours\ a\ day – a\ truly\ absurd\ idea!}

In conclusion, the freight elevator is in perfect agreement with the actual number of cremations, something like 20,000 for Crematorium II, but is absolutely out of proportion when it comes to the gigantic figures of a mass extermination claimed by the orthodoxy.

Incineration with Simultaneous Special Treatment

Pressac missed one “criminal trace” which was added to the list of orthodox absurdities by the already-mentioned Robert van Pelt.\(^{160}\) The document that triggered van Pelt's frenzy is a file memo of January 29, 1943 by an employee of the Auschwitz Construction Office on the “Power supply and installation at the Concentration Camp and PoW Camp” (see Illustration 59). It translates as follows:\(^{161}\)

“AEG [electric supply company] informs us that, following their request for iron and metal allocations which were submitted in part already in November 1942, no valid ration coupons for iron and metal have been issued yet. Therefore, this company has been unable so far to work on the ordered parts of the facility. A great risk exists that the delivery will be delayed considerably due to further delays in the allocation.

For this reason, it is also not possible to complete the installation and electricity supply of Crematorium II in the PoW Camp [Birkenau] by January 31, 1943. By using materials in stock meant for other construction projects, it is only possible to complete the crematorium to such a degree that it will be operational on February 15, 1943 at the earliest. This putting into operation can extend only to a limited use of the available machines (whereby an incineration with simultaneous special treatment becomes possible), because the main electricity supply to the cremato-

\(^{159}\) See C. Mattogno, The Real Case…, op. cit. (note 41), pp. 290-297.


\(^{161}\) Russian War Archives, 502-1-26, p. 196.
Illustration 59: The available machines enable “incineration with simultaneous special treatment.”
Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers. Introduction

...rium is too weak for its power consumption. The iron and metal coupons required for this overhead-line material have not yet been issued either.

For the reason just mentioned, an electricity supply to Crematorium III is currently not possible at all.”

The term “special treatment” used in this letter triggers the usual hyperventilation among orthodox scholars, all the more so since it is used in connection with cremations. They claim that this term was a euphemism for mass murder, here mass gassings in the claimed gas chamber. But since the operation of Crematorium II was limited to the available machines, and even then only to a limited degree due to the limited amperage available, the first question to ask is: which machines were available at the time when this file memo was written?

As we have seen earlier when discussing the wooden fan casings, the ventilation system for the two morgues could not be installed, because their fans and/or motors were still missing on February 17, as results from a file memo of the Topf Company written on that day. In fact, on January 29, not a single piece of the crematoria’s ventilation system had been delivered.162 Hence, this ventilation system was not part of the “available machines.” On Jan. 29, only the forced-draft units had been installed, as results from the worksheet of Topf’s fitter in charge of that work.163 In other words: the claimed homicidal gas chamber of Morgue #1 wouldn’t have been operational for quite some time.

The available documentation allows us to trace with great accuracy when the ventilation systems for these morgues were installed. On page 370 of the present book, Pressac lists in detail all the entries of the time sheets left behind by Topf’s fitter Heinrich Messing, who installed the crematoria’s various forced-draft, furnace-blower and ventilation systems. From it we learn that he finished working on the ventilation system of Morgue #1 during the week of March 8th to 14th, while the system for Morgue #2 was finished the following week.

Since on January 29, 1943, Morgue #1 could not be used for much of anything due to the missing ventilation system – and most certainly not for mass gassings – “special treatment” – which was possible, albeit to a limited degree, already on January 29 – could not possibly mean gassings. But what else could it mean?

As established throughout this introduction, the crematoria of Auschwitz had the exclusive function of improving the camp’s hygienic conditions by incinerating the victims of various “natural” causes of death, foremost infectious diseases. They were part of the huge “special program” to improve the camp’s hygienic conditions.


163 Ibid., BW 30/31, pp. 31-36; see here on page 370.
A cremation furnace operating at sub-optimum conditions due to insufficient machinery or electricity cannot reliably reduce a body to ashes, hence cannot reliably serve its role within this hygienic “special program” of “special treatment”. The thousands of typhus victims which by late January 1943 were piling up at Auschwitz needed to be cremated to such a degree that they would not pose any threat to human health anymore. Burying uncremated or only partially cremated remains was no option, because the high groundwater level meant that any toxic substances forming during the decomposition of corpses (ptomaines) could get into the drinking water, which would trigger yet another health disaster for the Auschwitz camp system as well as for the entire Auschwitz region, who all drew their drinking water from local wells.

In spite of the reduced electricity supply and the limited machinery available, the discussed file memo assured that the cremation possible with the available machines would at once (simultaneously) result in a special treatment of the corpses by definitely reducing them to a state where they will be no threat to human health anymore.

That’s all there is to it.

By the way, the expression used in this file memo – incineration with simultaneous special treatment – doesn’t even make sense for homicidal gassings, because that kind of claimed special treatment would not have been done simultaneously with cremations. The gassings are said to have happened first, requiring no electricity except for some lamps, then the gas chambers would have had to be ventilated successfully, after which the corpses would have been dragged out of them in order to be cremated. There simply is no simultaneity involved in that claimed scenario.

Material for the Resettlement of the Jews

During the typhus epidemic that got out of control at Auschwitz in summer 1942, the camp authorities not only had to battle lice, but also the bureaucratic nonsense coming from some pencil pushers in Berlin, who issued multiple, mutually contradicting decrees on how disinfection was supposed to be done. For instance, on June 5, 1940, the SS headquarters in Berlin decreed on the subject of “delousing facility” that “following maximum savings in steel, sealants, specialized workers etc., in the future no hydrogen-cyanide[-based], but exclusively heated-air delousing facilities are to be built” (see Illustration 60).\(^\text{164}\)

The second, contradicting decision, issued on March 11, 1942, demanded the exact opposite by calling for the “[...] conversion of all delousing facilities to operate with HCN,” in which regard it was noted.\(^\text{165}\)

\(^{164}\) Russian War Archives, 502-1-333, p. 145.

\(^{165}\) Ibid., p. 94.
Illustration 60: In June 1940, Berlin ordered the construction of hot-air disinfestation devices rather than Zyklon-B devices.
“Deviations therefrom – delousing by means of hot air or hot steam – are only permissible insofar as they involve temporary installations, in which the necessary safety for the handling of HCN is not ensured.”

It was based on experiences showing that hot-air and steam disinfection tended to be less effective, frequently due to insufficient temperatures used.

A further letter from Berlin of February 11, 1943, however, reminded the Auschwitz camp authorities of “[…] the prohibition against the use of HCN for disinfection […],” and from a letter of the Auschwitz camp authorities of June 8, 1944 we can glean that Berlin had ordered that all “Zyklon B gassing chambers are to be converted to ‘Ariginal gassing’.”

It goes without saying that it was impossible to constantly redesign and re-rig the various disinfection facilities that were being planned or already existed at Auschwitz. Hence, the camp authorities made the best of it. As Pressac shows in his chapter on the various disinfection facilities used, some operated with HCN, some with hot air. The Zyklon-B fumigation wing of Building 5a was in fact modified in 1943 to use hot-air instead, and plans for the Zentralsauna were adjusted early on to use hot-air disinfections instead of Zyklon B.

However, as Pressac shows, several other Zyklon-B fumigation facilities at Auschwitz were never changed. In addition, the only way of ridding the inmates’ living quarters and all other buildings at Auschwitz of lice and other pests was by fumigating them with Zyklon B. It is therefore not surprising that Zyklon-B orders skyrocketed in the summer of 1942, when the camp faced a catastrophic typhus epidemic. There are a number of well-known documents in this connection which are frequently quoted, see in the present book on pages 188 and 556f.

Pressac subdivides those Zyklon-B deliveries into two categories: those which specifically refer to Zyklon B being needed for disinfections, and those referring to “special treatment” or “resettlement of the Jews” (page 188). Pressac claims in accordance with the orthodoxy that the latter was a euphemism for mass murder. As we have seen before, “special treatment” had two meanings: first, measures to improve the camp’s hygienic condition, and second, the entire operation of deporting Jews in order either to use them as slave laborers, or to deport them further east.

The entire program of “resettlement of the Jews” is in itself declared by the orthodoxy to be a euphemism for a program of mass murder. We will not review here the plethora of documents dealing with this issue, as it is beyond the scope of this introduction. Those interested in reading more about it can consult the relevant literature.

---

166 Ibid., p. 35; the chemical’s proper name was Areginal, a disinfection agent based on ethyl formiate.
The “Franke-Gricksch Report”

On pages 236-238 of the present book, Pressac introduces the so-called “Franke-Gricksch Report” in order to support the orthodox thesis that Auschwitz served as an extermination center for Jews, and that the “resettlement Operation of the Jews” is a mere euphemism for their mass murder.

As can be seen from the document’s reproduction on page 238, this is not a report written by the German official Alfred Franke-Gricksch, but a text typed up by a certain Eric Lipmann. No original has ever been produced. The document and its history is so full of absurdities that the only conclusion can be that Lipmann made the whole thing up.168

The English translation of yet another report allegedly also written by Alfred Franke-Gricksch was found in the British National Archives in the early 2000s and posted online by a mainstream website in 2005.169 The German original seems to have been lost. This report, however, does not speak of any extermination of the Jews, but merely of them being deported and their property being confiscated and repurposed – that is to say: looted by the German authorities. This document is in perfect agreement with all the other documents speaking of the “Resettlement Operation of the Jews” as a real and actual program, and of “Aktion Reinhardt” as being the plundering operation implemented parallel to this continent-wide program of ethnic cleansing by forced relocation.

Mainstream scholars insist that both documents are genuine translations of authentic originals, the first one here discussed being a “secret” addendum made to be seen only by selected readers. The document’s absurdities, however, clearly speak a different language.

Criminal Traces?

So, after all is said and done, what is left of Pressac’s “criminal traces”? It is true that the German authorities at times used euphemisms to circumscribe what they were talking about. Some of it is ambiguous and open to interpretation, although the entire historical and documentary context leaves little room for wild conjectures. With regard to Auschwitz, these euphemisms concerned, to a large

---


169 www.deathcamps.org/reinhard/frankegricksch.html.
degree, the savage epidemic decimating the camp population. And what about the rest?

There is a set of documents which we can trust to tell the unembellished truth. Between the Auschwitz camp authorities and the Berlin headquarters of the SS, secret encoded radio messages were exchanged on a regular basis. The Germans did not know, however, that the British had cracked the code in early 1942 and managed to listen to these secret messages for over a year. They intercepted these and many other radio messages, recorded them, translated them and stored them in their archives, where eventually they were made publicly accessible.

We did receive an appetizer of what is in these radio messages already in 1981 when the British government published a brief summary of them in a book on the British Secret Services during World War II. It says there succinctly:170

“The messages from Auschwitz, the largest camp, with 20,000 inmates, mention disease as the chief cause of death, but also include references to executions by hanging and shooting. The decoded messages contain no references to gassings.”

These radio messages were systematically analyzed only a few years ago. According to this, these documents reveal not a mass-murder program or a racist genocide. Quite to the contrary, they show that the German authorities were desperate and determined to reduce the death rates in their labor camps caused by raging typhus epidemics.171

Suggested Readings

If you are interested in a truly scientific and technical approach to the crematoria and the claimed homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz, there are two comprehensive works meeting these requirements:

– Carlo Mattogno, Franco Deana, The Cremation Furnaces of Auschwitz: A Technical and Historical Study. An exhaustive study of the history and technology of cremation in general and of the cremation furnaces of Auschwitz in particular. On a vast base of technical literature, extant wartime documents and material traces, the authors can establish the true nature and capacity of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces. They show that these devices were inferior make-shift versions of what was usually produced, and that their capacity to cremate corpses was lower than normal, too. 3 vols., 1198 pages, b&w and


Germar Rudolf, *The Chemistry of Auschwitz. The Technology and Toxicology of Zyklon B and the Gas Chambers – A Crime Scene Investigation*. This study tries to conduct Auschwitz research on the basis of the forensic sciences, hence the search for material traces of the crime. Most of the claimed crime scenes – the chemical slaughterhouses aka gas chambers – are still accessible to forensic investigations. The infamous Zyklon B can also be analyzed as to who this poisonous substance acted, how poisonous it really is and whether it left any trace where it was used, and if so, then what kind. 442 pages, more than 120 color and almost 100 b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017) [PDF file free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com]

For a more thorough critique of Pressac’s writings and those of Dutch cultural historian Dr. Robert van Pelt, who essentially plagiarized Pressac’s texts, I recommend the two following books:

Germar Rudolf (Hg.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts. A Response to Jean-Claude Pressac*. The only scholar dared to confront the revisionists in the 1980s and 1990s was the French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac. The mainstream in Europe played him up as the ultimate “refutor of the revisionists,” and that is still the case to this day. Pressac’s main works are subjected to a detailed critique in this study. It demonstrates that Pressac’s interpretation of the sources is neither formally nor factually up to par with scholarly standards: He clams things which he doesn’t prove or which even contradicts the evidence; he insinuates that documents have a certain content which the don’t; he reveals blatant technical incompetence, and he ignores important arguments known to him. 226 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016) [PDF file free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com]

Carlo Mattogno, *The Real Case for Auschwitz: Robert van Pelt’s Evidence from the Irving Trial Critically Reviewed*. Robert van Pelt is considered one of the best mainstream experts on Auschwitz. He became famous when appearing as an expert during the London libel trial of David Irving against Deborah Lipstadt. From it resulted a book titled *The Case for Auschwitz*, in which van Pelt laid out his case for the existence of homicidal gas chambers at that camp. This book is a scholarly response to Prof. van Pelt—and Jean-Claude Pressac, upon whose books van Pelt’s study is largely based.
Mattogno lists all the evidence van Pelt adduces, and shows one by one that van Pelt misrepresented and misinterpreted each single one of them. This is a book of prime political and scholarly importance to those looking for the truth about Auschwitz. 2nd ed., 758 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015) PDF file free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

If you are interested in a more general, yet still scientific approach to the Holocaust topic, I recommend the following three books:

– **Thomas Dalton, The Holocaust: An Introduction.** The Holocaust was perhaps the greatest crime of the 20th century. Six million Jews, we are told, died by gassing, shooting, and deprivation. Much has been written about this crime. And yet much remains a mystery. Even some basic questions have no clear answers. For example, we would like to know: Where did the six million figure come from? How, exactly, did the gas chambers work? Why do we have so little physical evidence from major death camps? Why haven't we found even a fraction of the six million bodies, or their ashes? Why has there been so much media suppression and governmental censorship on this topic? In a sense, the Holocaust is the greatest murder mystery in history. Not only is it a fascinating story in its own right, but it can point us to deeper truths about our contemporary society. It is a topic of greatest importance for the present day. Let's explore the evidence, and see where it leads. 128 pages, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017)

– **Nicholas Kollerstrom, Breaking the Spell: The Holocaust, Myth & Reality.** In 1941, British Intelligence analysts cracked the German “Enigma” code. Hence, in 1942 and 1943, encrypted radio communications between German concentration camps and the Berlin headquarters were decrypted. The intercepted data refutes the orthodox “Holocaust” narrative. It reveals that the Germans were desperate to reduce the death rate in their labor camps, which was caused by catastrophic typhus epidemics. Dr. Kollerstrom, a science historian, has taken these intercepts and a wide array of mostly unchallenged corroborating evidence to show that “witness statements” supporting the human gas chamber narrative clearly clash with the available scientific data. Kollerstrom concludes that the history of the Nazi “Holocaust” has been written by the victors with ulterior motives. It is distorted, exaggerated and largely wrong. With a foreword by Prof. Dr. James Fetzer. 4th ed., 261 pages, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017)
- **Thomas Dalton, *Debating the Holocaust: A New Look at Both Sides*. Mainstream historians insist that there cannot be, may not be a debate about the Holocaust. But ignoring it does not make this controversy go away. Traditional scholars admit that there was neither a budget, a plan, nor an order for the Holocaust; that the key camps have all but vanished, and so have any human remains; that material and unequivocal documentary evidence is absent; and that there are serious problems with survivor testimonies. Dalton juxtaposes the traditional Holocaust narrative with revisionist challenges and then analyzes the mainstream’s responses to them. He reveals the weaknesses of both sides, while declaring revisionism the winner of the current state of the debate. 2nd ed., 332 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017)

- **Germar, Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust. Controversial Issues Cross Examined*.** Did you know that the mass media were reporting an impending holocaust of six million Jews since the late eighteen-hundreds? Did you know that the media have repeatedly exposed the stories of Holocaust survivors to be lies? Did you know that many mainstream scholars have expressed doubts about the accuracy of Holocaust history books? Did you know that Holocaust dissidents are thrown into jail in many countries with no defense allowed? This book addresses these and many other issues. In the first section, it starts by defining “the Holocaust” and giving examples demonstrating that it is well to keep an open mind. The second section tells of mainstream scholars expressing doubts and subsequently falling from grace due to this “heresy.” The third section discusses the physical traces and documents about the various claimed crime scenes, such as the camps at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor. It investigates the claimed murder weapons: gas chambers, gas vans, crematoria and cremation pits. The fourth section examines to what degree we can rely on witness testimony, and it analyzes the pertinent aspects of the most prominent among them. In the last section, the author lobbies for free inquiry and a free exchange of ideas about this topic, exactly because the powers that be can't face critical questions. This book gives the most-comprehensive and up-to-date overview of the critical research into the Holocaust. With its dialog style, it is pleasant to read, and with its logical organization and index, it can even be used as an encyclopedic compendium. 3rd ed., 596 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017) [PDF file free of charge at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com](http://www.HolocaustHandbooks.com)
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Illustration 61: In the spring of 1944, the German authorities decided to deport more than 400,000 Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz in order to deploy them as slave laborers in a desperate last-ditch attempt to increase armaments production. Orthodox historians claim that most of them were killed on arrival at Auschwitz in the claimed homicidal gas chambers. For that purpose, the maximum possible extermination capacity is said to have been reactivated. However, no trace of it can be found in the archives. What can be found, though, is the camp’s attempt to maximize its disinestation capacity. The old project of installing Degesch circulation fumigation chambers in the reception building of the Auschwitz Main Camp was dusted off. On March 7, 1944, The Auschwitz Construction Office sent a telegram to the Boos Company, informing them that in the “reception building 11 instead of 19 delousing chambers must be erected a.s.a.p.” (Russian War Archives, 502-1-333, p. 59). On May 3 and 4, with the Jewish mass deportations pending, Boos was asked by both telegram and letter to submit a cost estimate for that project (ibid., 502-1-347, p. 31; 502-1-333, p. 51). This led to some back and forth, also involving the Testa and Degesch companies, discussing how exactly this is to be done (ibid., 502-1-333, pp. 35, 30, 30a).

The above blueprint for that project, drawn probably sometime during March or April 1944, is the result of this (Russian War Archives, 502-2-149, p. 3). The eight empty cells on the left-hand side of this blueprint were at that time occupied by the microwave disinestation facility, which became operational six days later (see Illustration 4). The fact that the gas-tight steel doors for this project were never delivered (ibid., 502-1-333, p. 2; letter by the Berninghaus Company of November 22, 1944) indicates, however, that the project never went beyond the planning stage, probably because the tremendously efficient and effective microwave delousing device made it obsolete.
Anordnung der 11 Zellen für die Blausäure
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Illustration 61
Illustration 61, continued
Illustrations 62ae–b: Although the extant Auschwitz Death Books have more than 69,000 entries of deceased Auschwitz inmates, for relatively few of them, the cause of death listed is “typhus.” After all, typhus as such is not necessarily lethal. As a matter of fact, and as has to be expected, Auschwitz survivor anecdotes about contracting typhus, yet ultimately surviving the disease due to the care they received from both SS and inmate physicians and nurses, are quite common.

There is no doubt, however, that the health complications typhus can cause can be deadly, and these complications are rather diverse. Hence, the Auschwitz physicians usually listed the complication that ultimately killed the patient, not the underlying infection with a certain strain of bacterium that had caused it. During the peak of the typhus epidemic, it may even have happened that the physicians made educated guesses as to the ultimate direct cause of death, since it would have been physically impossible to conduct a thorough investigation of hundreds of victims every day.

A more reliable way of finding out what was going on at Auschwitz than to look at the causes of death listed in the Auschwitz Death Books is a look into the documentation left behind by the Hygiene Institute of the Waffen SS at Auschwitz-Rajsko. They conducted large-scale screenings of inmates for typhus, using the so-called Gruber-Widal and Weil-Felix Tests. This activity created huge volumes of documents attesting to the frightening presence of typhus at Auschwitz, but also demonstrating the unflagging efforts of the SS to bring this epidemic under control and to save the lives of as many inmates as possible under the prevailing, often dismal circumstances.

That the typhus epidemic wasn’t just another evil conspiracy by the SS to kill as many inmates as possible can also be gleaned from the fact that many members of the camp’s SS staff succumbed to the disease as well. They were not treated at Auschwitz, however, but were sent to the nearby reserve military hospital at Kattowitz for treatment. Some of the documents from that hospital ended up in the Russian Federal Archives, from which the one reproduced here has been taken (7021-108-54, pp. 192-192a). On the first page of this “sick sheet,” it shows the reason for the patient’s admission – here “Fleckfieber” (typhus) as well as some basic personal data. The second page (the sheet’s reverse side) briefly lists under A. the patient’s health history, under B. the patient’s health findings, and under C. the progression of the disease and the treatments he received at the hospital. I translate here sections A. through C.:
“A. Prehistory
Acc. to service book inoculated against smallpox and typhus.
Family history: negative
Diseases prior to service: measles and flu as a child.
Diseases during service: January 1942 14 days sickbay treatment for flu.
Progression of current disease: Became sick on Nov. 10, 1942 with high fever and headache. S. reported in sick and was immediately admitted to the sickbay. On Nov. 13, 1942 admission to the department for internal medicine at the reserve hospital Kattowitz due to suspected typhus.

B. Findings
Weight: 58.5 kg [129 lbs] Height: 164 cm [5 ft 4.5 in]
Head and eyes: Negative.
Ears: Negative.
Oral cavity: Except for one molar, all teeth complete and repaired. Throat negative.
Neck: No swollen glands. No extended thyroid.
Chest: Symmetrical.
Lungs: Bronchitis noises from both lobes.
Heart: Limits proper, sound clear, activity regular.
Limbs: Joints freely moveable.
Nervous system: Negative.

C. Progression of Disease
Nov. 13, 42: High temperature, slight stupor. Clear typhus [illegible].
Nov. 15, 42: Still high temperature. Treatment with strophanthtin glucose.
Nov. 19, 42: Still no decreased temperature, pulse somewhat soft. Increased stupor.
Nov. 22, 42: Still no decreased temperature. Eating difficult.
Nov. 26, 42: Lytic temperature decrease, reduced stupor. Weil Felix Reaction for typhus 1:800 +.
Dec. 1, 42: Temperature normal. No stupor anymore. Pulse easy to feel.
Dec. 3, 42: Continued wellbeing.
Dec. 8, 42: X-ray finding: hili compacted, lungs and heart negative.
Dec. 12, 42: S. complains about still getting easily fatigued. Inner organs all negative. Release scheduled.”

This case was “disease number 8.” A “disease number 7,” also a typhus case among Auschwitz SS men, was admitted on July 22, 1942: SS Rottenführer Michael Franzén.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sienschkowski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dienstgrad</td>
<td>1/2-Schütze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truppenteil</td>
<td>9/4-T. Stuba, K.-L. Auschwitz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geboren</th>
<th>Kulischkenen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kreis</td>
<td>Gumbinnen, Ostpr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstzeit</td>
<td>11.11.1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Nr.</td>
<td>Landarbeiter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mütter      | Anna B. Narwakau Kr. Beeklohe/Ostpr. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krankheitsnummern</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zugang am</td>
<td>13.11.1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verlegt am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wohnt?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verlegt am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wohnt?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entlassen am</td>
<td>18.12.1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie?</td>
<td>d. s. + K.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wohnt?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Truppenteil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustration 62a
A. Vorgeschichte:
Geimpft lt. Soldbuch gegen Fiebertyphus.
Familiengeschichte: o.B.
Krankheiten vor Diensteintritt: Als Kind Masern und Grippe.

B. Befund:
Gewicht: 56,5 kg. Größe: 164 cm.
Kopf und Augen: o.B.
Ohren: o.B.
Mundhöhlen: Bis auf einen Backenzahn Gebiß vollständig und sauber. Zunge trocken, braunlich belegt. Rachen o.B.
Hals: Keine Drüenschwellungen. Schilddrüse nicht vergrößert.
Brustkorbe: symmetrisch.
Leib: Leber und Milz nicht vergrößert.
Gliedmaßen: Gelenke frei beweglich.
Nervensystem: o.B.

C. Krankheitsverlauf:
19.11.42 hohe Temperaturabfälle, Puls etwas weich. Die Benommenheit hat zugenommen.
22.11.42 immer noch kein Temperaturabfall. Nahrungsaufnahme erschwert.
26.11.42 Lytischer Temperaturabfall, die Benommenheit hat nachgelassen. Weil-Felix'sche Reaktion auf Fleckfieber 1:800 +.
3.12.42 Weiterhin Wohlbefinden.
8.12.42 Rö.-Befund: Hili verdichtet, Lungen und Herz o.B.
Illustration 63: The Kattowitz hospital is also mentioned in the British radio intercepts. The above example mentions that the SS Schützen (privates) Adam Wituncheck, Ludwig Hansekl and Ferdinand Brauner were admitted to the Kattowitz reserve hospital due to a suspected typhus infection on Jan. 16, 1943 (British National Archives, HW 16-23).

Due to a complete camp lock-down ("Lagersperre") imposed twice in the camp’s history – one on July 23, 1942, the other on February 8, 1943 – the Auschwitz camp authorities managed to contain the epidemic. That camp lock-down meant that no one present inside the camp at that time was allowed to leave the camp – neither SS men nor any civilian workers deployed at the various construction projects.

Yet the mere fact that SS men living outside the camp’s fences were being admitted to hospitals in the wider region clearly shows that there was always a risk of the epidemic spreading into the local or even regional population. Fortunately that never happened.

For the very reason that such pathogens affect everyone indiscriminately – friend and foe – it is a very bad idea to use them as biological “weapons.”

174 Auschwitz Museum Archives, Standort-Befehl, D-AuI-1, p. 46.
This ambitious, growing series addresses various aspects of the “Holocaust” of the WWII era. Most of them are based on decades of research from archives all over the world. They are heavily referenced. In contrast to most other works on this issue, the tomes of this series approach its topic with profound academic scrutiny and a critical attitude. Any Holocaust researcher ignoring this series will remain oblivious to some of the most important research in the field. These books are designed to both convince the common reader as well as academics. The following books have appeared so far, or are about to be released.

**SECTION ONE: General Overviews of the Holocaust**

**The First Holocaust, The Surprising Origin of the Six-Million Figure.** By Don Heddesheimer. This compact but substantive study documents propaganda spread prior to, during and after the FIRST World War that claimed East European Jewry was on the brink of annihilation. The magic number of suffering and dying Jews was 6 million back then as well. The book details how these Jewish fundraising operations in America raised vast sums in the name of feeding suffering Polish and Russian Jews but actually funneled much of the money to Zionist and Communist groups. 5th ed., 200 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#6)

**Lectures on the Holocaust, Controversial Issues Cross Examined.** By Germar Rudolf. This book first explains why “the Holocaust” is an important topic, and that it is well to keep an open mind about it. It then tells how many mainstream scholars expressed doubts and subsequently fell from grace. Next, the physical traces and documents about the various claimed crime scenes and murder weapons are discussed. After that, the reliability of witness testimony is examined. Finally, the author lobbies for a free exchange of ideas about this topic. This book gives the most-comprehensive and up-to-date overview of the critical research into the Holocaust. With its dialog style, it is pleasant to read, and it can even be used as an encyclopedic compendium. 3rd ed., 596 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#15)

**Breaking the Spell, The Holocaust, Myth & Reality.** By Nicholas Kollerstrom. In 1941, British Intelligence analysts cracked the German “Enigma” code. Hence, in 1942 and 1943, encrypted radio communications between German concentration camps and the Berlin headquarters were decrypted. The intercepted data refutes the orthodox “Holocaust” narrative. It reveals that the Germans were desperate to reduce the death rate in their labor camps, which was caused by catastrophic typhus epidemics. Dr. Kollerstrom, a science historian, has taken these intercepts and a wide array of mostly unchallenged corroborating evidence to show that “witness statements” supporting the human gas chamber narrative clearly clash with the available scientific data. Kollerstrom concludes that the history of the Nazi “Holocaust” has been written by the victors with ulterior motives. It is distorted, exaggerated and largely wrong. With a foreword by Prof. Dr. James Fetzer. 4th ed., 261 pages, b&w ill., bibl., index. (#31)

**Debating the Holocaust, A New Look at Both Sides.** By Thomas Dalton. Mainstream historians insist that there cannot be, may not be a debate about the Holocaust. But ignoring it does not make this controversy go away. Traditional scholars admit that there was neither a budget, a plan, nor an order for the Holocaust; that the key camps have all but vanished, and so have any human remains; that material and unequivocal documentary evidence is absent; and that there are serious problems with survivor testimonies. Dalton juxtaposes the traditional Holocaust narrative with revisionist challenges and then analyzes the mainstream’s responses to them. He reveals the weak-
necesses of both sides, while declaring revisionism the winner of the current state of the debate. 2nd ed., 332 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#32)

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century. The Case against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry. By Arthur R. Butz. The first writer to analyze the entire Holocaust complex in a precise scientific manner. This book exhibits the overwhelming force of arguments accumulated by the mid-1970s. Butz’s two main arguments are: 1. All major entities hostile to Germany must have known what was happening to the Jews under German authority. They acted during the war as if no mass slaughter was occurring. 2. All the evidence adduced to prove any mass slaughter has a dual interpretation, while only the innocuous one can be proven to be correct. This book continues to be a major historiographical reference work, frequently cited by prominent personalities. This edition has numerous supplements with new information gathered over the last 35 years. 4th ed., 524 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#7)

Dissecting the Holocaust. The Growing Critique of ‘Truth’ and ‘Memory.’ Edited by Germar Rudolf. Dissecting the Holocaust applies state-of-the-art scientific technique and classic methods of detection to investigate the alleged murder of millions of Jews by Germans during World War II. In 22 contributions—each of some 30 pages—the 17 authors dissect generally accepted paradigms of the “Holocaust.” It reads as exciting as a crime novel: so many lies, forgeries and deceptions by politicians, historians and scientists are proven. This is the intellectual adventure of the 21st century. Be part of it! 2nd ed. 620 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#1)

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry. By Walter N. Sanning. Six Million Jews died in the Holocaust. Sanning did not take that number at face value, but thoroughly explored European population developments and shifts mainly caused by emigration as well as deportations and evacuations conducted by both Nazis and the Soviets, among other things. The book is based mainly on Jewish, Zionist and mainstream sources. It concludes that a sizeable share of the Jews found missing during local censuses after the Second World War, which were so far counted as “Holocaust victims,” had either emigrated (mainly to Israel or the U.S.) or had been deported by Stalin to Siberian labor camps. 2nd ed., foreword by A.R. Butz, epilogue by Germar Rudolf containing important updates; 224 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography (#29).

Air Photo Evidence: World War Two Photos of Alleged Mass Murder Sites Analyzed. By Germar Rudolf (editor). During World War Two both German and Allied reconnaissance aircraft took countless air photos of places of tactical and strategic interest in Europe. These photos are prime evidence for the investigation of the Holocaust. Air photos of locations like Auschwitz, Majdanek, Treblinka, Babyn Yar, etc. permit an insight into what did or did not happen there. The author has unearthed many pertinent photos and has thoroughly analyzed them. This book is full of air photo reproductions and schematic drawings explaining them. According to the author, these images refute many of the atrocity claims made by witnesses in connection with events in the German sphere of influence. 5th edition; with a contribution by Carlo Mattogno. 168 pages, 8.5”×11”, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index (#27).

The Leuchter Reports: Critical Edition. By Fred Leuchter, Robert Faurisson and Germar Rudolf. Between 1988 and 1991, U.S. expert on execution technologies Fred Leuchter wrote four detailed reports addressing whether the Third Reich operated homicidal gas chambers. The first report on Auschwitz and Majdanek became world famous. Based on chemical analyses and various technical arguments, Leuchter concluded that the locations investigated “could not have then, or now be, utilized or seriously considered to function as execution gas chambers.” The second report deals with gas-chamber claims for the camps Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim, while the third reviews design criteria and operation procedures of execution gas chambers in the U.S. The fourth report reviews Pressac’s 1989 tome Auschwitz. 4th ed., 252 pages, b&w illustrations. (#16)

The Giant with Feet of Clay: Raul Hilberg and His Standard Work on the “Holocaust.” By Jürgen Graf. Raul Hilberg’s major work The Destruction of European Jewry is an orthodox standard work on the Holocaust. But what evidence does Hilberg provide to back his thesis that there was a German plan to exterminate Jews, carried out mainly in gas chambers? Jürgen Graf applies the methods of critical analysis to Hilberg’s evidence and examines the results in light of modern historiography. The results of Graf’s critical
analysis are devastating for Hilberg. 2nd, corrected edition, 139 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#3)

**Jewish Emigration from the Third Reich.** By Ingrid Weckert. Current historical writings about the Third Reich claim state it was difficult for Jews to flee from Nazi persecution. The truth is that Jewish emigration was welcomed by the German authorities. Emigration was not some kind of wild flight, but rather a lawfully determined and regulated matter. Weckert’s booklet elucidates the emigration process in law and policy. She shows that German and Jewish authorities worked closely together. Jews interested in emigrating received detailed advice and offers of help from both sides. 2nd ed., 130 pages, index. (#12)

**Inside the Gas Chambers: The Extermination of Mainstream Holocaust Historiography.** By Carlo Mattogno. Neither increased media propaganda or political pressure nor judicial persecution can stifle revisionism. Hence, in early 2011, the Holocaust Orthodoxy published a 400 pp. book (in German) claiming to refute “revisionist propaganda,” trying again to prove “once and for all” that there were homicidal gas chambers at the camps of Dachau, Natzweiler, Sachsenhausen, Mauthausen, Ravensbrück, Neuengamme, Stutthof… you name them. Mattogno shows with his detailed analysis of this work of propaganda that mainstream Holocaust hagiography is beating around the bush rather than addressing revisionist research results. He exposes their myths, distortions and lies. 2nd ed., 280 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#25)

**SECTION TWO: Specific non-Auschwitz Studies**

**Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?** By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. It is alleged that at Treblinka in East Poland between 700,000 and 3,000,000 persons were murdered in 1942 and 1943. The weapons used were said to have been stationary and/or mobile gas chambers, fast-acting or slow-acting poison gas, unslaked lime, superheated steam, electricity, diesel exhaust fumes etc. Holocaust historians alleged that bodies were piled as high as multi-storied buildings and burned without a trace, using little or no fuel at all. Graf and Mattogno have now analyzed the origins, logic and technical feasibility of the official version of Treblinka. On the basis of numerous documents they reveal Treblinka’s true identity as a mere transit camp. 2nd ed., 372 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#8)

**Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research and History.** By Carlo Mattogno. Witnesses report that between 600,000 and 3 million Jews were murdered in the Belzec camp, located in Poland. Various murder weapons are claimed to have been used: diesel gas; unslaked lime in trains; high voltage; vacuum chambers; etc. The corpses were incinerated on huge pyres without leaving a trace. For those who know the stories about Treblinka this sounds familiar. Thus the author has restricted this study to the aspects which are new compared to Treblinka. In contrast to Treblinka, forensic drillings and excavations were performed at Belzec, the results of which are critically reviewed. 142 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#9)

**Sobibor: Holocaust Propaganda and Reality.** By Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues and Carlo Mattogno. Between 25,000 and 2 million Jews are said to have been killed in gas chambers in the Sobibór camp in Poland. The corpses were allegedly buried in mass graves and later incinerated on pyres. This book investigates these claims and shows that they are based on the selective use of contradictory eyewitness testimony. Archeological surveys of the camp in 2000-2001 are analyzed, with fatal results for the extermination camp hypothesis. The book also documents the general National Socialist policy toward Jews, which never included a genocidal “final solution.” 442 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#19)

**The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt”.** By Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues and Carlo Mattogno. In late 2011, several members of the exterminationist Holocaust Controversies blog posted a study online which claims to refute three of our authors’ monographs on the camps Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka (see previous three entries). This tome is their point-by-point response, which makes “mincemeat” out of the bloggers’ attempt at refutation. Caution: The two volumes of this work are an intellectual overkill for most people. They are recommended only for collectors, connoisseurs and professionals. These two books require familiarity with the above-mentioned books, of which they are a comprehensive update and expansion. 2nd ed., two volumes, total of 1396 pages, illustrations, bibliography. (#28)
**Chelmno: A Camp in History & Propaganda.** By Carlo Mattogno. At Chelmno, huge masses of Jewish prisoners are said to have been gassed in “gas vans” or shot (claims vary from 10,000 to 1.3 million victims). This study covers the subject from every angle, undermining the orthodox claims about the camp with an overwhelmingly effective body of evidence. Eyewitness statements, gas wagons as extermination weapons, forensics reports and excavations, German documents—all come under Mattogno’s scrutiny. Here are the uncensored facts about Chelmno, not the propaganda. 2nd ed., 188 pages, indexed, illustrated, bibliography, index. (#23)

**The Gas Vans: A Critical Investigation.** By Santiago Alvarez and Pierre Marais. It is alleged that the Nazis used mobile gas chambers to exterminate 700,000 people. Up until 2011, no thorough monograph had appeared on the topic. Santiago Alvarez has remedied the situation. Alvarez has analyzed a huge amount of witness statements as published in the literature and as presented in more than 30 trials held over the decades in Germany, Poland and Israel; and he has examined the claims made in the pertinent mainstream literature. The result of his research is mind-boggling. Note: This book and Mattogno’s book on Chelmno were edited in parallel to make sure they are consistent and not repetitive. 398 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#26)

**The Einsatzgruppen in the Occupied Eastern Territories: Genesis, Missions and Actions.** By C. Mattogno. Before invading the Soviet Union, the German authorities set up special units meant to secure the area behind the German front. Orthodox historians claim that these units called Einsatzgruppen primarily engaged in rounding up and mass-murdering Jews. This study sheds a critical light into this topic by reviewing all the pertinent sources as well as material traces. It reveals on the one hand that original war-time documents do not fully support the orthodox genocidal narrative, and on the other that most post-“liberation” sources such as testimonies and forensic reports are steeped in Soviet atrocity propaganda and thus utterly unreliable. In addition, material traces of the claimed massacres are rare due to an attitude of collusion by governments and Jewish lobby groups. 830 pp., b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#39)

**Concentration Camp Majdanek: A Historical and Technical Study.** By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. At war’s end, the Soviets claimed that up to two million Jews were murdered at the Majdanek Camp in seven gas chambers. Over the decades, however, the Majdanek Museum reduced the death toll three times to currently 78,000, and admitted that there were “only” two gas chambers. By exhaustively researching primary sources, the authors expertly dissect and repudiate the myth of homicidal gas chambers at that camp. They also critically investigated the legend of mass executions of Jews in tank trenches and prove them groundless. Again they have produced a standard work of methodical investigation which authentic historiography cannot ignore. 3rd ed., 358 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#5)

**Concentration Camp Stutthof and Its Function in National Socialist Jewish Policy.** By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. Orthodox historians claim that the Stutthof Camp served as a “make-shift” extermination camp in 1944. Based mainly on archival resources, this study thoroughly debunks this view and shows that Stutthof was in fact a center for the organization of German forced labor toward the end of World War II. 4th ed., 170 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#4)

**SECTION THREE: Auschwitz Studies**

**The Making of the Auschwitz Myth: Auschwitz in British Intercepts, Polish Underground Reports and Post-War Testimonies (1941-1947).** By Carlo Mattogno. Using messages sent by the Polish underground to London, SS radio messages send to and from Auschwitz that were intercepted and decrypted by the British, and a plethora of witness statements made during the war and in the immediate postwar period, the author shows how exactly the myth of mass murder in Auschwitz gas chambers was created, and how it was turned subsequently into “history” by intellectually corrupt scholars who cherry-picked claims that fit into their agenda and ignored or actively covered up literally thousands of lies of “witnesses” to make their narrative look credible. Ca. 300
The Real Case of Auschwitz: Robert van Pelt’s Evidence from the Irving Trial Critically Reviewed, By Carlo Mattogno. Prof. Robert van Pelt is considered one of the best mainstream experts on Auschwitz. He became famous when appearing as an expert during the London libel trial of David Irving against Deborah Lipstadt. From it resulted a book titled The Case for Auschwitz, in which van Pelt laid out his case for the existence of homicidal gas chambers at that camp. This book is a scholarly response to Prof. van Pelt—and Jean-Claude Pressac, upon whose books van Pelt’s study is largely based. Mattogno lists all the evidence van Pelt adduces, and shows one by one that van Pelt misrepresented and misinterpreted each single one of them. This is a book of prime political and scholarly importance to those looking for the truth about Auschwitz. 2nd ed., 758 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary, bibliography, index. (#2)

Auschwitz: Plain Facts: A Response to Jean-Claude Pressac, Edited by Germar Rudolf, with contributions by Serge Thion, Robert Faurisson and Carlo Mattogno. French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac tried to refute revisionist findings with the “technical” method. For this he was praised by the mainstream, and they proclaimed victory over the “revisionists.” In his book, Pressac’s works and claims are shown to be unscientific in nature, as he never substantiate what he claims, and historically false, because he systematically misrepresents, misinterprets and misunderstands German wartime documents. 2nd ed., 226 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary bibliography, index. (#14)

Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers: An Introduction and Update, By Germar Rudolf. Pressac’s 1989 oversize book of the same title was a trail blazer. Its many document reproductions are still valuable, but after decades of additional research, Pressac’s annotations are outdated. This book summarizes the most pertinent research results on Auschwitz gained during the past 30 years. With many references to Pressac’s epic tome, it serves as an update and correction to it, whether you own an original hard copy of it, read it online, borrow it from a library, purchase a reprint soon on sale, or are just interested in such a summary in general. 144 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography. (#42)

The Chemistry of Auschwitz: The Technology and Toxicology of Zyklon B and the Gas Chambers – A Crime Scene Investigation, By Germar Rudolf. This study documents forensic research on Auschwitz, where material traces and their interpretation reign supreme. Most of the claimed crime scenes – the claimed homicidal gas chambers – are still accessible to forensic examination to some degree. This book addresses questions such as: What did these gas chambers look like? How did they operate? In addition, the infamous Zyklon B can also be examined. What exactly was it? How does it kill? Does it leave traces in masonry that can be found still today? By examining these issues, the horror of Auschwitz is meticulously dissected and thus becomes comprehensible. 3rd ed., 442 pages, more than 120 color and almost 100 b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#2)

Auschwitz Lies: Legends, Lies and Prejudices on the Holocaust, By C. Mattogno and G. Rudolf. The fallacious research and alleged “refutation” of Revisionist scholars by French biochemist G. Wellers (attacking Leuchter’s famous report), Polish chemist Dr. J. Markiewicz and U.S. chemist Dr. Richard Green (taking on Rudolf’s chemical research), Dr. J. F. E. Adam Zimmerman (tackling Mattogno on cremation issues), Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman (trying to prove it all), as well as researchers Keren, McCarthy and Mazal (how turned cracks into architectural features), are exposed for what they are: blatant and easily exposed political lies created to ostracize dissident historians. 3rd ed., 398 pages, b&w illustrations, index. (#18)

Auschwitz: The Central Construction Office, By C. Mattogno. Based upon mostly unpublished German wartime documents, this study describes the history, organization, tasks and procedures of the one office which was responsible for the planning and construction of the Auschwitz camp complex, including the crematories which are said to have contained the “gas chambers.” 2nd ed., 188 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary, index. (#13)

Garrison and Headquarters Orders of the Auschwitz Camp, By C. Mattogno. A large number of all the orders ever issued by the various commandants of the infamous Auschwitz camp have been preserved. They reveal the true nature of the camp with all its daily events. There is not a trace in these orders pointing at anything sinister going on in this camp. Quite to the
contrary, many orders are in clear and insurmountable contradiction to claims that prisoners were mass murdered. This is a selection of the most pertinent of these orders together with comments putting them into their proper historical context. (Scheduled for late 2018; #34)

**Special Treatment in Auschwitz: Origin and Meaning of a Term**, By C. Mattogno. When appearing in German wartime documents, terms like “special treatment,” “special action,” and others have been interpreted as code words for mass murder. But that is not always true. This study focuses on documents about Auschwitz, showing that, while “special” had many different meanings, not a single one meant “execution.” Hence the practice of deciphering an alleged “code language” by assigning homicidal meaning to harmless documents – a key component of mainstream historiography – is untenable. 2nd ed., 166 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#10)

**Healthcare at Auschwitz**, By C. Mattogno. In extension of the above study on *Special Treatment in Auschwitz*, this study proves the extent to which the German authorities at Auschwitz tried to provide health care for the inmates. Part 1 of this book analyzes the inmates’ living conditions and the various sanitary and medical measures implemented. Part 2 explores what happened to registered inmates who were “selected” or subjected to “special treatment” while disabled or sick. This study shows that a lot was tried to cure these inmates, especially under the aegis of Garrison Physician Dr. Wirths. Part 3 is dedicated to Dr. this very Wirths. His reality refutes the current stereotype of SS officers. 398 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#33)

**Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda vs. History**, By Carlo Mattogno. The bunkers at Auschwitz, two former farmhouses just outside the camp’s perimeter, are claimed to have been the first homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz specifically equipped for this purpose. With the help of original German wartime documents as well as revealing air photos taken by Allied reconnaissance aircraft in 1944, this study shows that these homicidal “bunkers” never existed, how the rumors about them evolved as black propaganda created by resistance groups in the camp, and how this propaganda was transformed into a false reality. 2nd ed., 292 pages, b&w ill., bibliography, index. (#11)

**Auschwitz: The First Gassing, Rumor and Reality**, By C. Mattogno. The first gassing in Auschwitz is claimed to have occurred on Sept. 3, 1941, in a basement room. The accounts reporting it are the archetypes for all later gassing accounts. This study analyzes all available sources about this alleged event. It shows that these sources contradict each other in location, date, victims etc, rendering it impossible to extract a consistent story. Original wartime documents inflict a final blow to this legend and prove without a shadow of a doubt that this legendary event never happened. 3rd ed., 190 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#20)

**Auschwitz: Crematorium I and the Alleged Homicidal Gassings**, By C. Mattogno. The morgue of Crematorium I in Auschwitz is said to be the first homicidal gas chamber there. This study investigates all statements by witnesses and analyzes hundreds of wartime documents to accurately write a history of that building. Where witnesses speak of gassings, they are either very vague or, if specific, contradict one another and are refuted by documented and material facts. The author also exposes the fraudulent attempts of mainstream historians to convert the witnesses’ black propaganda into “truth” by means of selective quotes, omissions, and distortions. Mattogno proves that this building’s morgue was never a homicidal gas chamber, nor could it have worked as such. 2nd ed., 152 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#21)

**Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations**, By C. Mattogno. In spring and summer of 1944, 400,000 Hungarian Jews were deported to Auschwitz and allegedly murdered there in gas chambers. The Auschwitz crematoria are said to have been unable to cope with so many corpses. Therefore, every single day thousands of corpses are claimed to have been incinerated on huge pyres lit in deep trenches. The sky over Auschwitz was covered in thick smoke. This is what some witnesses want us to believe. This book examines the many testimonies regarding these incinerations and establishes whether these claims were even possible. Using air photos, physical evidence and wartime documents, the author shows that these claims are fiction. A new Appendix contains 3 papers on groundwater levels and cattle mass burnings. 2nd ed., 202 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#17)
The Cremation Furnaces of Auschwitz. By Carlo Mattogno & Franco Deana. An exhaustive study of the history and technology of cremation in general and of the cremation furnaces of Auschwitz in particular. On a vast base of technical literature, extant wartime documents and material traces, the authors can establish the true nature and capacity of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces. They show that these devices were inferior make-shift versions of what was usually produced, and that their capacity to cremate corpses was lower than normal, too. 3 vols., 1198 pages, b&w and color illustrations (vols 2 & 3), bibliography, index, glossary. (#24)

Curated Lies: The Auschwitz Museum’s Misrepresentations, Distortions and Deceptions. By Carlo Mattogno. Revisionist research results have put the Polish Auschwitz Museum under pressure to answer this challenge. They’ve answered. This book analyzes their answer and reveals the appallingly mendacious attitude of the Auschwitz Museum authorities when presenting documents from their archives. 248 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#38)

Deliveries of Coke, Wood and Zyklon B to Auschwitz: Neither Proof Nor Trace for the Holocaust. By Carlo Mattogno. Researchers from the Auschwitz Museum tried to prove the reality of mass extermination by pointing to documents about deliveries of wood and coke as well as Zyklon B to the Auschwitz Camp. If put into the actual historical and technical context, however, these documents prove the exact opposite of what these orthodox researchers claim. Ca. 250 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (Scheduled for early 2019; #40)

SECTION FOUR: Witness Critique

Holocaust High Priest: Elie Wiesel, Night, the Memory Cult, and the Rise of Revisionism. By Warren B. Routledge. The first unauthorized biography of Wiesel exposes both his personal deceits and the whole myth of “the six million.” It shows how Zionist control has allowed Wiesel and his fellow extremists to force leaders of many nations, the U.N. and even popes to genuflect before Wiesel as symbolic acts of subordination to World Jewry, while at the same time forcing school children to submit to Holocaust brainwashing. 468 pages, b&w illus., bibliography, index. (#30)

Auschwitz: Confessions and Testimonies. By Jürgen Graf. The traditional narrative of what transpired at the infamous Auschwitz Camp during WWII rests almost exclusively on witness testimony. This study critically scrutinizes the 40 most important of them by checking them for internal coherence, and by comparing them with one another as well as with other evidence such as wartime documents, air photos, forensic research results, and material traces. The result is devastating for the traditional narrative. (Scheduled for late-2018; #36)

Commandant of Auschwitz: Rudolf Höss, His Torture and His Forced Confessions. By Carlo Mattogno & Rudolf Höss. From 1940 to 1943, Rudolf Höss was the commandant of the infamous Auschwitz Camp. After the war, he was captured by the British. In the following 13 months until his execution, he made 85 depositions of various kinds in which he confessed his involvement in the “Holocaust.” This study first reveals how the British tortured him to extract various “confessions.” Next, all of Höss’s depositions are analyzed by checking his claims for internal consistency and comparing them with established historical facts. The results are eye-opening... 402 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#35)

An Auschwitz Doctor’s Eyewitness Account: The Tall Tales of Dr. Mengele’s Assistant Analyzed. By Miklos Nyiszli & Carlo Mattogno. Nyiszli, a Hungarian physician, ended up at Auschwitz in 1944 as Dr. Mengele’s assistant. After the war he wrote a book and several other writings describing what he claimed to have experienced. To this day some traditional historians take his accounts seriously, while others reject them as grotesque lies and exaggerations. This study presents and analyzes Nyiszli’s writings and skillfully separates truth from fabulous fabrication. 484 pages, b&w illus., bibliography, index. (#37)

For current prices and availability see book finder sites such as bookfinder.com, addall.com, bookfinder4u.com or findbookprices.com; learn more at www.holocausthandbooks.com
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Thomas Dalton, The Holocaust: An Introduction
The Holocaust was perhaps the greatest crime of the 20th century. Six million Jews, we are told, died by gassing, shooting, and deprivation. But: Where did the six million figure come from? How, exactly, did the gas chambers work? Why do we have so little physical evidence from major death camps? Why haven't we found even a fraction of the six million bodies, or their ashes? Why has there been so much media suppression and governmental censorship on this topic? In a sense, the Holocaust is the greatest murder mystery in history. It is a topic of greatest importance for the present day. Let's explore the evidence, and see where it leads.
128 pp. pb, 5”×8”, ill., bibl., index

Carlo Mattogno, Auschwitz: A Three-Quarter Century of Propaganda: Origins, Development and Decline of the “Gas Chamber” Propaganda Lie
During the war, wild rumors were circulating about Auschwitz: that the Germans were testing new war gases; that inmates were murdered in electrocution chambers, with gas showers or pneumatic hammer systems; that living people were sent on conveyor belts directly into cremation furnaces; that oils, grease and soap were made of the mass-murder victims. Nothing of it was true. When the Soviets captured Auschwitz in early 1945, they reported that 4 million inmates were killed on electrocution conveyor belts discharging their load directly into furnaces. That wasn't true either. After the war, “witnesses” and “experts” repeated these things and added more fantasies: mass murder with gas bombs, gas chambers made of canvas; carts driving living people into furnaces; that the crematoria of Auschwitz could have cremated 400 million victims… Again, none of it was true. This book gives an overview of the many rumors, myths and lies about Auschwitz which mainstream historians today reject as untrue. It then explains by which ridiculous methods some claims about Auschwitz were accepted as true and turned into “history,” although they are just as untrue.
125 pp. pb, 5”×8”, ill., bibl., index, b&w ill.

Wilhelm Stäglich, Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence
Auschwitz is the epicenter of the Holocaust, where more people are said to have been murdered than anywhere else. At this detention camp the industrialized Nazi mass murder is said to have reached its demonic pinnacle. This narrative is based on a wide range of evidence, the most important of which was presented during two trials: the International Military Tribunal of 1945/46, and the German Auschwitz Trial of 1963-1965 in Frankfurt.
The late Wilhelm Stäglich, until the mid-1970s a German judge, has so far been the only legal expert to critically analyze this evidence. His research reveals the incredibly scandalous way in which the Allied victors and later the German judicial authorities bent and broke the law in order to come to politically foregone conclusions. Stäglich also exposes the shockingly superficial way in which historians are dealing with the many incongruities and discrepancies of the historical record.
3rd edition 2015, 422 pp., 6”×9”, pb, b&w ill.

Gerard Menuhin: Tell the Truth & Shame the Devil
A prominent Jew from a famous family says the “Holocaust” is a wartime propaganda myth which has turned into an extortion racket. Far from bearing the sole guilt for starting WWII as alleged at Nuremberg (for which many of the surviving German leaders were hanged) Germany is mostly innocent in this respect and made numerous attempts to avoid and later to end the confrontation. During the 1930s Germany was confronted by a powerful Jewish-dominated world plutocracy out to destroy it… Yes, a prominent Jew says all this. Accept it or reject it, but be sure to read it and judge for yourself!
The author is the son of the great American-born violinist Yehudi Menuhin, who, though from a long line of rabbinical ancestors, fiercely criticized the foreign policy of the state of Israel and its repression of the Palestinians in the Holy Land.

For prices and availability see www.shop.codoh.com or write to: CHP, PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
Germar Rudolf, **Bungled: “Denying the Holocaust” How Deborah Lipstadt Botched Her Attempt to Demonstrate the Growing Assault on Truth and Memory**

With her book *Denying the Holocaust*, Deborah Lipstadt tried to show the flawed methods and extremist motives of “Holocaust deniers.” This book demonstrates that Dr. Lipstadt clearly has neither understood the principles of science and scholarship, nor has she any clue about the historical topics she is writing about. She misquotes, mistranslates, misrepresents, misinterprets, and makes a plethora of wild claims without backing them up with anything. Rather than dealing thoroughly with factual arguments, Lipstadt’s book is full of *ad hominem* attacks on her opponents. It is an exercise in anti-intellectual pseudo-scientific arguments, an exhibition of ideological radicalism that rejects anything which contradicts its preset conclusions. **F for FAIL**

2nd ed., 224 pp., 5“×8“, pb, bibl., index, b&w ill.

Carolus Magnus, **Bungled: “Denying History”. How Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman Botched Their Attempt to Refute Those Who Say the Holocaust Never Happened**

Skeptic Magazine editor Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman from the Simon Wiesenthal Center wrote a book in 2000 which they claim is “a thorough and thoughtful answer to all the claims of the Holocaust deniers.” In 2009, a new “updated” edition appeared with the same ambitious goal. In the meantime, revisionists had published some 10,000 pages of archival and forensic research results. Would their updated edition indeed answer all the revisionist claims? In fact, Shermer and Grobman completely ignored the vast amount of recent scholarly studies and piled up a heap of falsifications, contortions, omissions, and fallacious interpretations of the evidence. Finally, what the authors claim to have demolished is not revisionism but a ridiculous parody of it. They ignored the known unreliability of their cherry-picked selection of evidence, utilizing unverified and incestuous sources, and obscuring the massive body of research and all the evidence that dooms their project to failure. **F for FAIL**

162 pp., 5“×8“, pb, bibl., index, b&w ill.

Carolus Magnus, **Bungled: “Debunking Holocaust Denial Theories”. How James and Lance Morcan Botched Their Attempt to Affirm the Historicity of the Nazi Genocide**

The novelists and movie-makers James and Lance Morcan have produced a book “to end [Holocaust] denial once and for all.” To do this, “no stone was left unturned” to verify historical assertions by presenting “a wide array of sources” meant “to shut down the debate deniers wish to create. One by one, the various arguments Holocaust deniers use to try to discredit wartime records are carefully scrutinized and then systematically disproven.” It’s a lie. First, the Morcans completely ignored the vast amount of recent scholarly studies published by revisionists; they didn’t even identify them. Instead, they engaged in shadowboxing, creating some imaginary, bogus “revisionist” scarecrow which they then tore to pieces. In addition, their knowledge even of their own side’s source material was dismal, and the way they backed up their misleading or false claims was pitifully inadequate. **F for FAIL**

144 pp., 5“×8“, pb, bibl., index, b&w ill.

Joachim Hoffmann, **Stalin’s War of Extermination 1941-1945**

A German government historian documents Stalin’s murderous war against the German army and the German people. Based on the author’s lifelong study of German and Russian military records, this book reveals the Red Army’s grisly record of atrocities against soldiers and civilians, as ordered by Stalin. Since the 1920s, Stalin planned to invade Western Europe to initiate the “World Revolution.” He prepared an attack which was unparalleled in history. The Germans noticed Stalin’s aggressive intentions, but they underestimated the strength of the Red Army. What unfolded was the most-cruel war in history. This book shows how Stalin and his Bolshevik henchman used unimaginable violence and atrocities to break any resistance in the Red Army and to force their unwilling soldiers to fight against the Germans. The book explains how Soviet propagandists incited their soldiers to unlimited hatred against everything German, and he gives the reader a short but extremely unpleasant glimpse into what happened when these Soviet soldiers finally reached German soil in 1945: A gigantic wave of looting, arson, rape, torture, and mass murder…

428 pp. pb, 6“×9“, bibl., index, b&w ill.

For prices and availability see www.shop.codoh.com or write to: CHP, PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
Udo Walendy, *Who Started World War II: Truth for a War-Torn World*

For seven decades, mainstream historians have insisted that Germany was the main, if not the sole culprit for unleashing World War II in Europe. In the present book this myth is refuted. There is available to the public today a great number of documents on the foreign policies of the Great Powers before September 1939 as well as a wealth of literature in the form of memoirs of the persons directly involved in the decisions that led to the outbreak of World War II. Together, they made possible Walendy’s present mosaic-like reconstruction of the events before the outbreak of the war in 1939. This book has been published only after an intensive study of sources, taking the greatest care to minimize speculation and inference. The present edition has been translated completely anew from the German original and has been slightly revised.

500 pp. pb, 6"×9", index, bibl., b&w ill.

Germar Rudolf: *Resistance is Obligatory!*

In 2005 Rudolf, a peaceful dissident and publisher of revisionist literature, was kidnapped by the U.S. government and deported to Germany. There the local lackey regime staged a show trial against him for his historical writings. Rudolf was not permitted to defend his historical opinions, as the German penal law prohibits this. Yet he defended himself anyway: 7 days long Rudolf held a speech in the court room, during which he proved systematically that only the revisionists are scholarly in their attitude, whereas the Holocaust orthodoxy is merely pseudo-scientific. He then explained in detail why it is everyone’s obligation to resist, without violence, a government which throws peaceful dissident into dungeons. When Rudolf tried to publish his public defence speech as a book from his prison cell, the public prosecutor initiated a new criminal investigation against him. After his probation time ended in 2011, he dared publish this speech anyway…

2nd ed. 2016, 378 pp., 6"×9", pb, b&w ill.

Germar Rudolf, *Hunting Germar Rudolf: Essays on a Modern-Day Witch Hunt*

German-born revisionist activist, author and publisher Germar Rudolf describes which events made him convert from a Holocaust believer to a Holocaust skeptic, quickly rising to a leading personality within the revisionist movement. This in turn unleashed a tsunami of persecution against him: loss of his job, denied PhD exam, destruction of his family, driven into exile, slandered by the mass media, literally hunted, caught, put on a show trial where filing motions to introduce evidence is illegal under the threat of further prosecution, and finally locked up in prison for years for nothing else than his peaceful yet controversial scholarly writings. In several essays, Rudolf takes the reader on a journey through an absurd world of government and societal persecution which most of us could never even fathom actually exists.…

304 pp., 6"×9", pb, bibl., index, b&w ill.

Germar Rudolf, *The Day Amazon Murdered History*

Amazon is the world’s biggest book retailer. They dominate the U.S. and several foreign markets. Pursuant to the 1998 declaration of Amazon’s founder Jeff Bezos to offer “the good, the bad and the ugly,” customers once could buy every book that was in print and was legal to sell. However, in early 2017, a series of anonymous bomb threats against Jewish community centers occurred in the U.S., fueling a campaign by Jewish groups to coax Amazon into banning revisionist writings, false portraing them as anti-Semitic. On March 6, 2017, Amazon caved in and banned more than 100 books with dissenting viewpoints on the Holocaust. In April 2017, an Israeli Jew was arrested for having placed the fake bomb threats, a paid “service” he had offered for years. But that did not change Amazon’s mind. Its stores remain closed for history books Jewish lobby groups disapprove of. This book accompanies the documentary of the same title. Both reveal how revisionist publications had become so powerfuly convincing that the powers that be resorted to what looks like a dirty false-flag operation in order to get these books banned from Amazon…

128 pp. pb, 5"×8", bibl., b&w ill.
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